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ABSTRACT

From around 1838 to 1861, Charles Roach Smith played a central role in the revival and development of British archaeology. Among the first to whom archaeology was no longer subservient to history, Smith adopted and encouraged a strongly positivist approach and, influenced by Douglas and the comte de Caylus, effectively inaugurated the study of minor antiquities within Britain. His comparative artifact research, regional and international in scope, led to the development of Dark Age archaeology as an international field of study.

Smith's ideas on the organisation of British archaeology were derived from Northern France, where the democratisation of knowledge was more advanced. His aims were to extend to the middle classes the opportunity for involvement in archaeological research and publication (which was vital in view of the rising scale of archaeological destruction), to obtain government support (since they had little by way of private funds), and to improve standards by emphasising meritocracy rather than aristocracy in the ruling bodies of the discipline. Modelled on the Société Française pour la Conservation des Monuments Historiques, the British Archaeological Association, which Smith jointly inaugurated, was one tangible result. The campaign to induce the British Museum's aristocratic trustees to purchase his Museum of London Antiquities as the core of the national archaeological collection was another.

This thesis comprises an outline of Smith's life and career to 1861, with a detailed discussion of his contributions to the archaeology of Roman and medieval London and Anglo-Saxon England, and the developing institutions of British archaeology. In view of the centrality of Smith's position, it constitutes a logical first step towards a general history of early Victorian archaeology. This may be further advanced by the summary catalogue of Smith's manuscripts.
(some as yet untraced), which comprise an hitherto unrecognised archive of international importance.
C. Roach Smith

Pl. 1, frontispiece: C.R. Smith, photograph of c. 1865
(from Edwards 1865).
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CHAPTER 1: Introduction

It is just over a century since Charles Roach Smith FSA was buried with the remains of his sister Maria, in Frindsbury churchyard, Kent, overlooking their former home in Strood. The numerous obituaries written about Smith reflect the high esteem which he attained during his lifetime, but they stand in marked contrast with the lack of attention that he has since received. After summarising Smith's archaeological achievements as perceived by his contemporaries, this introductory chapter explains his subsequent eclipse in terms of the aims and interests of historians of archaeology. It then outlines the current state of archaeological historiography and the writer's approach to his subject. It concludes by calling for a more coherent approach to the collection and cataloguing of 19th-century antiquarian manuscripts.

The Obituaries

When he died in August 1890, Roach Smith (a retired retail chemist) was hailed as "Nestor of the Southern Antiquaries" (Gosselin 1890, 418). Some weeks earlier, on learning that Smith was ailing, John Evans, President of the Society of Antiquaries of London and The Numismatic Society, had organised the striking of a medal to commemorate Smith's "lifelong services to archaeology" (Morgan 1890, 243; Pl. 1). This had been presented to Smith, with one hundred guineas, three days before his death (Waller 1891, x). The Numismatic Society had already awarded Smith with its first ever medal for "services to numismatic science, more especially in connection with the Romano-British series" (NS 1883, 16-17).

Smith's obituaries (see Appendix 1e) all mentioned his outstanding Museum of London Antiquities, which comprised over 5000 archaeological finds of mostly Roman and medieval date. Smith had formed his collection between 1835 and 1855.
by making purchases from labourers employed on City of London construction projects. In 1856, he had sold the collection to the British Museum at a sacrificially low price, in order to preserve its integrity and to ensure that it would remain in the locality whose history it illustrated.

The obituaries also emphasised Smith's role in establishing the British Archaeological Association in 1843, which with its antipathetic clone, the Archaeological Institute, had fostered the early Victorian vogue for local antiquarian societies. His extraordinary zeal as the BAA's first secretary from 1844-49 was noted, along with his part in raising public awareness of the value of archaeological remains.

One writer described Smith as "almost the founder of the new school of Romano-British archaeology", recognising his role in reviving field-work in the tradition of Camden, Horsley and Lysons (Morgan 1890, 237). While The Builder called him "the greatest modern authority on Roman antiquities in Britain" (Anon. 1890b), the antiquaries J.C. Bruce and George Payne emphasised Smith's importance as editor of Faussett's Inventorium Sepulchrale and Stevenson's Dictionary of Roman Coins. Of his innumerable original works, they accorded greatest praise to his "incomparable" Collectanea Antiqua, which in seven volumes from 1843-80 had demonstrated the value of simple, accurate illustrations, particularly in the study of small artifacts and coins (Bruce 1892; Payne 1890). Through his visits to France, regular correspondence and gifts of publications, Smith had been made honorary member of most of the leading antiquarian societies in Western Europe. In addressing the Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France, Mowet commented that:

"Dans le groupe de nos associés étrangers, il tenait depuis quarante ans une place à part, car il était des nôtres au sens le plus littéral du mot" (Mowet 1891).
Most of the obituary writers dipped into the two volumes of Smith's Retrospections then published. None failed to be attracted by the romantic tale of the Lothbury druggist who amassed a museum at the rear of his shop, harangued the City Corporation for neglecting its antiquities, obtained his FSA in the teeth of those who thought a tradesman unworthy, and through tireless devotion to archaeology, gained the esteem of leading antiquaries and members of the nobility. It is no surprise to find Smith spoken of as "hero" (Payne 1890, 321).

Previous Work on Smith

Whereas Smith, who died in the same week as Schliemann of Troy, generally attracted longer obituaries than Schliemann, at least in British journals (the exception is Anon. 1891a; cf. Anon. 1890a), today Schliemann remains a household name, while Roach Smith's is little known, even among Romanists. Within London and Kent, his collection and publications ensure that Smith is not entirely forgotten; he is mentioned in every significant volume on Roman London (e.g. Wheeler 1928, 10; Merrifield 1965, 3-4; Marsden 1980, 190-1). Nevertheless, setting aside a volume of personal reminiscences (Smetham 1929), for 74 years after his death the importance of Smith's work to the development of archaeology passed almost without mention.

The first reassessment of Smith dates to 1964, when Ronald Jessup included a brief biography in his popular Story of Archaeology in Britain. Here Smith is accorded a position alongside Stukeley, Douglas and Pitt-Rivers, since with him "facts and adequate illustrations took the place of unsupported speculation" (Jessup 1964, 163).

Smith's work acquired a new significance as the rescue archaeology movement gathered pace during the 1970s. Following his appointment as "Chief Urban Archaeologist" at London's Guildhall Museum, Brian Hobley (1975) perceived
Smith as a "pioneer rescue archaeologist", who played a significant role in the professionalisation of archaeology (see also Gretton 1979). Pointing to Smith's demands for site watching to recover and record London's archaeology, Hobley viewed the BAA as a precursor of "Rescue", the trust for British Archaeology. The relevance of Smith's site records to the current excavation programme had been demonstrated by the rediscovery of the Roman riverside wall, first described by Smith. Hobley nevertheless considered that Smith's real pioneer work lay in his illustrations, comparing the quality of his small-find drawings to those of modern reports.

Dafydd Kidd's more substantial essays of 1977-8 hinted for the first time at the wealth of surviving documentary evidence relating to Smith, and its potential for biographical treatment (Kidd 1977; 1978). Although the BM had long held some of Smith's manuscript journals, these had not been transcribed and were rarely consulted (the writer has subsequently typed the narrative sections). Kidd's 1977 article examined the BM's decision to purchase Smith's collection, which marked a turning point in persuading its trustees to include British archaeological remains within the national collection. His other paper compared Smith with his French contemporary, the Abbé Cochet, discussing their influence one upon the other.

Kidd concluded that Smith's work marked a stage in the emergence from antiquarianism of scientific archaeology, recognising his debt to Douglas - one of the first "to substitute ... a clear description, and ample illustrations, for vague generalities and theories sparingly supported by facts" (Smith 1851b, 156). He emphasised that Smith collected artifacts for their archaeological significance "as relicts of everyday material culture of the past, rather than selected as works of intrinsic artistic merit" (Kidd 1977, 105). Smith's travels in France were also recognised as significant in fostering contacts between continental and
English archaeologists, and for revealing what might be possible in terms of governmental support for archaeology and museums.

Reasons why Smith has been neglected

Since Smith's work bears the hall-marks of greatness, the lack of attention accorded to him by historians of archaeology has given rise to comment (Hobley 1975, 328; Gretton 1979, 524). Whereas Gretton found it hard to understand, a number of reasons may be suggested, arising from:

- Smith's chronological position and the nature of his contribution to archaeology, and
- the aims, interests and approach of historians of archaeology, and the state of archaeological historiography in general.

That Smith has not attracted a biography may be partly due to the quantity of source material (D. Kidd, pers. comm.). On first sight, a biography might also seem unnecessary because Smith published three volumes of Retrospections, but whilst recognising their value to historians of Victorian archaeology, Smith's memoirs are "kaleidoscopic" in style (Anon. 1883c), and the events he describes are in anything but chronological order and entirely without dates. Privately, Smith's friends were disappointed in them, having hoped for:

"... a complete account of himself, that they might sit by their own firesides and follow their colleague year by year. Roach Smith could not have done this; it would have been too great a tax upon him. He must write as he thought, or not at all" (Payne 1890, 328).

Smith's Retrospections were further impaired by his intention:

"... to do justice to those of his friends who had in any way distinguished themselves, and whose labours and works might perchance fall into oblivion" (Payne 1890, 329).
Thus, despite some deft character sketches, they are interspersed with dry biographical details and bibliographies, and lack objectivity in that "ancient friends are seen in the golden setting of a generous regard" (Anon 1883c). Smith also had a tendency towards "omitting to mention the general progress of archaeology independent of his own exertions" (Kidd 1977, 132). If his "occasional want of perspective" was evident in the 1880s (Anon. 1883a), it follows that the modern reader, without much knowledge of the personalities involved and the intellectual and social background, is ill equipped to grasp the significance of much of Retrospections. Thus instead of providing the spring-board for a biography, a fully researched biography is needed to make sense of the Retrospections. This could not have been written without the manuscript evidence, the extent of which was unrecognised before the present study.

Smith's academic output would undoubtedly be better known but for the manner in which it was published. His papers and articles, which number over 800, are so dispersed in various journals that their quantity, range and quality are not readily apparent. Moreover, his major works were privately printed in small quantities, and are seldom encountered outside specialist libraries (see Appendix 1a). At the time of Smith's death a complete set of his Collectanea was already a "great rarity", and fetched over £ 20 (Smetham 1891).

Smith's very significance as one who "marks a sort of half-way house between antiquarianism and present day archaeology" also makes it easy to overlook him (Gretton 1979, 524). His principal achievements date from 1835-61, when he led the field, and was sometimes far ahead of his contemporaries. By his 78th year, however, when he abandoned antiquities to write his memoirs, Smith (to his disgust)\(^{10}\) was rightly described as a "veteran", who had

\(^{10}\) LOA 263/34, CRS to JOH, 21 Mar. 1883.
"seen the great leaders of research avail themselves of his labours, and in their march of discovery leave him behind" (Anon. 1883a; 1883b). Consequently, there was no prospect that Smith's ideas might be revived by a new generation of archaeologists, like those of Stukeley, Douglas and Pitt-Rivers. He outlived those over whom his influence had been of the greatest significance and unlike Cochet, left no successors of major importance (cf. France-Lanord 1978, 41). His surviving protégés, George Payne, J.E. Price and George Dowker, were capable but no more (Barry 1970). The baton of academic progress had long been wrenched from Smith's creation, the BAA, which rapidly declined after Smith resigned from it in 1849. A.W. Franks, who otherwise might have been regarded as Smith's natural successor, joined the Archaeological Institute.

The Intellectual Context of this Study

It is understandable that Smith's work should have been eclipsed by the spectacular discoveries of the late 19th century. Unlike Schliemann, Smith did not discover great art treasures or explore the historical basis of archaic poetry. Unlike Sir Arthur Evans or Maudslay, he did not discover new civilisations. Unlike Boucher de Perthes, Smith did not gain new insights into the antiquity of man, with all its implications for other disciplines, nor did he conduct model excavations like Pitt-Rivers. His work was mostly confined to Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon antiquities, and it is against this less glamorous background that his achievements must be measured.

That even here Smith's contribution should have passed largely unnoticed is due to the nature of previous research on the history of British archaeology. From the Second World War until quite recently the subject has been dominated by Professors Glyn Daniel and Stuart Piggott—both prehistorians with little apparent interest in the historic and proto-historic periods. Neither accords
Smith's work with even minor significance. Daniel's studies were focused narrowly upon the evolution of the three-age system, creating an impression that there were no other important issues in British archaeology during the 19th century (Daniel 1962; 1975, etc.). Piggott is primarily interested in 18th-century archaeology (1976a; 1985; etc.), and unlike Daniel, has at least maintained a balanced approach, admitting that: "The history of Victorian antiquarianism and archaeology still remains to be written" (Piggott 1986a).

That such a treatise has not appeared may be because it lies beyond the capability of an individual writer. It is not just that the source materials - manuscripts and publications - are too abundant for one person to examine and synthesise, but that the range of topics that such a work ought to encompass would extend beyond the specialisms of most contemporary archaeologists.

The absence of a general history of British archaeology does not, however, explain the lack of research into its aspects, as evidenced by a dearth of doctoral theses (ASLIB 1950-82). McVicar and Fahnestock (both 1984), suggest that the traditional approach to archaeological historiography has itself caused the subject to be relegated to the side-lines. The teleological model, propounded by Daniel, sees archaeology as a new discipline maturing as if by some internal dynamic. From this perspective, its history frequently becomes an attempt to legitimise ideas by rooting them in an intellectual tradition (Christenson 1989, 1), and at worst comprises a catalogue of failures, errors and bankrupt lines of enquiry - the study of which is:

"... something of a luxury: an after-dinner pastime ... or something to 'flesh out' the methodology training given to undergraduates" (McVicar 1984, 3).

Apart from being intrinsically interesting, its value lies merely in preventing a repetition of past errors (Daniel 1981b, 10).
According to McVicar (1984, 5), archaeology's methodology and its understanding of its past are mutually reinforcing, hence:

"... as the discipline's self-image changes, so there will be a requirement sooner or later for a new disciplinary history; equally, a change in the discipline's view of its past will promote a reevaluation of its self-image".

This comment may help to explain the lack of interest in the history of the archaeology of Roman Britain in particular, in that according to Cunliffe (1984, 177), objectives in the study of Roman Britain have changed little since Haverfield established its present direction. Romanists have consequently paid little attention to their theoretical base (Jones 1987, 85-86), a situation reflected in their lack of interest in the subject's history, which prior to the mid 1980s, comprised Haverfield's lecture of 1907 (Haverfield and MacDonald 1924, 59-88), and Birley's geographically limited Research on Hadrian's Wall (1961). Recently, however, there have been signs of a renewal of interest, prompted by a need to take stock of the wealth of discoveries, publications, and theoretical approaches of the 1970s, and to suggest where these may be leading with regard to the study of Roman Britain (Cunliffe 1984; Potter 1986 and 1987; Jones 1989; Frere 1988; Johnson 1989; etc.).

Both McVicar and Fahnestock advocate a new framework of study derived from intellectual developments of the 1960s. These involve the rejection of a progressive view of the past, which historians call "Whig history" after Butterfield (1931, etc.). The Whiggish approach encourages a one-sided analysis in which successful ideas are disassociated from unsuccessful ones, whereas in reality both emerged from the same context and influenced one another. Any adequate "critical history" must explain their co-existence as well as why the successful idea was adopted. It must also explain each past archaeology "within the total context of its time - social, economic, political and intellectual" (McVicar 1984, 4). By demonstrating that "different people at different times create different images of the past",
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histories on these lines would challenge the notion that the material nature of archaeological evidence imparts a special objectivity (Jones 1989, 85-86). By revealing the processes that lead to archaeological knowledge, they might even help to reorientate archaeological practice (Pinsky 1989). With this in mind, Pinsky argues that practising archaeologists should be involved in writing the discipline's history.

A number of recent writers, notably Clarke (1972) and Binford (see Fitting 1973) have studied historical changes in archaeological interpretation in terms of Thomas Kuhn's analysis of how scientific ideas alter through revolutionary paradigm change (Kuhn 1962). According to this approach, where archaeologists of different age groups are advocating apparently irreconcilable archaeological approaches and philosophy has been introduced into the debate, then archaeology is undergoing a Kuhnian revolution.

Although it offers valuable insights, there are numerous objections to Kuhn's original thesis, and Kuhn has modified his views (Kuhn 1970). The application of his ideas to archaeology raises the old difficulty of whether archaeology is now, or was ever, art or science - and whether it incorporates one or more dominant universal paradigms, or a host of conflicting or even complementary viewpoints and approaches (Clarke 1972, 8; cf. Popper 1970, 55). This second question is especially pertinent with regard to Roman archaeology bearing in mind Richmond's remark that:

"... the vastness of the subject permits also this luxury ..., that no one person will be so rash as to fancy he can cover all its aspects thoroughly. In so rich a treasury choice has wide play and enjoyment may extend to such aspects as are deemed most interesting or most fruitful or found most akin to the intellectual propensities of the chooser" (Richmond 1957, 5).

Perhaps the most powerful objection to Kuhn's analysis is that, like all current theories of the structure of science, it is based on an inadequately researched history of the subject, which "cannot bear such a load at this time"
(Williams 1970). Whether or not this is true for science, the comparatively ill-researched history of archaeology surely remains at a pre-theoretical stage. The critics of traditional histories of archaeology cited above complain that they are mere chronicles of events. In the absence of an adequate summary of the practice and development of proto-historic archaeology, such criticisms nevertheless seem premature. Since this thesis represents a venture into poorly charted waters, the writer's primary task has been to outline some problems, to draw some preliminary conclusions, and above all, to chart the source materials upon which future, more critical histories must be based.

This said, some of Kuhn's recommended methodologies for historians of science do seem relevant - even to a preliminary study. In particular, his central idea, that scientific changes have sociological aspects, places a new focus on "the nature of the scientific group, ... its values, what it tolerates, and what it disdains" (Kuhn 1970, 238). According to Kuhn, a specialist group forms when a number of individuals receive a paradigm, and may be identified by the formation of journals, societies, and "the claim for a special place in the curriculum" (Kuhn 1962, 19). Accordingly, the writer gives special attention to the new journals with which Smith was associated, and the new societies that he created or joined. Having isolated a specialist group, Kuhn asks the historian to consider the "disciplinary matrix", or how its members practised science in order to solve puzzles (Kuhn 1970, 271, etc.). An examination of archaeological methods may likewise reveal the subject's suppositions and limitations at a given period.

It is Kuhn's theory of the nature of scientific revolutions that has aroused most controversy. A Kuhnian revolution occurs when novelties thrown up in the course of normal puzzle-solving science can no longer be suppressed or evaded. Then:
"... begin the extraordinary investigations that lead the profession at last to a new set of commitments; a new basis for the practice of science" (Kuhn 1962, 6).

Some of Kuhn's opponents agree that Kuhnian revolutions exist whilst maintaining that not all revolutions are Kuhnian, but whatever the case, the view that science evolves through accretion is now untenable. This demands that particular attention be given to the major advances in knowledge - which are likely to marked by excitement, controversy and disputes within the community.

In that both Kuhn and his opponents place such stress upon scientific communities and institutions, it is fortunate that the institutions of Victorian antiquarianism have already received some attention by historians. Of particular value are the painstaking histories of the Society of Antiquaries by Evans (1956), the British Museum by Miller (1974), and the Guildhall and London Museums by Sheppard (1991). Another important contribution is the volume of papers to commemorate the centenary of the death of Joseph Mayer of Liverpool 1803-1886 whose collections form the basis of Liverpool Museum (Gibson and Wright 1988). Like other post-war writers, Evans recognised the importance of considering the social background of antiquarians (see also Brooks 1985; Piggott 1976a; Hudson 1981). A more recent study by Levine (1986) has considered how the county archaeological societies were relegated to the sidelines of research through the professionalisation of history during the 19th century. Despite shortcomings in her treatment of archaeology, Levine's work represents the first serious attempt to place these societies in their intellectual and social context (Rhodes 1987).

Whilst recognising the importance of archaeological historiography as a means of gaining theoretical insights, the writer wishes to underline two practical reasons for studying archaeology's history. These are that if we understand how our archives and collections were formed and/or dispersed, we will obviously stand more chance of
tracing relevant data, and that an understanding of past methodologies and presuppositions is important when reinterpreting archaeological records. If we are to understand the limitations and strengths of old data, be they illustrations or descriptions of fieldwork, then we must try to comprehend the observer's intellectual background: what he expected to see and would have noticed, what he might have overlooked, and the parameters within which he interpreted his perceptions (Meltzer 1989, 15). The value of such considerations in solving archaeological problems are illustrated in a recent paper by Needham (1986), and a reinterpretation of Smith's records of the coins from London Bridge, presented in Chapter 6.

Aims and Objectives

The writer has adhered to his original aim of producing a critical appraisal of Smith's life and work. Because of Smith's extensive memoirs, it was wrongly thought that this might be achieved without preparing a biography. When the deficiencies of Smith's Retrospections were recognised (p. 20), it nevertheless became necessary to look to the manuscript evidence to create a framework wherein to place the events and archaeological discoveries which Smith describes. Some of the results are incorporated into this thesis (notably in Chapters 3-4, 7-8 and Appendix 4). Together with an extensive archive of notes and photocopies arranged in chronological order, these may one day form the basis of a comprehensive biography, the need for which has been indicated by Kidd (1977, 132).

The writer initially underestimated the scope of Smith's activities and achievements, which ultimately made it necessary to limit the topics to be covered in depth. Having decided to concentrate upon Smith's most important work between 1835 and 1861, it became apparent that Kidd had covered the main points relating to the purchase of Smith's
collection (Kidd 1977). This left available Smith's contribution to:

- the archaeology of Roman and medieval London
- the British Archaeological Association
- the development of museums
- the study and publication of coins and "small finds"
- Roman Britain and Gaul
- Dark-Age cemeteries and grave-goods.

It was decided to concentrate upon Smith's contribution to the study of Roman and medieval London, to the British Archaeological Association, and to the study of Dark Age cemeteries and grave goods, since it is these areas that the relationship between institutional and paradigm change is most apparent. These topics are also sufficiently diverse to demonstrate the breadth of Smith's endeavours, and to permit the writer to demonstrate a range of historiographical skills and approaches. The main omission is Smith's contribution to the study of Roman Britain and Gaul, which warrants a thesis in its own right. The final chapter nevertheless considers Smith's contribution in all these areas in relation to his academic career as a whole, and to parallel social and intellectual trends.

While preparing the thesis, it was discovered that aspects of Sheppard's work on the origins of the Guildhall Museum and a paper on Mayer's contribution to archaeology by Roger White were likely to touch on certain areas covered in Chapter 9 of this thesis. The writer decided to collaborate fully with these authors in sharing information on sources, although his approach to the subject and conclusions remain substantially original, and it will be noted that Chapter 9 was presented to Professor Wilkes prior to the other writers' publications (Sheppard 1991; White 1988a).

**The Manuscript Sources**

As the writer investigated the manuscript collections, an unsatisfactory situation was revealed, namely:
• that many of the most important are missing, and if still extant, are privately owned, or abroad;
• that public institutions have not always sought to acquire this kind of material, especially by purchase;
• that most collections are inadequately catalogued;
• that in consequence, many valuable manuscripts are effectively lost to scholarship; certainly, little use is being made of them.

An increasing conviction of the importance of the manuscripts and a desire to improve their accessibility gave rise to the third main component of this study – a summary catalogue of manuscripts relating to Smith's life and work (Appendix 2). It is intended to make this publicly accessible on computers in one or more academic libraries, so that searches may be made on the names of antiquaries or archaeological sites. This thesis is an appropriate place for such a catalogue because Smith's manuscripts represent a substantial portion of his archaeological legacy. His attempts to find a secure home for his correspondence, albeit unsuccessful, show that he regarded it in this light.

Smith's manuscripts are important firstly as a source of information about the development and practice of archaeology. His journals, for instance, provide a rare insight into the state of provincial antiquarianism in south-east England immediately prior to the inception of the BAA in 1843. The manuscripts are also a prime source of archaeological data – the 19th-century equivalent of modern "Level II and III" archives (Frere 1975). This analogy explains both their importance and limitations. Because Smith placed great emphasis upon immediate publication, it would be incorrect to suggest that many unpublished finds or site details of major significance await rediscovery. The manuscripts nevertheless constitute a valuable quarry of "new" archaeological information of secondary importance. For instance, Smith's journals and notebooks have provided details, including find spots, of eleven hitherto unrecorded Saxon coins from London that have proven useful to a recent
distributional study of Saxon finds (Rhodes 1991; Stott 1991). The manuscripts also contain details omitted from published accounts (e.g. Marsden 1978), including information about the history of individual artifacts, which can help authenticate their provenance, or assist in tracing associated finds that may have gone missing.

The manuscripts fall into various categories, namely: letters, memoranda, notes and notebooks, diaries, newspaper clippings and scrapbooks, draft reports and papers, annotated proofs and publications, proof engravings, pencil and water-colour drawings, sketch books, photographs, plans, maps, tracings, impressions and rubbings. Most are loose, or mounted in bound volumes or grangerised publications. Such documents form a distinct class from those listed in the Guide to British Topographical Collections, which is confined to illustrations and photographs of buildings and places (Barley 1974). Most are inadequately catalogued, so do not appear in the indexes of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, which when visited by the writer, pointed directly to only fifteen of the 304 collections subsequently traced and catalogued, and to nineteen more listed under the names of Smith's antiquarian colleagues.

In preparing the summary catalogue, the writer contacted every British institution that might have reason to hold relevant manuscripts (listed in Appendix 2c). Many are owned by societies and museums, who often seemed unclear about what they held. As often as not, additional relevant collections were identified by the writer during visits. Advertisements were placed in the Museum's Bulletin and MAN (the newsletter of the Society of Museum Archaeologists), but without useful results. Apart from the postal survey, the most useful leads comprised passing references in publications, and information from colleagues and booksellers. A few collections were located by tracing members of Smith's family.
The writer consulted every available catalogue of manuscripts held by American institutions, and contacted those which are stated to hold British manuscripts by Hamer (1961). Following advice from Oliver Orr of the Library of Congress and Peter Beal of Sotheby's, it was decided that, for present purposes, a comprehensive postal survey of American libraries was not justified. Even if this were to reveal additional manuscripts, many institutions are unwilling to photocopy original documents, and there was no possibility that the writer would be able to obtain grants or study leave to examine them personally.

The catalogue lists every relevant collection known to the writer, although because of its tendency to extend indefinitely, it was decided not to catalogue a small number of collections apparently similar to ones already summarised, which were deemed unlikely to contain much new information.

As ever more collections came to the writer's notice, the merit of studying their history became apparent, both as a means of locating further material and of estimating what portion of Smith's manuscripts is publicly available. This task was hindered because of poor archival practices within many of the institutions visited. A tendency persists to break up and reorganise collections on "logical" lines or for storage purposes (cf. Barley 1974, 8). Furthermore, many institutions consider it unnecessary to accession notebooks and extra-illustrated books, or to record how or when manuscript materials come into their possession; staff often seemed unaware that such information might be useful.

The Fate of Smith's Manuscripts

Smith's habit of saving his correspondence, together with antiquarian and biographical notes originated in the early 1840s. It probably arose from contact with antiquaries like J.O. Halliwell, J.G. Nichols and Dawson Turner, all great
hoarders of manuscripts (Munby 1962), and a Mr. Cole, who had secured "an immense number of letters and autographs of eminent and public characters from ye rejected papers of the Treasury".\(^{11}\)

Prior to the 1820s, there had been two strands to the practice of collecting manuscripts. Some had collected them for the historical, topographical or antiquarian information they contained, recognising that possession of the documents strengthened the information's authenticity. Others had collected autographs of the famous as a matter of sentiment and romance - a hobby made fashionable through the publication of a collection of engraved portraits by J. Granger (1769-74) - hence "grangerised books" which contain illustrations and autograph letters (Munby 1962, 5). Now however, according to Munby, the two streams merged, and there arose extreme manifestations of the hobby, including the mounting of letters with biographical memoranda. Dawson Turner's Norfolk collection alone contained 25,000 autograph letters in 130 volumes (Jones 1849).

Although material survives from every period of Smith's adult life, the bulk of Smith's paperwork dates to 1840-61 - the product of his role as a one-man "clearing house" for archaeological information. During this period, Smith retained even the dullest letters, in case they might be of interest to the collectors who continually applied to him for autographs.\(^{12}\) He notes having retained 500 letters dated 1851 and 700 dated 1852.\(^{13}\)

From 1839, Smith began to send batches of letters of trifling content to the Derbyshire barrow-digger and collector, Thomas Bateman,\(^ {14}\) although from 1851, Joseph Mayer - the Liverpool jeweller, collector and philanthropist -

\(^{11}\) CRS:J3, 16 Nov. 1839.
\(^{12}\) LP, Box 2, CRS/72, CRS to MAL, 7 Feb. 1860.
\(^{13}\) LOA 217/5 and 189/2: CRS to JOH, 14 and 30 Apl. 1875, respectively.
\(^{14}\) Preserved in SM:CRS
became the principal recipient. In 1856 Smith dispatched a bundle of letters, addressed to himself, about the striking of a medal to Mehemet Ali. This became the first of a series of topical compilations which Smith forwarded to Mayer at intervals until the latter's death in 1886. Meanwhile, miscellaneous items were sent of increasingly important content:

"I ever keep upon my mantel-piece an envelope directed to you; and when I come across a letter of extra interest I enclose it".

By 1869, Smith's "extraordinary correspondence with the chief men of Europe" formed the bulk of Mayer's "antiquarian memorandums". Smith paid the carriage on these gifts "as a matter of conscience". He sent them partly for safekeeping and partly because he hoped that some might be published in Mayer's History of the Arts in England. This unrealistic and grandiose project resulted in a large collection of autograph letters and objects, which filled Mayer's retirement home at Pennant House, Bebington (Gibson 1988, 20).

By 1881, Smith had gained so much confidence in Mayer that he sent him the cherished papers of his illustrator friend, F.W. Fairholt, who had died in 1866 making Smith his executor. Mayer subsequently arranged the loose papers in 26 quarto volumes, and there was a similar number of sketch books (SWH 1887, Lot 124). Bearing visible signs of facial cancer, Smith was becoming increasingly aware of his own mortality, and soon after sending Fairholt's papers, he decided to send his own correspondence, which with the

15 eg. BAC III, CRS to TB, 19 Sep 1851.
16 MP, CRS to JM, 7 Apr. 1856; probably still extant but not available for study, see Appendix 2a, under Chatham.
17 MP, CRS to JM, undated but c. 1873-4 from mention of Ann Eveleigh's final illness; see also CRS to JM, 11 June 1878 and 5 Jan. 1882.
18 RP:I, JM to CRS, 28 May 1869.
19 MP, CRS to JM, 9 Jan. 1882.
20 MP, CRS to JM, 3 Nov. 1881.
21 MP, CRS to JM, 5 Nov. 1880; 8 and 9 Apr., 27 May, 6 June and 21 Sep. 1881.
22 MP, C. Warne to JM, 12-14 Sep. 1881.
material already sent, he estimated at 20,000 items (see Appendix 2b).23

Unfortunately, on Mayer's death in 1886, it became apparent that Smith's trust in Mayer was misplaced. In building an arts complex for Bebington, Mayer had retained insufficient capital for their upkeep, and made provision in his will for the contents of Pennant House to be sold for this purpose (Gibson 1988, 20). Smith somehow refrained from criticising his friend in print, but was privately dismayed.24 Apart from a crate of papers, mostly correspondence, which escaped the sale, the only Roach Smith manuscripts known to have survived as arranged by Mayer comprise small collections of letters relating to Eliza Meteyard, Lieutenant Waghorn, and Thomas Wright.25 Much of the documentation relating to Mayer's collection in Liverpool Museum was also dispersed.

Meanwhile, Smith retained his notebooks, scrapbooks, and some correspondence as source material for the third volume of his Retrospections. His library included many extra-illustrated works with manuscript additions, and numerous antiquarian illustrations. All were dispersed at his own posthumous auction (SWH 1891). The most significant items to have been located are the scrapbooks which Smith compiled as mementoes of the first six BAA congresses, and fifteen of his manuscript notebooks. The notebooks presumably formed part of Lot 151, which comprised 31 notebooks sold for £2-15s, of which at least sixteen are still missing.26 Fortunately, those which contain Smith's observations on London building sites were rescued for the BM, doubtless due to prompt action by A.W. Franks.27

---

23 MP, CRS to JM, 9 Nov. 1881; BL, MS. 41496, f. 196, CRS to SGP, 6 Jan. 1888.
24 BL, MS. 41496, f. 194, CRS to SGP, 1 Jan. 1888.
25 EML; Chatham Library, Collection of letters by T.F. Waghorn; TW:L.
26 BL, S.C. Sotheby (1), Bound volume of SWH (1891), annotated by the company.
27 CRS:J1-J5 and CRS:N1.
The majority of Smith's manuscripts, from both the Mayer and Roach Smith sales, were reunited by Frederick Hendriks, FSS, FIA (1827-1909). A leading member of the Statistical Society and former Director of the Universal Life Assurance Company (Craigie 1909), Hendriks did not belong to any archaeological societies, and cannot have understood the archaeological value of Smith's manuscripts. An unsystematic collector, Hendriks rearranged his acquisitions at will. His practice of incorporating small groups of letters within books or folders facilitated their dispersal by dealers after the posthumous sales of his collection, and effectively ensured that Smith's manuscripts can never be reunited (SWH 1909; 1910).

Of the huge quantities of Roach Smith manuscripts from Hendriks' sales, only fifteen groups have been traced.28 None is of much consequence apart from the collection to illustrate Smith's Retrospections, and even this is incomplete. The greatest losses comprise hundreds of engravings and letters relating to Smith's studies in Kent (SWH 1887, Lot 150(?); 1910, Lot 255), his work on Faussett's Inventorium Sepulchrale (SWH 1891, Lot 291), on British Antiquities in general (SWH 1891, Lot 207), together with his sketches of Roman antiquities in France (SWH 1910, Lot 256), and several thousand letters "which arose from the [London] collections, Roman, Saxon, and Mediaeval" and which Mayer had "mounted and bound in forty volumes" (Smith 1886, 28 CUB:W; DUL, MS. 913.42 B8, "Select Antiquarian Tracts and Autographs"; RP:I, II and III; LM, Acc. No. 38.48, Papers relating to CRS and JM; SAL, Correspondence for 1873, Four letters to CRS concerning JYA; SAL, Shelf 306D, "Celts, Saxons, Lake Dwellers"; SAL, Part MS. 857, Collection of ephemera relating to CRS and others; SAL, copy of Worsaae (1849) with manuscript additions; NRO:DT; BLO:MAL; BLO, copy of Nichols (1874) with manuscript insertions; BLO, MS. Eng. lett. c.783, Misc. papers; FLWDC, Call No. C.b. 16-17, Letters of Shakespearean interest from JOH to CRS and others, 1841-83; FLWDC, Call. No. C.b. 18-20, "Shakespeareana. Autograph Letters of Shakespearean Interest" [to CRS]; FLWDC, Call No. W.a. 81-82, the author's interleaved copy of Smith (1870).
Smith's illustrations of London antiquities have been missing since the library sale of Joseph Clarke of Saffron Walden (SWH 1896, Lot 81).

The task of tracing manuscripts listed in sale catalogues is formidable and carries a limited chance of success (Munby 1962, 85-101). Moreover, it seems likely, that the collections which Dobell and Maggs purchased were sold to American buyers, placing them beyond the writer's reach (P. Beale, pers. comm.). Others may not have survived, and one must accept advice that researchers working on autograph letters "must resign themselves to the idea that much of this material will remain unknown and inaccessible in private hands" (Storey and Madden 1977, 63).

The loss to scholarship of over half of Smith's manuscripts is a hitherto unrecognised archaeological disaster. It is nevertheless not the only tragedy of its kind: John Clayton's manuscripts, including the records of his excavations at Chester and other wall sites, were apparently discarded when his museum was sold in 1929 (Dr. Grace Simpson, pers. comm.). Many of Lord Londesborough's manuscripts were burnt following the sale of his estates in 1924 (Elgee 1930, 15).

Such wanton destruction may be unpreventable, but more could be done to remedy sale-room losses. Of over 200 collections relating to Smith that are known to have passed through dealers' hands, often on several occasions, only one quarter have been purchased by institutions (see Appendix 2). Reasons for non-purchase include lack of funds and a tendency to regard books with manuscript additions as luxury items (Munby 1962, 92-3). Another is that most public museums and archives have regional collecting policies, whereas antiquarian documents are often wide-ranging in subject matter. Relevant institutions may also not hear about the sale. The British Library is perhaps the only institution able systematically to scan sale catalogues with
a view to purchase, or to inform relevant institutions. Unfortunately its staff have little knowledge of archaeology or antiquities, and now that the Library's link with the British Museum is severed, they no longer seek the advice of Museum staff (Dr. F. Harris, pers. comm.). This could easily be rectified.

Purchasing decisions must also be hampered by the general difficulty of assessing antiquarian records, arising from a lack of even basic catalogues of publicly owned British antiquarian records. Practical considerations dictate that these should comprise summaries of collections, rather than lists of individual manuscripts. Such summaries could be indexed by computer, or conventionally, as for the manuscript catalogues of the British Library. Aspects of the procedures used by MacLeod and Friday (1972) to obtain their list of Archives of British Men of Science might prove beneficial. Evidence abounds of the need for catalogues. A recent article on the early years of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society was written in ignorance of a major collection of correspondence that reveals the true reasons for its creation (Brooks 1985).29 The Isle of Wight's county archaeologist, Dr. Roger Tomalin, was equally unaware, until informed by the writer, of a volume of letters and photographs relating to the discovery of the island's foremost Roman site: the Brading Villa.30 Further cataloguing projects are essential if the archives are to be effectively utilised.

---

29 THC I, II and III; TH:AC; BL, Add. MS. 30300, TH, "Collections relating to the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society".
30 AL, Fol. 530.14, Bra. 1, Scrapbook - "Roman Villa. Brading".
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CHAPTER 2: The Antiquarian Background, 1586-1827

"... let him who is curious in [ ... antiquarian] researches, open barrows; let him explore encampments, trenches, and the places adjoining; let him examine the ancient public ways; let him, without superstition or dread, open and ransack sepulchres, which are generally by the road-side; let him carefully explore the ruins of cliffs; when he finds any traces of antiquity, let him pursue them and call in the assistance of connoisseurs; if he should discover any coins, either lying in a heap, or inclosed in an urn or pot, let him observe the latest; for they will nearly determine the time when they were buried; let him allow every man of learning full liberty to inspect whatever he finds; when he meets with inscriptions, let them be accurately copied, and, without envy, communicated to the world. And be these the laws of antiquaries" (Batteley 1774, 134 ff.).

The above might almost have been written by the young Roach Smith, or any other enthusiast of Roman Britain alive between the late 17th and mid 19th centuries. Indeed, Batteley's "Laws" are referred to by Smith's "antiquarian godfather" A.J. Kempe (1832, 198), illustrating that, initially at least, many of Smith's aims and methods were those of his 18th-century forebears.

In order to understand Smith's role in the development of British archaeology, it is clearly necessary to understand the intellectual and social background from which he emerged. This chapter therefore aims to summarise the development and diversity of the tradition which he inherited, paying particular attention to the archaeology of the proto-historic periods. It takes the story to 1827, when Smith moved to London.

William Camden

Whereas John Leland inaugurated the topographical study of England, the true father of English antiquarianism from the 17th to the early 19th centuries was William Camden. An Oxford scholar who subsequently taught at Westminster School, Camden spent much of his free time travelling in search of topographical information for his Britannia, first published in 1586.
Britannia was intended to elucidate the topography of Roman Britain and the province's subsequent history. Its contents are subdivided according to the pazi of the British tribes recorded by Roman historians, with a description of Hadrian's Wall to provide a fitting climax. Camden's aim was to establish Britain's position within the international Renaissance as one of those nations who drew precedence from roots in the Roman Empire (Piggott 1976a, 33-53).

Although Camden noted cropmarks and upstanding monuments, his approach was primarily literary. Italian Renaissance scholarship had made available most of the major classical works, enabling Camden to collated those passages which relate to Roman Britain. Like Humphrey Llwyd and Talbot before him, Camden used the Antonine Itinerary to establish the Roman names of towns, and it was a natural step to consider for the first time Roman inscriptions from the northern counties, and coin finds, which were used as evidence of occupation. With the aid of Sir Robert Cotton increasing numbers of both were included in subsequent editions of Britannia (Piggott 1976a, 12). On visiting Hadrian's Wall in 1599, Camden and Sir Robert recognised the need to purchase inscriptions to place them in safety. Others followed their lead (Horsley 1732, 181-2).

Through Britannia, Camden gave coherence to a diverse and poorly understood body of material, and inaugurated a new era in historical studies. By the early 17th century, Britannia had acquired the status of a common intellectual possession, and its influence was so pervasive that from 1672 the figure of Britannia began to be depicted on the coinage. Thus wider society began to absorb Camden's view of Roman remains as evidence of Britain's links with classical civilisation before they were severed by the Gothic Middle Ages. One consequence was that until the mid 18th century and beyond, antiquities or field monuments that
revealed any degree of technological skill were generally assumed to be Roman – from Stonehenge to Saxon brooches.

The Royal Society

Following Camden, little advance was made until the mid 17th century, when antiquities began to be included in wider schemes for investigating the visible world. The principle workers – including Plot, Llwyd, Ashmole, Dugdale, and John Aubrey – were linked by correspondence and gatherings in taverns; most were members of the Royal Society. Their exploratory travels were facilitated by improved breeds of horses, and from 1663 by official turnpikes (Piggott 1976a, 15 and 115).

The form of Aubrey's *Natural History of Wiltshire* (begun 1656; published by Britton 1847) reflects the parochial questionnaires of the 1670s. These might include questions about the existence of castles, churches, Roman roads and stations, heaps of stones and coin finds. They were sent to country squires and clergy by scholars intent on compiling systematic topographical accounts of objective phenomena, natural or artificial, within each British region or locality (Piggott 1985, 21).

To facilitate such studies, local antiquities and coins were collected alongside botanical specimens, ethnographic items from the expanding world, and other curiosities. Such cabinets, epitomised by Tradescant's Ark and *Musaeum Thoresbyanum*, developed in parallel with the first encyclopaedias (Thoresby 1713).

The discovery of several varieties of Roman pottery in York, led to a remarkable paper by the zoologist Martin Lister (1672–88), who divided them into three categories: very sandy bluish grey, fine micaceous sandy, and glossy red with no sand (samian). Pots in the first category he suggested were made on the moor six miles east of York, where he had found wasters, slag and cinders, or at Santon, Lincolnshire,
where kilns had been discovered. It was exceptional at this time for small artifacts to be classified in this manner.

Better progress was made with field monuments. Aubrey's *Monumenta Britannia* was the first systematic corpus of archaeological evidence, in parallel with Lister's work in conchology, Llwyd's in fossils, and Ray's in botany and zoology (Hunter 1975, 191). It comprises observations of field monuments arranged by type, together with quotations from classical writer's, Camden and others, although the emphasis is on field knowledge, rather than books and traditional authority (Fowles 1980-82).

**Gibson to Horsley**

*Monumenta Britannica* was not published, but materials from it were introduced into Gibson's augmented edition of *Britannia* (Gibson 1695). By this work, Gibson provided a framework within which country gentry, doctors and clergymen could pursue their local historical and archaeological inquiries (Piggott 1985, 18). A new commentary on the Antonine Itinerary encouraged further study (Gale 1709). Through the influence of such works it became almost obligatory for local histories to include discourses on topographical evidence for the location of Roman towns, roads, or historic events, such as Caesar's crossing of the Thames. Archaeological finds were reported not for their intrinsic interest, but as evidence of Roman occupation, although literary evidence remained paramount in their interpretation.

From now on, scholars began to consider the Roman occupation separately from Britain's subsequent history and, both here and abroad, the first specifically archaeological collections came into being (cf. Sklenár 1983, 31). Between 1670 and 1730 around forty books on Romano-British antiquities appeared, two by notable collectors.
John Batteley's collection, now in Cambridge University's Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, is the first substantial collection of Romano-British artifacts to have survived. The finds came mostly from the cliffs at Reculver, having been dislodged by coastal erosion (Batteley 1711). Their rescue depended upon the co-operation of local people, whom Batteley instructed:

"... not to clean such coins as were rusty, by rubbing them with sand or anything else; as I have seen many of the most valuable by that means quite obliterated; to sell no brass to the braziers, but to reserve it for me, and I would give a higher price for it; to break no urns or pots; and if they found them broken, and inscribed with any mark or letters, to bring them to me" (Batteley 1774, 134-5).

Batteley identified box flue tiles and a cochlear by reference to classical literature, and made a number of independent interpretations: forged coins were recognised because the tinning ran in a flame, and the nature of what are now called "Barbarous radiates" was understood (idem., 93-94). Other finds he was "utterly at a loss to know in what class to rank" (idem., 114).

The most notable collector of London finds was Dr. John Woodward, best known for his essay on antiquities from Bishopsgate (Levine 1977, 139 ff.; Woodward 1713). Woodward was the first to describe the construction of London's city wall and to recognise that surviving portions were of Roman origin. He also recognised the early medieval repairs and the brick battlements of 1477 (cf. Grimes 1968, Fig. 19). A tessellated pavement found just inside the wall overlay Roman cremations and a coin of Antoninus Pius. Since burials were prohibited within Roman cities, Woodward deduced that the wall was a later Roman development that extended the city limits.

The spate of new publications culminated in Horsley's Britannia Romana (1732; Piggott 1985, 18). Whereas Camden had regarded the remains of Roman Britain as a scatter of interesting objects, Horsley understood that he was dealing with a Roman province. He knew many of the monuments personally, and could draw the evidence into new theoretical
frameworks (Haverfield 1924, 74-75). His interpretation of Hadrian's Wall incorporated an earlier misunderstanding that the Vallum and Wall were separate frontiers, which might be attributed to Hadrian and Severus respectively, but it was the best attempt thus far to analyse and draw the various elements into a cohesive chronological scheme (Birley 1961, 53-59).

Horsley's work had its limitations. Living in Northumberland, his conception of Roman Britain was based on inscriptions and upstanding monuments of the northern military zone. He knew little of Roman farms and civilian life in the South. Consequently, when he observed that most inscriptions were erected by the military, he concluded that "there were few Romans, but soldiers, in this island" (Horsley 1732, 181). He also worked too hurriedly, using earlier work without acknowledgement or verification (Birley 1958, 9-23).

Horsley's best work was on inscriptions, for whereas Camden had not hesitated to use guess-work to complete inscriptions for publication, Horsley regarded them as historic texts and recognised the importance of working from accurate illustrations. His approach owed much to a continental tradition in epigraphic studies inaugurated over a century before by J.J. Scaliger. Having discovered early Latin by studying texts from a chronological standpoint (Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1982), Scaliger then embarked upon a collection of Latin inscriptions, eventually published by his assistant, Janus Gruter (1603). Like Britannia, Gruter's corpus underwent revisions and addenda (e.g. Reinesius 1682; Graevius 1707), and despite inaccuracies, remained invaluable to the interpretation of Romano-British inscriptions until the relevant volume of CIL was published in 1873 (Hübner 1873).

Horsley broke new ground in using inscriptions to study Roman military movements. His work on Romano-British place names was equally important. He was the first to recognise
the geographical basis of the Notitia list, and to take seriously the Ravenna Cosmography following the discovery in 1725 of the Rudge cup. After Horsley this field of study did not greatly advance until late Victorian times, when the achievements of early 19th-century German philologists in Romance, Germanic, classical and Indo-European languages finally spread to England (Rivet and Smith 1979, 6-7). It was almost as long before anyone attempted a new synthesis of Roman Britain (Wright 1852; p. 288).

Stukeley

In 1703, Newton became president of the Royal Society, which consequently became more scientific in the modern sense. Thus antiquarian studies were excluded when interest in them was growing. This gave rise to a new Society of Antiquaries, which faltered, but was revived in 1717 by William Stukeley.

Stukeley's main achievement lay in his field-work. From 1710-25, he made around a dozen excursions, from Richborough to the Roman Wall, and recorded them in a journal, the *Itinerarium Curiosum*, which he published by subscription (Stukeley 1724). Stukeley mixed with county lawyers, land agents and gentry, who were concerned with land measurement and record. In consequence, he thought in terms of maps and diagrams rather than written descriptions, and thereby inaugurated our contemporary tradition of field-work (Piggott 1985, 61). Stukeley's plans of Romano-British towns were the first to be published (Stukeley 1724; SAL 1718-47). A sharp observer, Stukeley was also the first Englishman to make a stratigraphic drawing of an archaeological site (in Bloomsbury Square; Evans 1956, 74). Later, at Avebury and Stonehenge, he recognised the vulnerability of features such as the Avenue, making records to preserve their "memory" (Stukeley 1740, 35).

Stukeley intended that the Society should emphasise the recording of "Relicks of former Ages, especially of the Romans". To this end its members were:
Thus, reports of archaeological sites and finds were included at the Society's meetings, which consisted largely of exhibitions of objects. Its first publications were prints of antiquities, later bound with accompanying dissertations in Vetusta Monumenta (SAL 1718-47). Roman mosaics aroused special interest.

Stukeley was dissatisfied by the Society's lack of fieldwork and its ineffectiveness in preserving ancient monuments. In 1721 he persuaded it to erect posts to prevent Waltham Cross from being injured by carriages, but this was an isolated action (Evans 1956, 72). Soon afterwards Stukeley founded the short-lived "Society of Roman Knights" to "search for and illustrate the Roman monuments in the British Isles" and fight "barbarians" to save Roman remains (Piggott 1985, 55). His tours of 1722 were mostly along Roman roads.

Travelling made Stukeley aware of the extent of archaeological destruction, then unrestrained by legislation. The only official intervention had occurred under Elizabeth I, who issued a proclamation against "defacing monuments of antiquity set up in the Church for memory not for superstition" (Evans 1956, 4). During the 18th century, Britain lost some of the most outstanding Roman remains to have survived the middle ages, including the east gates of Lincoln and Chester (Gough 1806). The demolition of the Roman temple known as Arthur's O'on left Stukeley appalled, and when Hadrian's Wall was quarried to build a military road he complained to the Antiquaries that the workmen "break in pieces the Squared and Carved stones, Inscriptions ... and the like noblest Remains". He also wrote to Princes Augusta urging legislation, but nothing was done (Evans 1956, 98 and 121; Piggott 1985, 145-6).

Unfortunately, from the 1730s Stukeley abandoned scholarly discretion for half-mystical speculations, in which prehistoric field monuments were interpreted as Druidical
remains - a notion which persisted into this century. Then, in 1747 he performed a grave disservice by promoting what purported to be a transcript of a medieval copy, by Richard of Cirencester, of an itinerary of Roman Britain. This had been forged by one Charles Bertram, using a mixture of ancient authorities, Camden, and Stukeley himself. One third of the place-names were fabricated. Thereafter until the mid 19th century, almost all that was written on Roman Britain was tainted with this source. False place-names came into use, and the idea gained credence that Bath and Caerleon were major Roman cities (Piggott 1985; 1986b).

The tradition of fieldwork inaugurated by Stukeley nevertheless continued to flourish. One of his disciples, Alexander Gordon, made the first detailed survey of the Wall (Gordon 1726; Birley 1961, 53), and from the mid 18th century the exigencies of politics and war led to the production of accurate large-scale maps, exemplified by the Scottish survey of 1747-55, under William Roy. The discovery in 1754 of Roman forts and camps north of the Tay led Roy to prepare his Military Antiquities... (Roy 1793). He later became Director General of the Ordnance Survey, whose maps from the beginning of the 19th century set new standards. It was a young Ordnance surveyor, Philip Crocker, who helped Richard Colt Hoare to prepare his study of Wiltshire earthworks and tumuli (Hoare 1812-21; Cunnington 1975, 73; p. 61). Nevertheless, the technical ability to conduct detailed field survey was ever confined to a few, and although surveyors such as MacLaughlan were active during Smith's career, field survey continued as a parallel stream, independent of the main current of antiquarian study (e.g. MacLaughlan 1857).

Portable Antiquities

The 18th century saw little advance in the study of small antiquities from British sites. Setting aside a paper on spurs (Grose 1787), medieval artifacts other than seals were largely ignored. There were important Roman finds: the
girl's shoes from a sarcophagus at Southfleet, Kent, and the samian ship's cargo lost on the Pudding Pan Rock (Rashleigh 1803; Pownall 1779). The first sewer trench finds from London were reported (Anon. 1787; Jackson 1787). They were related to a basic stratigraphic sequence, so far as this could be determined from outside the trench. Nevertheless, such was the lack of information and research that in 1790 a fragment of amphora was stated to be unique in Britain (Rooke 1792, 140).

The interpretation of Romano-British finds rested primarily upon advances in the study of classical antiquity (Sandys 1908). These arose through a revival of popular interest in the subject, inaugurated by the publication of *De Etruria* (Dempster 1723-6), and sustained by reports of the discoveries at Herculaneum and Pompeii (Anon. 1752-65; 1762-71).

In England, the revival resulted in support for the Antiquaries being transferred to the Society of Dilettanti, founded in 1724. This was a mixed blessing for British archaeology. Whereas English antiquarians had previously studied artifacts for their information value, the remains of classical civilisation encouraged study from an art historical standpoint. From now on, there was a temptation to regard aesthetically pleasing objects as more important than utilitarian ones. At worst this deteriorated into a quest for "taste", defined as:

"an artificial gusto of which the aim was to reconcile the picturesque with the supposed canons of classical beauty" (Evans 1956, 105-18).

Thus the Dilettanti ignored local antiquities other than art treasures, like the Ribchester helmet (Townley 1815). On the other hand, they ensured that Britain acquired some of the finest classical treasures outside Italy. The most notable - Charles Townley's collection of Roman sculptures, Richard Payne Knight's medals, intaglios and bronzes, and Sir William Hamilton's Greek vases - eventually passed to the British Museum.
Whereas in Britain, enthusiasts of classical antiquity spurned local finds, a different situation prevailed in France. Here, following its reconstitution in 1701, the influential Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres urged the description of French antiquities (Grenier 1931, 35-38). France had long superseded Italy as the focus of intellectual life, and developments there were closely monitored by the English. It was therefore natural that English antiquarians should begin to seek "precedents" for their finds in the works of the French erudites, notably the Benedictine monk, Bernard de Montfaucon.

Having laid the foundations of Greek palaeography, Montfaucon had proceeded to compile Antiquité Expliquée - a fifteen-volume treasury of classical antiquities, which aimed to integrate the accumulated wisdom of the Italian classical scholarship (Montfaucon 1719). It was hugely successful and soon appeared in English translation (Montfaucon 1721-5).

Antiquité Expliquée incorporates 40,000 stylised images of art objects. These were copied by Montfaucon's engravers from old plates and drawings sent from all over Europe. Consequently none of the illustrations is to scale and no dimensions are given. Montfaucon nevertheless took pains to record the owner or his source beside each representation. He included provincial antiquities such as the Roman theatre and baths at Valognes (Manche). Moreover, the illustrations are linked by a sensible commentary, with discussions on classical terms for artifacts and details of the varieties within each class. Although he included everyday objects such as combs, fibulae and urns, Montfaucon concentrated upon items that illuminated classical literature and mythology, such as sculpture, Greek vases, medals, and intaglios, and by studying them was able to explode many complicated interpretations of classical religious symbols.

Antiquité Expliquée is not without serious flaws, as might be expected in a work which encompassed Egyptian, Indian and
Persian antiquities, and stone tools from the tombs of North European barbarians. Like his Italian predecessors, Montfaucon saw the ancient world as a unity, viewed through Roman spectacles, and interpreted Romano-Celtic gods in terms of classical deities - a tendency seen in certain English works (see discussion on "Belatucadro" by Carlisle 1794). He also saw no need to record details of provenance, and included modern and forged pieces uncritically alongside genuine antiquities.

Nevertheless, due to the widespread ignorance of classical antiquities in Britain, Montfaucon's tome improved the identification of Romano-British artifacts; a century passed before it was superseded. It spread Mercati's idea that stone tools were man-made and might be linked with hints in Herodotus and Lucretius of an age without iron (Mercati 1717; cf. Lyttleton 1776). It was illustrations in Montfaucon that enabled Borlase to recognise that a hoard of Gallo-Belgic and British staters and quarter staters were unlike Phoenician, Greek or Roman coins, but resembled Gaulish ones. He concluded that they were Gaulish or British, and that coinage must have come to Britain from Gaul, which is still the prevailing view (Borlase 1754).

Criteria by which false antiquities might be distinguished from genuine were established by the comte de Caylus, who succeeded in this regard by paying attention to manufacturing techniques (Grenier 1931, 42-43). Caylus carefully cleaned his acquisitions, analysed their materials, and sought the advice of chemists (Bazin 1967, 117). Like Lister, he studied pottery fabrics, and determined their provenance from kiln sites (Caylus 1752-66, V). He also demonstrated the similarity between antiquities of Roman date found in Gaul and abroad. According to Richard Gough:

"Even the pottery found at Lombard Street, 1786, will admit of a comparison with some discovered in the baths at Nismes and Rome, and elsewhere, engraved by C. Caylus ... and will serve to establish the Count's opinion of the ceremonial intercourse between Gaul and Britain, from the conformity of taste, ornament,
An engraver in Watteau's workshop, Caylus collected medals, gems, and items of every-day life from Italy and Asia Minor. He instructed his assistants to draw them, prepared a commentary, then stashed away the results until he had sufficient for another volume of his *Receuil d'antiquités égyptiennes, grecques, étrusques et romaines* (Caylus 1752-66). This novel work inspired numerous "Receuils" by subsequent writers.

The compilation of *Receuil* coincided with the building of the French road network, and Caylus invited the engineers to submit notes on their discoveries for inclusion. Faced with increasing quantities of prehistoric and provincial Roman material, Caylus extended the title of Volumes III-VII to include *gauloises*. However, like Montfaucon he presented Gallo-Roman antiquities as poor relations of Greek and Roman.

The practice of treating Greek and Roman classicism as an entity was first challenged by J.J. Winckelmann, who suggested that most Roman works of art were copies of lost Greek originals (Winckelmann 1764-67). His observations paralleled the work of generations of classical historians, who by comparing ancient texts had attempted to determine reliable manuscript traditions. Winckelmann demanded that a distinction be made between classical antiques and imitations. To this end he stressed systematic description and classification of individual features - the size of nipples or flaring of nostrils - and paid attention to technicalities. By these means he discovered archaic Greek art, and developed technical criteria for assessing and dating Roman sculpture, thus establishing the ground rules for art historical criticism (Curtius 1968, 12-18). Winckelmann's *Description des pierres gravees* ... is arguably the first scientific museum catalogue (1760). It paved the way for the Munich Glyptothek, which from 1816
arranged its sculptures chronologically rather than thematically as in earlier museums (Haskell & Penny 1981, 101 and 116). Unfortunately, Winckelmann's work was little known in England, and was outdated by the time of its first English translation (Lodge 1850).

The Agrarian Revolution and Romanticism

Meanwhile, from around 1740-1840 Britain was undergoing a social, economic and political upheaval which ultimately transformed the nature of British archaeology. The agrarian revolution led to the disappearance, especially in the South, of the traditional open strips. From 1750 the process was enforced by 3,500 Enclosure Acts, which ruled that the enclosures should be hedged and served with roads. Rising agricultural prices caused marsh, common and woodland to be ploughed to meet the demand for corn, as did Napoleon's attempted food blockade (Hill 1969, 268-9). Many archaeological sites suffered serious injury in consequence, and numerous finds, particularly gold, silver, and coins, were sold or melted down without record. Quarrying for road-building materials caused as much damage as road construction. Ironically, the peace of 1815 also brought losses in that insolvency became widespread and property of all kinds, including historic buildings and churches, fell into decay.

The agrarian and industrial revolutions were sustained by better communications. Coach-making techniques improved and new turnpike trusts established. From 1784, mail-coaches provided speedy postal services and more regular public transport (Addison 1980, 103). Thus Britain's countryside and historic centres became more accessible. The Gentleman's Magazine, published from 1731, included articles on touring for pleasure, with notes on traditional industries, antiquarian finds (mostly Roman inscriptions) and natural history. Local newspapers followed suit. Travellers' handbooks were produced, including the first guide to Hadrian's Wall, access to which had been improved
by the military road (Warburton 1753; p. 46). Thus a new reading public was supplied with a new kind of secular literature.

Transport and tourism hastened the destruction of the peasant village, whose customs had previously been preserved by isolation. Many villages had already lost their traditional landlords. Since the abolition of feudal tenure a century before, numerous ancient families had been forced to sell to larger landowners or merchant investors (Hill 1969, 146-54).

Historic links with the land were equally important to those who remained and to those who had succumbed, and sustained a vogue for regional or county histories. These were written to a new standard, epitomised by Maitland's treatise on London and Hasted's on Kent (Maitland 1757; Hasted 1778-99). By 1780, 31 out of forty English counties had a history (Gough 1780, x). All such works used evidence of Roman occupation to enhance the perceived merit of a particular locality. If the Roman's had selected a site, who could question its excellence?

As the old rural order crumbled, there emerged an interest in ballads, quaint speech and Shakespearean theatre, which was revived by Garrick. There also arose a perception of the sublime in nature. Landscape gardening and mountains found favour. So did megalithic monuments, which with naturally perched rocks, were interpreted as Druidic remains. Fortunately, such interpretations lost favour in the early 19th century. Stonehenge evoked much speculation, and was ascribed by several to the Dark Ages (Cunnington 1975, 35-45). The romantic perception of a world untamed by man also stimulated interest in Gothic architecture. Previously dismissed as barbarous, this was now increasingly extolled as reflecting the irregularities of nature (Lovejoy 1948, 136-65). Scholarly interest in the subject followed.
Books were a prerequisite for antiquarian progress, but were hard to obtain outside London. From the 1750s the folio format was increasingly abandoned and publication by subscription began to replace writing by patronage (Heyck 1982, 33). But most writers and publishers favoured expensive limited editions to larger, cheaper runs (Kelly 1966, 96 and 121). The introduction of steam printing in 1814 stabilised costs, but there was no dramatic reduction.

In towns, the demand for books by business and professional men was met by subscription libraries. Previously, the only public libraries had been cathedral and endowed libraries, intended mainly for clergymen. The Bristol Library Society's borrowing records for 1773-85 show that history, antiquities and geography were the most popular subjects (ibid., 133-5).

Starting in 1770, the demand for antiquarian literature encouraged the Antiquaries to publish Archaeologia - Britain's first journal devoted to antiquarian matters (Evans 1956, 139). It included archaeological reports in the Britannia tradition, especially of Roman pavements, bricks, pots and coins. Unfortunately the descriptions were often second-hand, vague and, inscriptions apart, were generally unsupported by drawings or diagrams. Papers comprising miscellaneous topographical notes linked by reference to the line of a Roman road were especially popular.

Archaeologia precipitated a dispute over what the Antiquaries should study. Advocates of "taste", like Walpole, were aghast at the "cartload of bricks and rubbish and Roman ruins they have piled together" (ibid., 158). Others wanted the Society to produce tomes on British History in parallel with the French Académie des Inscriptions ... ("Philistor" 1788). The Antiquaries were interested in neither. They studied customs, institutions and art history - subjects outside the province of the political historian, which might incorporate non-literary
evidence (Momigliano 1966). Their concerns were those of collectors, connoisseurs or local gentry. They focused upon the particular - the individual charter, a class of artifact, an inscription, a Roman road, a ruin or locality.

The quality of the papers in *Archaeologia* ranged from reasoned analyses to speculative nonsense. Whereas a century before archaeological observations might be presented with minimal comment, the fashion was for long interpretations, whether or not there were adequate data. Archbishop Usshur's date for the creation (4004 BC) was widely accepted, and there was a tendency to interpret archaeological remains in the light of early pictorial evidence, literature and scripture.

Prehistoric finds were prone to widely differing opinions. Some writers accepted the classical idea of an age without metal (Lyttleton 1776; p. 50). Others pointed to *Genesis* IV, 22, which implied that brass and iron were used together early in man's history (Pegge 1789, 88). Brass "celts" were variously interpreted as Druidical implements, Roman chisels, or the spearheads of civilised Britons, provincial Romans, or Roman or Gaulish auxiliaries (Lort 1779; Gough 1806). Kits Coty House was deemed to be the tomb of Horsa (Colebrook 1773, 116-7). A few volumes later, Pegge declared it to be a "cromlech" or British tomb, following work in Cornwall by Borlase (1754; Pegge 1786). Such discrepancies gave rise to scepticism concerning the reliability of antiquarian opinions, epitomised by Scott's account of Jonathan Oldbuck, *The Antiquary*, who identified Roman camps from hearsay, not fieldwork, in ignorance of the disciplines of scholarship (Scott 1816).

The Society's Director from 1771, Richard Gough, was ill-equipped to raise standards. His misconceived revisions of *Britannia* comprised encyclopaedias of antiquarian data and opinions hung upon Camden's framework (Gough 1789; 1806). They popularised views which were not the best and made no attempt critically to assess different viewpoints.
What Gough lacked in discrimination he compensated for in enthusiasm. He was almost alone among the Antiquaries in advocating fieldwork and preservation. In 1776, when the President of the Royal Society, passed on a proposal to investigate Silbury, for which subscriptions were invited, the Society declined involvement. It also refused Gough's suggestion of a committee to preserve ancient buildings from mutilation and dilapidation. This would receive reports and, after inquiries, would inform owners of the Society's wish to see certain structures preserved. It might even raise funds for restorations (Evans 1956, 152 and 191). Insult was added to injury when in 1797 John Carter complained about the threat to the "Galilee" in Durham Cathedral. The Society sided with Wyatt, the destroyer, and Gough resigned (idem., 206-10).

National Antiquities

A better awareness of the need for conservation was stimulated by the French Revolution. In 1789 the French Assemblée constituant nationalised the church's assets, paving the way for the sale and ultimately the destruction or mutilation of the monasteries. Millin, a natural scientist and numismatist, hastened to describe and draw the most important, together with public buildings, châteaux, tombs and statues, publishing the results in his Antiquités nationales (Millin 1790-5). His work was taken up by others, notably by Laborde (1816), and by A. Lenoir, who established a new museum in Paris: Le Musée des Monuments français (Lenoir 1800-6). Thus provincial architecture and artifacts began to be placed on a par with classical antiquities and, alarmed by the vandalism it had itself promoted, the Assemblée began to introduce tough conservation measures (Léon 1951, 63-76; Bazin 1967, 170).

The shocking news that French abbeys had been damaged and cathedrals turned into Temples of Reason encouraged the English to look more favourably upon their own ecclesiastical buildings, and to read about and visit them
Paintings of castles and ruins by moonlight became popular, and medieval structures began to be drawn and described prior to demolition. From 1801, John Britton pioneered the publication of English architectural engravings with the *Beauties of England and Wales*. Published in octavo for cheapness, it aimed at popularisation, but Britton's text was careful and his engravings good.

In the decades after Trafalgar and Waterloo, England acquired a strong sense of national destiny. Massive commemorative architecture was planned for central London, and the concept of "National monuments" permeated influential circles, improving the climate for conservation. John Rokewood Gage (later known as Gage Rokewood) succeeded in preventing the demolition of the screen at York and the Lady Chapel of St. Saviour's Southwark, assisted perhaps by Scott's *Waverley* novels, which from 1814 heightened the romantic appeal of the middle ages (Evans 1956, 226). In 1828 the Tower Armories opened, drawing large crowds, and the next decade saw a movement in favour of extending free admission to "Public National Buildings" in addition to the British Museum and National Gallery (HCPP 1837-8).

The French Revolution also changed perceptions of the relative merits of classical Greek, Roman and provincial art treasures. The revolutionaries considered that works of art, like political power, proceeded from the people, belonged to the people, and ought to serve the people. This view justified art plunder, which began with the homes of the French nobility. Municipal museums were established all over France to receive the treasures (Bazin 1967, 180-1). During the Napoleonic wars, looting took place throughout central Europe under the supervision of a Commission. France had for centuries aspired to recreate Rome in Paris, and the invasion of Italy provided an unprecedented opportunity (Treue 1960, 139-99). A national museum, the *Musée Napoléon* (the Louvre), was created to accommodate the booty.
Having gained a wealth of Roman art, the French were receptive to the views of Visconti, keeper of the Musée Napoléon, who agreed with Winkelmann that many Roman statues were adapted from earlier works, but argued that they had been improved in the process. Elsewhere, Winckelmann's ideas were developed by the German painter, Mengs, and Richard Payne Knight, who held that the Greeks were superior to their successors; Knight even compared the Roman Empire with the Dark Ages. Such views suited the English who, having failed to capture Napoleon's Italian booty, had to console themselves with the Elgin marbles (Haskell and Penny 1981, 106-8).

After the wars, the nations of Europe tried to recover their treasures as a matter of national pride. The Prussians seized theirs by force; others were largely unsuccessful. The Congresses of 1814-22 not only failed to right these wrongs, but carved up central Europe with a disregard for national boundaries. This sowed the seeds of nationalistic discontent, which from the 1830s was expressed variously as separatist or unification movements. These encouraged the study of language, history and folk lore, reflected in the foundation of new societies. Within France, the most influential were the Académie Celtique (founded 1804) which developed into the Société des Antiquaires de France (founded 1814), and the École des Chartes (founded 1821).

In most European countries, the nationalist movements also led to the establishment of national galleries and museums. Public museums had existed before the French revolution, but they were the products of aristocratic and hierarchical societies, and embodied a belief that art and scholarship were for a closed circle (Hudson 1975, 3). Now, however, national pride and national conscience combined to rescue and preserve objects for the public good (idem., 53).

Barrow Digging
Whereas nationalist ideology came to the fore during the 19th century, national awareness is an older phenomenon. Since Bible stories and classical texts alike describe ancient history in terms of migrations and invasions, it is no wonder that antiquarians speculated about which nations might have been responsible for early earthworks and antiquities. Greeks, Danes, Trojans and Phoenicians were all proffered as likely contenders. Aware of their mixed ethnic origins and secure within their borders, the English were relatively unconcerned with racial ancestry. Instead, they stressed the history of English political institutions, which according to popular Whig history had enjoyed a continuous history from Saxon times, although subsequent changes had destroyed earlier freedoms (Horsman 1976). By contrast, as nationalism grew on the continent, particularly in Central Europe, various national groups began to look to archaeology for evidence that they were the original inhabitants of particular territories (Sklenár 1983, 56-59). But despite the urgency of the questions this raised and the production of classified catalogues of artifacts, Caylus and his contemporaries enjoyed but limited success (Caylus 1752-66, III, xviii-xxiii). Even so, classification by nation became so established that in 1836, when Worsaae postulated the sequence of Stone, Bronze and Iron ages, he saw it not in evolutionary terms, like post-Darwinian archaeologists, but rather as evidence of the introduction of new races (Daniel 1975, 45).

After Montfaucon, Roman remains were usually correctly identified in Britain, but there remained many instances of prehistoric and Saxon antiquities being mistaken for Roman. From the late 18th century, however, the classification of artifacts improved rapidly due to the vogue for barrow digging. This provided a range of closed groups, which showed that certain varieties of artifacts tended to occur together.

Barrows and graves had long attracted treasure hunters, and had even stimulated scientific exploration (e.g. Browne
The new interest was encouraged by the Romantic movement, which stimulated a morbid interest in death and the tombs of medieval dignitaries. This was manifest in 1772, when a delegation of Antiquaries exposed the crowned corpse of Edward I in Westminster Abbey (Ayloffe 1786). Interest was sustained by the Society's Director, who was gathering materials for a tome on the subject (Gough 1786-96).

Foremost among the barrow diggers was Revd Bryan Faussett, who from 1757 until his death in 1776 excavated 777 Saxon barrows and unmarked graves on the East Kent downs. It was the first sustained campaign on a particular class of field monument. Like his contemporaries, Faussett opened burials with phenomenal speed - up to 31 per day - but he was a painstaking observer, making detailed records in his journal, the Inventorium Sepulchrale. Although Faussett wrongly thought that the skeletons he found were of "Britons Romanised" or "Romans Britonised" (Faussett 1856, 37), he examined them for abnormalities and tooth wear, and could age and sex them - skills doubtless acquired by studying anatomy at Oxford (Hawkes 1990, 3).

Faussett's notion that the graves were Roman was disproved by Revd James Douglas, whose Nenia Britannica (1786-93) is remarkable for its rejection of the literary tradition of interpretation and for its statement of the principle of applying relative dating from a known to an unknown source. Whilst only the discovery in a grave of a coin or inscription would obviate errors, the antiquary could use graves dated by these means to date others of similar construction. A burial at Gilton, Kent, could be no earlier than the coin it contained of Justinian (AD 527-65), and no later than AD 742 when burials outside churchyards were prohibited. A Roman brooch and circular stone from Gilton could not be used for dating, neither could an associated polished flint, which was regarded as an amulet from an earlier epoch (op. cit., 92). Thus, the remains of the Anglo-Saxons were first identified and characterised.
Douglas also recognised that the burials belonged to communities, and not to warriors. He was uncertain if they were of pagans or Christians, but favoured the second option.

Douglas's principle was afterwards applied to isolated artifacts. A purse-frame formerly described as the "antennae or cross bars of the Roman Standard" was now recognised to be medieval because a similar object was inscribed "Ave Maria" (Douce 1814). However, most antiquarians were unready to replace dependence upon literary evidence for the scientific consideration of observations. Even Colt Hoare, who adopted Douglas's idea of classifying barrows, rejected his Anglo-Saxon dating for barrows of the "small conic" variety (Hoare 1812-21, I, 46-7 and Tumuli Pl. IV). Not until the 1840s was Douglas's achievement fully appreciated.

Meanwhile Cunnington and Colt Hoare had subjected the early Bronze Age barrows of Wessex to the first integrated programme of field survey and excavation (Cunnington 1975). Both were influenced by Douglas in speaking from "facts not theory" (Hoare 1812-21, I, 7; Atkinson 1975). By 1802, Cunnington had recognised that the Wiltshire barrows were of a different class and earlier to Douglas's Kentish barrows, and had learnt to recognise Roman or "Romanized British" pottery. Since pottery from the barrows was not of this kind, he concluded that they belonged to "Celtic Britons" (Cunnington 1975, 29-30 and 95). This was a great advance over opinions expressed in early issues of Archaeologia.

Roman Britain 1770-1827

The first excavations in Britain of Roman forts and villas were inspired by the excavations at Herculaneum and Pompeii from 1738 and 1763 respectively. Because news of them was suppressed, the spectacular nature of the discoveries was not appreciated in Britain until the 1770s, when the Antiquaries received a set of views of Pompeii and acquired the Herculaneum publications (Hamilton 1786; Evans 1956,
Interest in Roman civilisation was sustained by the publication of Gibbon's *Decline and Fall* (Gibbon 1776-88).

That remains of Pompeian splendour might be found in England was demonstrated in 1755, when portions of the Roman baths were found, recorded and destroyed at Bath (Lucas 1756). Then, in 1790, the civic authorities found a Roman pavement when enlarging the pump room. Above it were over seventy blocks of sculptured and inscribed Roman masonry, recognisably from the front of a magnificent Corinthian temple. Antiquarians from all over Britain came to see the discoveries, which were eventually published by Lysons (1807-19; Englefield 1792).

Setting aside records of mosaics, the systematic clearance and publication of Roman villas in Britain began with Rooke's work at Mansfield Woadhouse (Rooke 1787). No villa in Britain had previously been published as such. Rooke's report includes descriptions of the rooms, details of coins as dating evidence, and plans of the structure and its mosaics by Basire. It set the standard for a series of excavations by Lysons, a west-country barrister and Director of the Society of Antiquaries from 1798-1809.

Lysons initial investigations - at Comb-End, Rodmarton, Withrington and Woodchester - culminated in 1811-17 with the excavation of the Bignor villa (Lysons 1818; 1821a). This revealed the finest mosaics so far discovered in Britain, and by following the walls, Lysons produced a complete building plan. In 1818, at Great Witcombe, he excavated another magnificent villa with a very complete bath-house (Lysons 1821b). Previously, the only baths to have been illustrated were those at Dover and Wroxeter (Lyon 1779; Leighton 1789). Lysons published his work in *Archaeologia* and in his Romano-British corpus with its sumptuous coloured illustrations of mosaic pavements (Lysons 1807-19).

Like most of his contemporaries, Lysons had no concept of stratigraphy or that Roman buildings might have undergone alterations; he failed to recognise that Great Witcombe
belonged to two phases. But his descriptions were thorough, and his interpretations restrained and reasonable. Many have stood the test of time: for example, his suggestion that the room with a central water tank at Great Witcombe was a shrine.

Lysons small-finds were donated to the British Museum from 1802 (Catherine Johns, pers. comm.), and seem to be the first to have been systematically recovered in an archaeological excavation and subsequently consigned to a public museum. Lysons included finds in his excavation reports as evidence of site usage: the discovery in a room at Comb-End of burnt wheat, an earthenware colander, an iron hatchet and large iron chopping implement suggested that it had been a kitchen (Lysons 1817). He might have engendered a much wider interest in finds, but after Bignor, mosaics regained their precedence over all else.

Whereas Roman buildings found in towns were generally destroyed, some landowners recognised that there were advantages in preserving Roman mosaics (Hoare 1829). One cannot say whether this was due to a genuine feeling for the past, the prospect of financial gain or entertaining important visitors, or because the remains of a Roman villa offered physical evidence of the desirability of the land (p. 53).

The only other excavations in Britain were of forts along Hadrian's Wall. In 1790, the owner of Netherhall was said to keep "a man daily at work in searching, and clearing the walls within the fort" (Rooke 1792). Excavations at Castlesteads and elsewhere produced building plans, inscriptions and coins (Carlisle 1794). But it was Revd John Hodgson's excavations in 1822 of the mithraeum and south gateway at Housesteads, and his subsequent monograph on the Wall that pointed the way for the systematic excavation and publication of Wall sites (Hodgson 1820-40; Birley 1958, 30). In 1813, Hodgson and another excavator, Revd Anthony Hedley helped to inaugurate the Society of
Antiquaries of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. This may lay claim to be the first local society, in that it aimed to promote an enquiry "into antiquities in general but more especially into those of the North of England" (SANUT 1816, v).

Setting aside the northern borders, a perusal of Gough's Britannia (1806) shows that the 18th century produced remarkably little reliable archaeological information about Roman Britain. Villas apart, few Roman buildings were known. The Dover pharos and the amphitheatres at Silchester, Richborough and Caerleon were correctly identified, but upstanding Roman masonry generally aroused uncertainty. The Saxon practice of reusing Roman bricks meant that their presence was no sure token of Roman work. Tile courses in the walls of Silchester, Verulamium and Chesterford were regarded as proof of Roman origin, but since these were absent at Pevensey, Richborough, Burgh Castle, Chester, York, and the southern extension of Lincoln, the walls here were taken to be Saxon or Norman work on Roman foundations. Wallingford castle was mistaken for Roman because it incorporated herring-bone stonework, like the walls of Silchester.

Prehistoric hill-forts were generally mistaken for Roman, not least because Roman coins were sometimes found within them. The possibility of reoccupation was passed over. Whereas Roman camps on level ground were known to be square, it was argued that ramparts on hill tops would follow the sinuosities of the landscape (Narrien 1819). The practice camps on Llandrindod Common were recognisably Roman, but their function aroused puzzlement (Price 1814).

Little was known about the interior of Romano-British towns and civitas capitals. Upstanding ruins at Wroxeter and Jewry Wall, Leicester, were recognised as Roman, but misunderstood. Sewer excavations continued in London. In 1774, they revealed a layer of ash 22 feet below street level in Walbrook, considered (perhaps correctly) to represent the Boudiccan fire (Gough 1806, 92). Mosaics
found in Leadenhall Street and Camomile Street were lifted and preserved (Fisher 1807). Otherwise, the destruction continued without record until just before Smith entered the scene (p. 84).

The intellectual achievements of the 18th century were nevertheless considerable. Through studying classical literature and inscriptions, Horsley and others had provided an outline geography and history of Roman Britain. Montfaucon had revolutionised the understanding of Roman symbolic art. Caylus had shown the value of studying manufacturing techniques. Winckelmann had demonstrated how detailed descriptions could assist in revealing stylistic chronologies. Lysons spadework had proved the potential of excavation, while Douglas had recognised the importance of the closed group for dating purposes. Thus when the intellectual and social climate led to a popular explosion of archaeology, there was available a range of new intellectual tools, whose application will be discussed in subsequent chapters.
CHAPTER 3: Smith's Life and Personality

In order fully to comprehend the course of Smith's archaeological career, we need to understand not only the broader intellectual and social background, but something of Smith's character and personal circumstances. This chapter begins by summarising Smith's life outside archaeology and then proceeds to provide a brief character sketch. It is the writer's contention that an appreciation Smith's perception of the world, and what motivated him, provides insights into his strengths and weaknesses as an archaeologist, and the biases which may have affected his records - a prime source of information about the events covered in this study.

Early Life, 1806-20

Charles Roach Smith was born in 1806 to an Isle of Wight family of considerable local importance. His father, John, was the tenant of Landguard, near Shanklin - one the island's largest and most fertile farms (M. Coventry, pers. comm.). John also owned several fields, and his wife, Ann, enjoyed a small private income. She belonged to the Roach family of Arreton farm some miles to the north. Although of yeoman stock, both families had acquired some of the attributes of small-scale country gentry. The Smith's boasted an heraldic shield, and had charted their family
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31 Unless otherwise stated, the following narrative is derived from CRS:J0 and CRS:J1.
32 The DNB states that he was born in 1807, but the Newchurch baptismal records give 1806, see IOWCRO:S.
33 IOWCRO, Tithe maps of 1842 for Brading and Arreton parishes.
34 LOA 189/3, CRS to JOH, 20 July 1875.
35 IOWCRO, Ref. RP/30: Release of interest on the personal estates of John Pope of Redway, deceased.
36 IOWCRO:S and IOWCRO, FAM/90 (Roach).
37 Used by CRS on his bookplates. Field - ermine, bezants 2 and 1.
tree to the 17th century. Arreton Manor, Charles' second home, remains one of the island's finest houses, and is now open to the public.

In later life, Smith regarded his early childhood as a lost golden age. As the last of nine surviving children, he received an inordinate amount of attention, especially from his eldest sisters, Ann and Mary, who were in their twenties. He saw less of his brothers. John and Richard were farming; Henry was a lieutenant in the Royal Marines, and in 1837, gained promotion to captain (AO 1824, 100; 1826, 100; 1840, 116).

Before his fifth birthday, Charles was sent to Miss Trattle's Boarding School for Young Ladies, in Brading. His sister Maria joined him soon afterwards, but the separation from his family proved traumatic, and its ill effects were exacerbated by the sudden death of his father, in August 1812.

John Smith was sorely missed by his wife and children, but their situation could have been worse. Charles' brother Richard took over the lease of Landguard, and their mother's financial prospects were secured by her ageing father, Henry Roach, who made a new will two months after John's death. Thus, when Henry himself died in 1815, Ann Smith received the interest on £2,250, which on her decease was to be divided equally between her children.

When eight or nine, Charles transferred to John Crouch's school at Swaythling, Southampton, thereafter moving with the school to St. Cross, Winchester. The education which

38 IOWCRO, Ref. BRS 414, Pedigree of Smith family, given by John Smith to his niece, Frances Cheverton of Apse, 1822.
39 JM:A, entry by CRS, 1877.
40 IOWCRO:S; HR:SFC, H. Smith to sister Mary, 9 Aug. 1812.
Crouch (previously a carpenter) provided was woefully inadequate. It was therefore fortunate that the school should unexpectedly close, and that Charles should transfer to Withers' Academy, Lymington, where the standards were better. Although he spent only two years at Withers' Academy, Charles' natural ability was recognised, and the staff took pains to teach him Latin (his best subject) and English literature. In later life, he considered himself educationally disadvantaged, but since contemporary Public and Grammar Schools were notoriously poor, the disadvantages may have been primarily social.

We may guess that Charles was much influenced by his eldest brother, Henry (born 1785). In middle age the brothers' did not get on well - Henry is hardly mentioned in Smith's Retrospections - yet as a young man, he clearly brimmed with intelligence, courage and high spirits (Smetham 1929, 125-43). His tales of navy life probably encouraged Charles' taste for continental travel (Anon. 1928), especially if (as he must) Charles had occasion to peruse Henry's illustrated journal of his Mediterranean voyages, which perhaps inspired his own illustrated journals. The clearest evidence of Henry's influence lies in the brothers' mutual love of theatre, in that one of Charles' earliest memories was of watching Henry act with members of his ship's company (Smith 1883, 99). At Lymington, Charles visited the local theatre, and became so enthused that he obtained a copy of Planché's Amoroso, and set about drilling his class-mates. The production was abandoned when they failed to learn their parts, but not before Charles had learnt to recite the entire play from memory, mimicking the different voices, and singing the songs. These were skills to which he returned during his retirement.

Apprenticeship, 1820-27

42 HR:SFC.
Charles left school in the summer of 1820, just before his fourteenth birthday, with no notion of what to do for a living. Privately, he dreamt of a stage career, but this was deemed so unsuitable for a gentleman that he dared not mention the idea. He tried his hand at legal work in the office of a Newport solicitor, but without proper assistance, found what transpired there incomprehensible. Thus in the autumn of 1821, Charles returned to his mother and spinster sisters, Elizabeth and Maria, who now lived at "Ellyards", a small-holding adjacent to Landguard.\footnote{IOWCRO, Tithe map for Brading Parish, 1842; Ordnance Survey maps of Lake of 1862 and 1867.}

Whereas at school Charles had bemoaned his separation from home and family, he now became irritable and listless, and it was clear that a decision must be made about his future. With a brother and two brothers-in-law in the navy, a lieutenancy in the Royal Marines seemed the obvious choice. Captain Eveleigh - who had married Ann, Charles eldest sister - managed to obtain the promise of one, but not for three years, and it was thought unwise for Charles to wait \citep[99]{Smith1883}. At this juncture, Ann noticed a newspaper advertisement for an apprentice to a Chichester chemist and druggist, which was lighted upon as just what Charles was seeking: training in a respectable business that required little starting capital. Thus, in February 1822, Charles commenced what he called "the great trial of my life".\footnote{HR:SFC, CRS to nephew of same name, 7 Jan. 1876.}

Charles' new employer, John Follett, lived on his premises in East Street, together with two sisters and another apprentice, John Harris. They were kind people, but Charles' first impressions of the household and of his duties were wholly negative. He made a desperate appeal to his mother, but on receiving a severe reply, had no option but to adapt to his circumstances \citep[100 and 284]{Smith1883}.
In truth, Charles' situation was not wholly unfavourable. "Chemists and druggists" specialised in buying and preparing drugs and medicines, and in selling them, wholesale and retail. They had no official training or regulatory standards, so Charles' apprenticeship would have been informal (Matthews 1962, 67 and 115). His work involved serving customers, gathering or purchasing raw materials, and assisting in the manufacture of herbal preparations according to prescriptions in "Pharmacopoeias".

In his spare time, Charles went fishing and swimming, and did gardening (a favourite pastime at home) in exchange for French lessons. He also developed an interest in antiquities, encouraged by an outing to the Bignor Roman villa, and by reading Gibbon's Decline and Fall... (1776-88) and Camden's Britannia (pp. 39 and 55; Smith 1883, 103).

Follett had once collected coins - a common hobby towards the close of the 18th century - and Charles found on his bookshelves a popular treatise on the subject: Pinkerton's Essay on Medals (1784). He resolved to obtain some Roman coins, and eventually acquired a coin of Faustina which he spotted in a shop till (Smith 1883, 100). (This was presumably in circulation, the debased state of the currency being notorious in the years up to 1821.) Then, in November 1824, he obtained part of a hoard of denarii by following up gossip about a find of coins which "would not go" (i.e. were rejected by shopkeepers). They had been unearthed by a labourer near Almodington Common, six miles away. Charles immediately borrowed Follett's horse, rode through the dusk to Earnley Common, and located the labourer's house - only to learn that his wife had seized the coins and gone to bed! Undaunted, the youth insisted that she was roused, and bargained with her through the window until she had sold him some. It was a never-forgotten lesson in taking the initiative. Charles subsequently examined a further 250-300 coins, bought some of the more interesting, and ultimately
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45 CRS:J0, 28-29 Apl. 1827.
published a list of the types represented (Smith 1836; 1883, 100-2).

London, 1827-56

The year 1827 is illuminated by the earliest of Smith's six surviving journals. He may have begun it to gain some perspective upon his fast-changing circumstances, in that the second entry records a letter from his sister Elizabeth, who was helping him to obtain an alternative position. Having learnt his trade, Charles had every reason to leave Follett, whose extravagance was leading to financial ruin. London was the obvious place to look, not least because Ann and Captain Eveleigh now lived at Gravesend, thereafter moving to Kennington. Thus, in July 1827, Charles left Chichester to work for Messrs. Wilson, Ashmore, Hodgkinson and Minshull, wholesale druggists of Snow Hill, London (cf. Pigot and Co. 1826).

Here young Smith excelled at his work, which involved grading, weighing and packing herbs and supplying orders for quinine, oils and balsams. He lodged alone in Surrey Street, then in Clerkenwell with a relative, James Roach. If there were few opportunities for fishing, Smith remained interested in coins and theatre-going, and evidently still wanted to become an actor (Smith 1883, 106-10).

Little is known of Smith's life from 1828 to 1835 because the relevant journals are missing. The principal event was his mother's death in August 1832. This would have released Smith's share of his grandfather's legacy, and to overcome his grief, Smith apparently used the money as his mother would have wished: by setting up in business. It
was an act of duty, however, and he soon felt shackled by "grovelling trade and all its anxieties and vicissitudes".50

Smith's premises at 48 Lothbury, behind the Bank of England, comprised a shop, stock room, sitting room and bedroom (Pl. 3). Although tiny, its location ensured that Smith's business flourished. Behind the shop were baths owned by his landlord, a physician, and Smith did brisk trade with his patients and with gentlemen using the baths. He also obtained the occasional export order.51 From 1833-39 his annual turn-over rose from £ 460 to £ 1,395, and in 1838 and 1839 Smith made enormous profits of £ 746 and £ 878 respectively. He could easily afford an assistant. (James White served him during 1836; John Buckett began in June 1838 and stayed until shortly before Smith retired.)52 By 1840, Smith also had a servant and apprentice (Smith 1891, 154).53 Being in the City, his shop closed at 6.00 p.m. and did not open on Sunday.54 Thus Smith had sufficient money to purchase antiquities for his museum, and was able to spend his weekends exploring the countryside (see Chapters 4 and 7).

In 1840, Smith's prosperity was abruptly terminated when the Corporation of London compulsarily purchased his shop for road-widening. He immediately re-established himself at 5 Liverpool Street, a relative backwater along the southern border of a vast urban slum (Hunting 1991, 47; Wyld 1842).55 Smith remained here until he retired in 1856, but his profits were severely curtailed, and his angry response to his expulsion from Lothbury caused the Corporation to hinder his access to sites (p. 97). His new premises were larger, however, which enabled Smith to display his enormous collection (Pl. 9; for description, see Anon. 1854d). He

50 RP:II, CRS to WHR(?), 27 Dec. 1843.
51 CRS:J3, 17 Aug. 1839; CRS:J4, 7 Feb. 1840.
52 CRS:J2, from 12 Jan. to 24 Aug. 1836; CRS:J3, from 7 June 1838, etc.
53 CRS:J4, 11 May 1840.
54 COLRO:LBCJ, 11 May 1840.
55 CRS:J4, 29 Sep. 1840.
was also able to entertain visitors, and to provide a home for his sister Maria, who was unwilling or unable to stay alone at Ellyards following Elizabeth's recent death (Smith 1883, 129; 1886, 1). Thus until her own death in 1874, Maria lived with Charles, and they became totally devoted to each other.

For a while, Smith's business ticked over, but the recession of 1847-8 precipitated a long, slow decline, and the worry gave rise to increasing ill health. Smith began to look for ways of making a living from archaeology, and in February 1848, agreed to prepare a new edition of Pinkerton (1784; p. 70), but found the remuneration not worth the effort. He began to toy with the idea of selling his collection and retiring "to the coast of France" where he and his sister might live cheaply and comfortably. In December 1849, and again, in May 1852, Smith was forced to lay off his assistant. By June 1853, he had determined to retire. According to one writer, Smith's business depended upon "the prescriptions of three celebrated physicians" all of whom either died or retired at this time (Anon. 1890e). Smith's best customer, a Dr. Gosset, died in November 1854, reducing his annual income by several hundred pounds, which made a decision about his future a matter of urgency.

The Smiths' choice of a retirement home was determined by Maria's concern to remain close to family and friends (Smith 1886, 236-7). She and Charles were friendly with a Mr and Mrs Humphrey Wickham of Strood, Kent, and while staying with them, Maria had come to admire Temple Place, "a spruce dandified modern villa" set in gardens, on Cuxton Road (Pl.
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56 CRS:J4, 9 Sep. and 7 Nov. 1840.
57 JM:A, 92; LOA 158/5, CRS to JOH, 4 Mar. 1875.
59 DNM:CRS, CRS to JJAW, 29 Aug. 1850 and 13 Jan. 1855.
60 BAC, CRS to TB, 13 Dec. 1849.
61 KBC, CRS to JJAW, 6 May 1852.
63 NR0:DT, DT to CRS, undated, c. Nov. 1854; DNM:CRS, CRS to JJAW, 13 Jan. 1855.
On learning that it be sold, she used her influence, and Smith bought it to please her. The deed of conveyance is dated 23 Feb. 1856, a month before Smith sold his collection to the British Museum (Smetham 1929, 28-32).

Unfortunately, Smith's financial problems followed him into retirement, in that he had to use the money raised in selling his collection to buy land to secure himself from builders. This land was mostly low lying, and in 1874 and 1883 Smith and his tenants suffered substantial losses when the Medway flooded its banks (Smetham 1899). In general, however, the Smiths enjoyed a happy retirement, growing flowers, fruit and vegetables, as their parents had done when they were children (Smith 1886, 238). The "long and enchanting dream" was shattered only by Maria's sudden death in 1874.

**Smith's Personality**

We now turn from Smith's domestic situation and business to consider his personality, and his motives for collecting and becoming an antiquarian. As one who evoked strong reactions, it is difficult to gain an objective view of Smith. His contemporary biographers indulged in unashamed hagiography (Smetham 1929; Payne 1890), but their assessment stands in marked contrast to that of Joan Evans', who thought Smith: "odd, unhappy and eccentric", and "a self-educated egotist with as strong a propensity for reciting Shakespeare in public as for collecting" (Evans 1943, 290 and 129, respectively). The truth probably lies between the extremes.
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64 MP, JC to CRS, 25 Dec. 1856.  
65 BAC V, CRS to TB, 11 Oct. 1855.  
66 LOA 110/15, CRS to JOH, 28 Apr. 1874; LOA 263/34, CRS to JOH, 21 Mar. 1883; CRS:KP, CRS to JC, 13 Dec. 1883.  
67 JM:A, 92.
By all accounts, Smith was manly and handsome (Smetham 1890, 387). This much is confirmed by portraits (Pls. 1, 2 and 5), although a friend once commented that:

"I never saw a likeness of C.R. Smith that I could tolerate. In fact he is a bad subject for a painter or sculptor. His face is nothing without its animation, I had almost said fire, therefore the sculptor must strive to get as much spiteful animation as possible 'and then ye'll see him!'"^68

Smith's "flashing eye" was matched by his sharp intellect, decisiveness, love of punctuality, and relentless industry (Dowker 1890). He was doggedly determined, and would persist where others saw only difficulties. John Evans called him "a man of warm feelings, a devoted man, but one who when occasion arose could show himself a stout opponent" (Evans 1891, 312).

Arising from his experiences as a chemist's assistant and his struggle for social acceptance among the Antiquaries, Smith developed strong social beliefs. He identified with the working classes, and emphasised the point by smoking a workman's clay pipe (Smetham 1929, 51 and 217).^69 He abhorred all forms of snobbery (Smith 1883, 108-9; Smetham 1890, 387). Following his resignation from the BAA, he also:

"... avoided society mainly because his time was too valuable, and also because he had the most profound contempt for its hollow, deceptive formalities, which are such a formidable barrier to true friendship and enlightening intercourse" (Payne 1890, 327).

Politically a Liberal, Smith opposed capital punishment and the New Poor Law, and supported the spread of education and fair treatment of workers (Smetham 1929, 6).^70 He had memorised a remarkable number of folk songs, and had a liking for ballad poetry and stories about animals. He campaigned for fruit trees to be planted to benefit the poor, and for the protection of small birds, which saved the fruit from pests (idem. 80; Smith 1862-3). In later life a
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^68 MP, JC to JM, undated.
^69 CRS:J4, 29 June, 18 Aug. and 22 Nov. 1841.
^70 CRS:J4, 29 June and 16 Aug. 1841.
concern for animal welfare led him to become almost a vegetarian (Smetham 1890, 383-90).

Although nominally Christian, after leaving home Smith rarely attended church. Although he kept quiet about them, his theological views were said to be "very advanced", and he disliked Puseyites and evangelicals alike (Anon. 1890e; Smetham 1890, 384; Smith 1883, 109). Instead, he sublimated his problems in country walks, and the stoic philosophy of Cicero, so that in retrospect he was able to claim that:

"... peace of mind ... is just the thing I was ever rich in and which really supported me through the hideous trials that beset me in my London life. I can truthfully say it never deserted me; and I believe, so long as I act conscientiously, never will."  

Smith's first diary, written in Chichester, is prefaced with quotations from the works of Cicero, whose concept of living in agreement with nature, and rejection of hedonism in favour of "virtue" provided a powerful philosophy for an apprentice labouring under what he perceived as adversity (see Griffin 1986). Such ideals stood at variance with his employer's reckless life-style, and Follett's subsequent humiliation caused Charles to reflect that:

"I think I shall be enabled should I ever be placed in business to guard against the idle vanity of appearing to be greater than I really am to make it a strict rule of conduct to carry myself in such a manner that I may gain the respect of those that know me, on no occasion ever so trifling to forfeit my given word, or to act in any way dishonourable, for I have seen to what misery a contrary behaviour can bring a person".

Smith ever kept this resolution, adopting simple habits and upholding the "majesty of simple truth" (Smetham 1890, 384-90). His "sterling integrity, and ... sense of honour" were universally recognised; the Revd Thomas Hugo called him "the only consistent man in the Society of Antiquaries".
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71 THC I, CRS to TH, 9 Dec. 1856.
72 CRS:JO, 1-2 Feb. 1827.
73 LOA 235/21, CRS to JOH, 11 Apl. 1878; CRS:IOW, TH to Sir J. Simeon, 27 Aug. 1855.
A life-long bachelor, Smith greatly valued his many friends, who ranged from leading antiquaries to the young working men of Strood. Temple Place was always open to the latter for conversation and advice, and they regarded Smith as the greatest teacher of their lives (Anon. 1890c; Dowker 1890; Reed 1890; Smetham 1891). He was "one of the most interesting and genial companions, equally easy of approach both by rich and poor" (Anon. 1890e). Stories abound of his generosity, hospitality, kindness and selflessness (Smetham 1890, 384; Waller 1991, ix). On occasion, loyalty could cloud Smith's judgement. In 1858, for instance, he testified to the authenticity of the forged pilgrim badges called "Billy and Charley's", in support of his friend William Edwards (Halliday 1984). He spared no pains to help friends in trouble, as when J.O. Halliwell stood accused of having stolen manuscripts (Winstanley 1948), and when Dawson Turner eloped with a young, socially inferior woman.74 Smith's friends in turn thought very highly of him. A book dedication by F.W. Fairholt records that "I only wish that while one copy of this little book remains, it should exist to record the sincere esteem I feel for you" (Fairholt 1859).

To modern eyes, Fairholt's dedication raises questions about the nature of their relationship, especially since both men remained unmarried. There was, however, never any suggestion of impropriety, and close friendships between Victorian men of letters were commonplace; at the height of their friendship, J.O. Halliwell and Thomas Wright corresponded daily at least. Indeed, the sense of camaraderie and shared purpose was a powerful reason why bachelors like Smith were attracted into the antiquarian community (cf. Levine 1986, 20). Smith was certainly capable of admiring young women,75 and if he preferred the
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74 e.g. NRO:DT, G. Balls to CRS, 5 May 1854.
75 CRS:J1, "Letter 1"; MP, JC to JM, 7 and 20 Jan. 1866; JC to CRS, 7 Dec. 1868.
company of young men, this could be because he enjoyed playing the role of mentor (Payne 1890, 326). 76

It may also be significant that at the age of 21, Smith noted in his diary that "Camden chose a single life apprehending that the encumbrances of a married life might prove a prejudice to his studies". 77 Probably Smith remained single because of his devotion to archaeology and to Maria, in that she provided him with every domestic comfort, while he chose to spend his time and increasingly limited money on antiquities and publishing.

**Smith's "Peculiarities"

In his eulogy of Smith, J.G. Waller remarks that "such peculiarities as he had one could easily forgive" (Waller 1891, ix) - a recognition that, like many great men, Smith had serious flaws. In particular, Smith harboured an "inferiority complex", manifest in a tendency to self-aggrandisement and craving for praise. He was intensely disappointed if the press omitted to review his publications, 78 and his Retrospections abound with trite anecdotes and letters included solely for their flattering content; his capacity to melt in the face of flattery was almost endearing. 79 The same could not be said of his sense of aggrievement and antagonism towards authority figures in general and public officials in particular. The 1881 census returns, for instance, show that having lied about his age (his usual practice), 80 Smith gave as his profession "Archaeology, Shakespeare and Horticulture". This induced the hapless census collector to annotate the entry: "?? (3)" - referring to a key which gives (3) as "imbecile or
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idiot". Such incidents undermine a remark that Smith was among "the most courteous of men" (Anon. 1890d).

In adult life, Smith's "peculiarities" were exacerbated by a lack of recognition of his archaeological achievements, but they probably originated in childhood. It may be that being sent too young to boarding school gave rise to a sense of rejection, compounded by guilt arising from the death of his father. Smith had little affection for his father, so that when during his final illness:

"... he called me to his bedside and said to try me 'Charles, I am sick. Will you go to Brading for a doctor'. I demurred for I knew his doctor did not live there, and also by no means relished the idea of going near school again so soon, at which he seemed much hurt. Whether he prognosticated a bad disposition in me by my answer I cannot tell, or only affected to be so, but it made a strong impression on me, and I have thought on the incident thousands of times" (Smith 1883, 91).

The incident may help explain Smith's extreme sensitivity if anyone questioned his integrity, also his lambasts against persons in authority, in that people of censorious disposition often harbour a sense of their own failings. It is as if by exposing the culpability of others, they themselves feel less unworthy. The underlying theme of his strictures - the failure of those in authority to promote general education - suggests that subconsciously Smith may have blamed his family for his disadvantageous schooling.

Smith's first diary reveals another early trait in mentioning a letter that he wrote to the Master of the mint, "suggesting a few hints for the improvement of the coin of the realm" - as if the ideas of a youngster might have carried any weight! Smith's later actions evince the same desire to make persons in authority notice his ideas and opinions. It is as if his sisters and mother for too long treated him as an infant and were over manipulative in persuading him to accept what he truly did not want. He was sent away to boarding school, and obliged to follow a trade
he detested, yet could say or do nothing to alter his family's mind. The same desire to extend his influence caused Smith to adopt a Johnsonian manner of speech (Smetham 1929, 6), to write with a thick quill years after most had changed to metal nibs, and to take up elocution - "the power of exhibiting reason attractively and persuasively" (Smith 1879b, 4). He also developed a gift for economy of language, "quaint sayings" and repartee (Anon. 1883a; Smetham 1890, 386-7). 83

As Smith was to discover, sound logic and linguistic skills are by themselves often not enough to persuade and motivate; the views of his intellectual inferiors but social superiors frequently carried more weight. Smith also lacked the ability to analyse his own and other people's motives from a psychological standpoint and thereby to predict how they might react in certain circumstances. This lack of insight was a common failing among the early Victorians. In the age before Freud and psychological novelists such as Thomas Hardy, there was little awareness of the human subconscious, and unworthy human emotions tended to be clothed, for personal as well as private acceptability, in terms of honour and principle.

For Smith, therefore, the only hope of implementing his ideas lay in the power of language, and he had an unquestioning faith in the printed word as a means to persuade and cajole. If his ideas were not adopted, his first recourse was to express disapprobation in print. His Retrospections contain rebukes to people who years previously had failed to take his advice, or to accredit his ideas. His outspokenness in the press and at public meetings sometimes embarrassed his friends and made enemies, but Smith held that the "cause of science is best served by speaking the plain truth and not disguising our opinions" (Smith 1875, 467). According to Joseph Clarke:

83 LOA 259/28, note by JOH on letter from CRS, 6 Oct. 1881.
"Mr. C.C. Babington said to me, Smith is the most straightforward and honest of the antiquaries ... but he appears to have no idea how unpopular he is, his ill-success is owing in a greater degree to this, than is imagined."\textsuperscript{84}

Smith's belief in the moral strength of truth also produced a tendency to be litigatious, as in 1864, when as a matter of principle, Smith successfully took the Dean and Chapter of Rochester to court for illegally acquiring forty square feet of reclaimed land. Since the case was heard in private, Smith subsequently published a tract on the subject (Smith 1865b). As secretary of the BAA and Numismatic Society, however, it appears from the surviving manuscripts that he successfully curbed his tongue, supporting Smith's claim that he:

"... ever worked well and pleasantly with all sorts of people, often discordant among themselves; and I have ever prided myself on possessing the secret of not being disagreeable when in office" (Smith 1883, 120).

It was partly his desire to feel important and be noticed which led Smith to become an antiquary. In later life, Smith gained equal satisfaction from giving dramatic readings, and at times almost abandoned archaeology, commenting that he had mistaken his proper vocation (Pl. 4).\textsuperscript{85} During his years in London and his early retirement, however, Smith wholeheartedly pursued the ideal of the archaeologist as hero, and cultivated his image as an exemplar of antiquarian zeal. If his contemporaries failed to honour him, Smith could always appeal to his alter ego, or to posterity, by recording his exploits in his diaries, and later on in his Retrospections. In an age which looked for heroes, there was no shortage of admirers ready to perpetuate this image. It was widely held for example that Smith's friends had struck a medal to commemorate his efforts to save the walls of Dax (Payne 1890, 325; Smetham 1929, 219). In reality, the medal was a commercial venture,

\textsuperscript{84} MP, JC to JM, 8 Nov. 1855.
\textsuperscript{85} HR:SFC, CRS to J. Thorp, 28 Dec. 1888.
and the idea of depicting the walls of Dax on the reverse had come from Smith himself (Smith 1891, 50).

By embracing Stoicism and the Camden tradition of antiquarian self-sacrifice, Smith gained what amounted to a religious faith, which brought with it a sense of meaning and purpose. His museum and researches offered an escape from the mundane routine of shopkeeping by attracting eminent visitors, and bringing intellectual stimulation and a sense of personal significance in contributing to progress and the public good. Otherwise Smith might have shared the fate of:

"... the vast crowds who daily fill the streets of the Metropolis, like bees in a hive ... [of whom] not one in a million knows or cares to know the history of the place.... They are not taught to think beyond; and thus the faculty of thinking beyond selfish and animal gratifications ... becomes for them almost or quite extinguished" (Smith 1883, 112).

Such language is suggestive of another motive for studying antiquities - an ambition to be considered knowledgeable and cultivated - which is manifest also in Smith's pride at having "gained ... the respect of those who can judge of my manners by their superior education and standing in society". It was understandably irksome to Smith that he had little standing outside antiquarian circles, and this in turn made it easy for fellow antiquarians to disparage or ignore his achievements. Like the Revd John Hodgson and Mark Anthony Lower, Smith found that antiquarian endeavours were frequently discouraged, could ruin one's health, and rarely brought financial rewards (Smith 1851e, 172; 1867c; 1883, 19).

As a result of his own difficulties, Smith developed a compulsion to honour the literary and scientific achievements of others, from Shakespeare to his illustrator friend, F.W. Fairholt (e.g. Smith 1883, 36). He expended

86 MP, CRS to JM, 8 Feb. 1857.
87 CRS:J4, 2 Feb. 1841. 
much energy on committees to raise subscriptions for testimonials, and even criticised the Archaeological Institute for failing to honour his former adversary, Albert Way (Smith 1881a; 1881b). During the 1860s and 70s, he followed Charles Dickens' example and used his public readings to raise money, but unlike Dickens, gave the profits - which often exceeded his income - to support impoverished antiquaries (Anon. 1890e).

In the mutual bestowing of honours, as in other matters, the Victorians took themselves very seriously, so although Smith's self-importance and other "peculiarities" frequently worked to his disadvantage, as secretary of the Numismatic Society and BAA they worked mainly in his favour, in that he tended to treat fellow antiquaries as if they were equally important, which was flattering and made his self-importance unobjectionable. Smith's success in this regard would have been furthered by his intense interest in other people; his manuscripts are sprinkled with jottings about their habits, opinions, and biographical details. It was this which led him to collect autographs, claiming that "nothing shows the character of men better than letters". Smith's correspondents, in turn, often collected his own letters, in acts of mutual homage. Thus following his retirement, the death of a friend or correspondent acquired a further significance as the loss of someone who remembered and recognised Smith's archaeological triumphs of former years. This explains Smith's growing concern from 1861 onwards, to publish obituaries and biographical sketches. It is as if by elevating his friends and acquaintances, Smith hoped somehow to uphold his own status also (Smith 1861b; etc.).

88 LOA 217/5, CRS to JOH, 14 Apr. 1875.
We are now ready to introduce the first main theme of this thesis - Smith's contribution to the archaeology of Roman and medieval London. The following two chapters comprise a critical appreciation of Smith's collecting activities and site observations, followed by a reappraisal of the artifactual evidence that he obtained for the existence of Roman London Bridge. The present chapter examines the background to Smith's work in the City of London, and the reasons for his poor relations with the Corporation of London. It argues that Smith's lambasts against the Corporation were motivated partly by personal concerns, but equally refutes a view that Smith might have been more successful if had he been more tactful.

The Rebirth of City Archaeology

The revival of interest in London's archaeology dates from 1824-31, when the rebuilding of London Bridge produced a wealth of Roman and medieval antiquities, and attracted the attention of antiquarians. The British Museum acquired its famed Roman statuette of Harpocrates, and a sizeable collection was made by John Newman, Comptroller of the Bridge House Estates (Welch 1896, 157 and 161). Many Roman and medieval coins were found in digging the foundations, and it was observed that:

"The workmen, who at first considered all the coins they met with as being merely old halfpence, which were worth nothing because they would no longer pass, soon discovered their error, and have now all become connoisseurs" (Anon. 1827).

Works for the Bridge approach roads in 1830-2 drew even wider attention. They involved building a viaduct over Thames Street and a road from there to the Bank of England (King William Street). A sewer trench below this road and the south abutment of the viaduct produced large amounts of samian. Workmen sold sherds to bystanders, one of whom commented that it "was in such quantities as almost to
induce a belief that it must have been made or sold here" (Herbert c. 1835, 26). Recent excavations have revealed the presence hereabouts of breakages from Roman pottery warehouses (Rhodes 1986, 199 and 27, Fig. 2).

Among the bystanders were William Knight and Alfred Kempe, both FSAs, who subsequently published their observations (Knight 1834; Kempe 1832). Kempe, a poor man who made a living by intermittent clerical work, had previously supported Gage's campaign to preserve the Lady Chapel of Southwark Cathedral, but is best known as founder of the "Society of Noviomagians" DNB). This was a dining club of FSAs who had assisted Kempe's 1828 excavation of a Roman mausoleum near Caesar's Camp - an Iron Age hillfort near Keston, Kent, which he conceived to be "Noviomagus" of the Antonine Itinerary (Kempe 1829; Evans 1956, 231 fn.). Newman was also a member.

The London Bridge finds created a vogue among such men for collecting London antiquities, especially coins, stamped and/or decorated pottery and statuary. The field was wide open for private individuals. Only rarely did the British Museum buy London antiquities. Since ready cash was needed to purchase them, the BM's clumsy procedures would have hampered its ability so to do; permission for every purchase had to be obtained from the Trustees.89 As with the Society of Antiquaries, the assumption was that a classical education and high social standing were sufficient qualifications to pronounce on antiquarian matters. The Keepers held a subordinate role.

London had no local museum, but there were moves to create a library for members and senior officers of the Corporation. The impetus came from R.L. Jones (1783-1863), who from 1824 to 1843 chaired the new Library Committee. A former plumber, painter and glazier, Jones had been elected to the

89 e.g. BM:CA, Minutes of Standing Committee of Trustees XII, 1833-4, 3678.
Court of Common Council in 1819 as representative for Cripplegate Without. He subsequently became known as "The City Dictator" because of his domination of numerous committees responsible for City improvements (Anon. 1839b). These included the Bridge House Estates and London Bridge Approaches Committees (responsible for rebuilding London Bridge), and the Joint Grand Committee for Gresham Affairs, which erected the present Royal Exchange. Such was Jones' determination to improve the City's roads and sewers, that in 1833-4 he attempted to arrange the demolition of thirteen City churches. He was ultimately thwarted because a newspaper campaign persuaded the Bishop of London and Archbishop of Canterbury to oppose him - but on the grounds that it was undesirable to lose places of worship, rather than because of the loss of buildings of architectural and historical merit (COL 1834; Jones 1863).

It was Jones' library which ultimately gave birth to the Guildhall Museum. After the recovery of numerous antiquities on the GPO site of 1826, the Court of Common Council asked the Library Committee to report on:

"... the propriety of providing a suitable place for the reception of such Antiquities as relate to the City of London and Suburbs, as may be procured, or presented to the Corporation." 90

No report was produced, but in 1827, when coins were discovered around the Bridge foundations, Jones obtained all he could:

"... with the liberal intention of presenting his set to the Corporation, to form the nucleus of a collection in the new City Library".

At the same time, workmen were directed to deposit any finds with the works engineer in return for compensation (Anon. 1827).

Although generally ineffective, such measures resulted in a trickle of antiquities finding their way to the librarian, who in 1829 reported that "a foundation is laid for a Civic Museum or Collection of Metropolitan Antiquities and

90 COLRO, Common Council Minutes, 19 Jan. 1826.
But a librarian's idea of a museum — a few cases of curiosities — fell far short of what was required. There was, for example, nowhere to place moulded stones. If not broken up (as was usually the case), these were stored in the City Stone Yard in Worship Street (Price 1846, 248; Elmes 1831, 132-3). Fortunately, some exceptional pieces were saved through private initiatives — for instance a statue of Diana found in 1830, which was eventually placed in Goldsmiths' Hall (Smith 1848c, 130 and 138).

Smith's Introduction to City Archaeology

By 1832, when Smith moved to the City, the works on London Bridge were largely complete, but there followed an extensive programme of road-widening by the Corporation's London Bridge Committee, and a partly related programme of sewer construction by the Commissioners of Sewers. To build the sewers, deep longitudinal cuts were made down the centre of streets, which were particularly destructive of archaeology (Pl. 6). Recent excavations in ventilation shafts for an extension to the Docklands Light Railway confirm that away from the sewers archaeological remains may still survive to a high level beneath City streets (Spence 1989, 22-23). On either side, post-medieval basements will often have obliterated all but the earliest Roman strata.

Smith seems to have been unaware of the archaeological interest of the City or of the destruction which was taking place the close of 1834 (Smith 1837a, 140). His interest was aroused by the coins, but soon widened to embrace other minor antiquities. During 1835, Smith made purchases almost daily, and began to receive calls from workmen offering their finds. His journal became interspersed with records

92 CRS: J2, 27 Nov. 1837; 4 Sep. 1838.
93 More properly "The Committee to Carry into Execution the Act of Parliament for the Rebuilding of London Bridge and for Improving and Making Suitable Approaches Thereto".
of artifacts, find-spots and even contextual information, accompanied by sketches which, although amateurish, reveal a feel for form and texture.94

In May, Lothbury was excavated to lay sewers. Smith's irritation at the disruption to his trade was ameliorated by the discovery (presumably in the Walbrook, which crossed beneath the road) of a Roman nailed shoe. Because it retains its upper, the find is still a rarity (cf. Rhodes 1980, 100-1). Smith made a reconstruction drawing of it - his first (Pl. 7).95 The same trench produced samian sherds with "potter's names", which he listed. Figured samian fascinated Smith, and he searched the classics for descriptions of gladiatorial combats and other scenes depicted on samian.

The Lothbury sewer trench also presented Smith with a particularly clear view of some archaeological features:

"About 8 feet beneath the surface was found large lumps of lead with cinders encrusted in and around, bearing evident marks of the agency of fire.... Underneath was about three feet of clay, and then gravel which had not before been moved. About twelve feet from the ... footpath and at about the same depth, they found piles of timber and tiles apparently used for paving, some 10 inches square and 1 ¾ inch thick; some 15 inch long and 11 wide. Thick chalk walls ran in different directions intersecting each other".96

Clearly, Smith had immediately grasped the distinction between archaeological strata and "natural" subsoil.

Smith had begun recording his site observations some two months earlier - a task fraught with practical problems. Nothing could be seen when the sewers were constructed in tunnels, especially when these were dug day and night by relays of navvies (Smith 1859, i). In Cheapside, the only signs of activity were the ventilation and access shafts. A shaft opposite Wood Street produced "immense quantities of

94 CRS:J1.
95 CRS:J1, between 11 Aug. and 7 Sep. 1835.
96 CRS:J1, 13 July 1835.
human bones" from thirty feet down. Another nearer St. Paul's produced chalk walls on wooden piles, two brass coins of Vespasian, and a Roman(?) skeleton.97 Sometimes Smith did not hear of the discoveries until long after the event, as in December 1839, when he learnt that in Paternoster Row a forty-foot coloured mosaic, depicting birds and beasts, had been destroyed without record the previous March.98 Where the sewers were being constructed in open trenches, it was often necessary to enter the trench to see anything, which, assuming that permission was forthcoming, could be difficult or dangerous. To examine a Roman culvert in Old Fish Street Hill, Smith had to be lowered into the trench "in a mud bucket by a windlass".99

Although ultimately the difficulties all but overcame him, it is to Smith's credit that he produced around 120 useful site records. The significance of these observations will discussed in Chapter 5. The remainder of this chapter describes how Smith made his collection, and the social and political background to his antiquarian activities.

Until the early 1840s, the works at London Bridge remained the main source of antiquities. Long after the removal of the old bridge, there were repeated dredging operations along its line to clear and deepen the channel. The finds were often exceptionally well preserved; on seeing Roman coins from the Thames for the first time, Smith's reaction was that they were "badly preserved, and they had, moreover, apparently been steeped in some acid as they were very bright".100 With hindsight, it seems likely that their shine resulted from burial in anaerobic silts, and that they appeared "badly preserved" due to wear in antiquity.

Smith's suspicion of workmen was nevertheless justified. Whereas bronze coins or samian stamps sold for mere pence,

---

97 CRS: J1, 25 and 31 July, and 10 Aug. 1835.
98 CRS: J3, 5 Dec. 1839.
100 CRS: J1, 20 Mar. 1835.
attractive minor antiquities - such as a complete pot, Roman lamp or fragment of sculpture - went for around 2 shillings - almost the daily wage of a labourer (cf. Burnett 1968, 51).\textsuperscript{101} Coins of precious metals might fetch several pounds. Such high prices encouraged deception, particularly when the workmen realised that objects with a London provenance would sell immediately at higher prices than junk-shop antiquities (Hugo 1858).\textsuperscript{102} Later, as interest in antiquities grew, fakes began to come onto the market. In 1853, Smith warned a correspondent:

"... against jet forgeries. They are making all sorts of antiques at Whitby. They are also now importing some clever things from Germany + France" (cf. Munro 1905).\textsuperscript{103}

In competing for antiquities, Smith found himself at a disadvantage due to the demands of his shop. He could always send his shop assistant to make purchases.\textsuperscript{104}

Nevertheless:

"From not being able myself to attend the works I lose many excellent chances of buying. To succeed with the men it is necessary to be very alert and active and also persevering in attendance. For the above [i.e. the Roman sandal from Lothbury] I am indebted to the exertions of Mast. Edwards".\textsuperscript{105}

Young William Edwards and his brother John were making quick profits by buying from workmen and selling to collectors and dealers. Initially they knew nothing about antiquities, so Smith helped with identifications. In return they allowed him to record some of their acquisitions and reported their site observations, some of which are recorded in Smith's journals.\textsuperscript{106} William Edwards was still making a living as a middle man in 1858 (Anon. 1858a). Unfortunately, the brothers became crafty and unreliable. In the Spring of 1836, they agreed to act as agents for Newman, and began to

\textsuperscript{101} For typical prices, see BM:DMLA, EBP and JEP, "[Antiquarian Diary 1841-62]".
\textsuperscript{102} CRS:J1, 23 Oct. 1835.
\textsuperscript{103} BAC V, envelope containing letter from CRS to TB, 9 May 1853.
\textsuperscript{104} CRS:J2, 10-12 Nov. 1836 and 16 Jan. 1837.
\textsuperscript{105} CRS:J1, 20 July 1835.
\textsuperscript{106} e.g. CRS:J2, 27 Sep. 1836 and 29 Aug. 1837.
conceal discoveries from Smith and bid against him.\textsuperscript{107} On one occasion Smith forced William Edwards to bid too high to teach him a lesson.\textsuperscript{108} The youth was not above giving finds a false provenance to increase their value.\textsuperscript{109} Thus the reality behind Smith's "little band of juvenile watchers" was less romantic than the phrase suggests (Smith 1883, 118).

Phoney antiquities rejected by Smith include what is now identified as a contemporary Arab water jug, supposedly found in London Wall.\textsuperscript{110} Moreover, dishonest claims about the provenance of genuine but imported pieces of Arretine subsequently gave rise to an erroneous notion that London was occupied in pre-Roman times; only in 1979 were the deceits exposed (Marsh 1979, 127; cf. Smith 1847a, 164). Smith was nevertheless alert to the need to sift out unreliable information:

> "I heard a report of a helmet having been discovered in Prince's Street, and also some silver vessels, but making it a rule to be sceptical in all matters of antiquity that depend merely on the word of the workmen, I pass them over" (Smith 1837a, 144).

One way of obtaining reliable information was to be present when any finds were made. From May 1836, Smith occasionally rowed a hired boat to the barges, to help recover antiquities when the lifting gear poured gravel onto the deck (Smith 1886, 206).\textsuperscript{111} As a result of his precautions, few spurious items entered Smith's collection, and a suggestion arising from the controversy over its disposal, that it includes imported antiquities from Italy may be largely discounted ("A.B." 1869; Waller 1869; Kidd 1977, 119).

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{107} CRS:J2, 16 Jan. 1837.
\textsuperscript{108} CRS:J2, 8 Apl. 1838.
\textsuperscript{110} CRS:J2, 23 Dec. 1837.
\textsuperscript{111} CRS:J2, 31 May 1836.
\end{flushright}
In September 1835, Smith heard that a silver coin of Carausius had been found in Thames ballast used to repair the banks of the Grand Surrey Canal, Deptford.\textsuperscript{112} Enquiries led him to J.R. Pimm of that locality, who had purchased several hundred Roman coins from this source (Smith 1883, 128).\textsuperscript{113} Smith examined them, and later himself acquired some from Deptford and from ballast dumped on the river-bank at Battersea. Again, the recovery of these coins emphasised the need for a rigorous approach in verifying archaeological provenance, concerning which Smith:

"... often reflected, how cautious antiquarians should be in dogmatical asserting or conjecturing. Might not some one at a future day say the Romans had a station on this very spot? Not if he sees this record of the fact."\textsuperscript{114}

Such remarks show that Smith had a clear understanding of empirical methods, perhaps shaped by an informal study of chemistry, which also made him peculiarly well placed to experiment with conservation (BAA 1845, 258).\textsuperscript{115} His method of treating waterlogged leather by replacing the water with oil was later widely adopted in London (Smith 1854d, 123).

**The Society of Antiquaries**

Whereas Smith had hitherto operated in isolation, he now began to collaborate with other collectors and to receive enquiries from strangers. These included A.J. Kempe (p. 85) and his nephew, Thomas Stothard, son of the famous artist, who first visited Smith in January 1836.\textsuperscript{116} Stothard later accompanied Smith on some of his excursions (Chapter 7).

On viewing his collection, Kempe immediately invited Smith to a meeting of the Antiquaries. Here he was introduced to J.G. Nichols, proprietor of *The Gentleman's Magazine*, and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{112} CRS:J1, 26 Sep. 1835.
\item \textsuperscript{113} CRS:J1, 1 Nov. 1835.
\item \textsuperscript{114} CRS:J2, 29 May 1836.
\item \textsuperscript{115} CRS:J3, copy of letter from CRS to Earl of Sandwich, 29 Nov. 1839.
\item \textsuperscript{116} CRS:J2, 29 Jan. 1836.
\end{itemize}
J.Y. Akerman, author of books on Roman coins (Akerman 1834; 1836). The proceedings themselves were uninspiring:

"Sir Henry Ellis read the Proclamation of Queen Elizabeth for the execution of Mary Queen of Scots and other papers, which took up but little more than an hour. Some members were balloted for, coffee was introduced and they separated at an early hour".117

Smith nevertheless came again, flattered perhaps to find himself among a class of men with whom he would otherwise not have mixed.

The social divide was nevertheless destined to cause Smith tribulation. In February, at Kempe's request, Smith submitted a paper to the Society on his London observations. Unfortunately, Sir Henry Ellis, the British Museum's Principal Librarian and Senior Secretary to the Antiquaries, was displeased that a person of relatively low social rank such as Kempe should promote an unknown outsider.118 Although amiable and a fair scholar, Ellis was also highly conservative and elitist (Miller 1974, 133-45). When, in 1842, Hudson Gurney proposed that fellows of the Society be allowed to read their own papers, Ellis vigorously opposed the idea.119 On this occasion, however, Ellis displayed his pique by postponing Smith's article - an irony since he was forever complaining of the lack of papers (Evans 1956, 239). Eventually, on 17 March, he read the first part "in a style most vile", and completed it a week later.

Smith's paper was well received, and towards the end of the year, Kempe proposed him for election. Remembering his previous difficulty, Kempe hesitated to submit Smith's certificate without consulting Ellis, but when Smith learnt that this was unusual:

"I directly expressed my wish to stand solely upon my own merits with the requisite recommendation of such members as were acquainted with me".120

117 CRS: J2, 4 Feb. 1836.
118 CRS: J2, 4 Feb. 1836.
119 CRS: J5, 28 Apl. 1842.
120 CRS: J2, 28 Oct. 1836.
Kempe immediately signed his certificate, but in consequence Ellis backed an anonymous person who opposed Smith's election because he was in business. Fortunately, Newman — whose wife was related to Follett (Smith's former employer) — was able to enlist support from The Noviomagians, and they ensured that Smith was elected by a large majority (Smith 1883, 116).

Smith was by no means the last would-be Antiquary to be discriminated against because he was in trade. His friends, E.B. Price (a paint dealer) and T. Purland (a dentist) were opposed for the same reason.¹²¹ Such bigotry must be viewed against the contemporary animosity and suspicion between the social classes. Britain may have escaped bloody revolution, but its social structure was nevertheless undergoing drastic upheavals, in which the old land-owning aristocracy and the rising middle classes were embroiled in a bitter political struggle, symbolised by the Reform Act of 1832 and the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 (Gregg 1965, 147-62).

Class discrimination permeated all aspects of public life. In 1839, Smith proposed a commemorative medal for Mehemet Ali, ruler of Egypt. During his recent war against the Turks (which had drawn armed opposition from Britain), Ali had been acclaimed by London merchants for protecting British trade and the overland route to India. But when donations were sought, these same merchants not only refused, but suspected Smith of fraud because of his social rank.¹²² Having enlisted a respectable committee, Smith approached the gentry, but with similar results. Lord Prudhoe withheld his support because the plans "did not spring from his Lordship or from a nobleman!" (Smith 1883, 126-36).¹²³ The medal was eventually struck, but such

---

¹²¹ DNM:CRS, CRS to JJAW, 3 May 1851; CRS:J4, 30 Apl. 1840; LOA 18/30, TW to JOH, 12 Mar. 1843; BAC III, CRS to TB, 17 Nov. 1852. For EBP's occupation, see PRO, 1841 census returns, HO/107/669, 29-30 Cowcross Street.
¹²² CRS:J4, 26 Nov. 1841.
incidents embittered Smith's attitude toward class prejudice, which he considered "antisocial and antichristian".\textsuperscript{124} He was often to complain of the respect paid to the ignorant but well connected in contrast to the disregard shown to men of real ability who lacked social standing.

In Roach Smith, the Antiquaries gained a recruit of great intellect and refreshing enthusiasm. He became their most industrious worker since Richard Gough (p. 55), and during the next eleven years, supplied twenty papers for Archaeologia, mostly about London site observations and finds. Only Sir Henry Ellis produced more. He readily acknowledged Smith's ability,\textsuperscript{125} and within four years of his election, Smith had been elected to the Antiquaries' Council.\textsuperscript{126}

Membership of the Antiquaries doubtless improved Smith's knowledge of and access to antiquarian works, such as Caylus (1752-66), Lysons (1807-19) and Stow (1603).\textsuperscript{127} But he soon became sceptical about the ideas of senior fellows. These were often based on inadequate evidence:

"Several coins of Tetricus have been found in Princes' St. which ... confute an assertion of Mr. Akerman in the Archaeologia that none later than Trajan & Vespasian are found in the City."\textsuperscript{128}

The older generation also lacked Smith's insight and good judgement, as is illustrated by these comments about the finds he obtained from the line of old London Bridge:

"Mr. Doubleday ... gave his opinion that my leaden seals were false, and that the most reasonable way to account for so many things of different eras being found in the Thames was to suppose that a Curiosity Shop existed at one period on the Bridge, and that at the Fire or a fire, the articles were precipitated to the Bottom!"\textsuperscript{129}

\textsuperscript{124} CRS:J2, 6 Dec. 1836.
\textsuperscript{125} CRS:J3, 22 Nov. 1838; 20 June 1839.
\textsuperscript{126} CRS:J4, 23 Apl. 1840.
\textsuperscript{127} CRS:J2, 12 May 1837, 3 Sep. 1837, and 30 Nov. 1839, respectively.
\textsuperscript{128} CRS:J2, 16 May 1836.
\textsuperscript{129} CRS:J2, 1 Feb. 1838.
Few Antiquaries had any practical experience of excavation. One exception was J. Gage Rokewood, the Society's Director from 1829-42 and excavator of the "Bartlow Hills", whom Smith described as "perhaps the best friend I had in the Society". The other exceptions were "The Noviomagians", who had excavated at Keston (p. 85), and from February 1838, Smith began to join them at the "Old Dog", Holywell Street, after the Antiquaries' meetings (Smith 1868d, 325). Their lively discussions must have helped to sharpen Smith's critical faculties and to sustain his enthusiasm.

Membership of the Antiquaries also improved Smith's opportunities to meet other collectors. Of those who collected London antiquities, the most important were A.J. Kempe (active 1830-7), J. Newman (active 1827-48), E.B. Price (active 1841-50), the antique dealer, W. Chaffers (active c. 1842-55; Smith 1859, ii), and W.D. Saull. The architect, George Gwilt, made a parallel collection of Southwark antiquities (active c. 1825-33; Anon. 1825; 1833).

Of these men, Newman alone chose not to collaborate with Smith, perhaps because he resented a newcomer on his patch. Competition came to a head in 1837, when Smith bid against John Edwards for some Roman bronzes from the Thames. Edwards claimed to want them for Newman, but Smith feared that they might disappear unrecorded, and bid well over the normal price. In the event, Newman obtained a Ganymede (interpreted by Smith as a priest of Cybele), and Smith

130 CRS:J5, 18 Oct. 1842.
131 Kempe began collecting London finds in 1830 (Kempe 1832). He ceased around 1837, following financial losses (CRS:J2, 3 July 1837). Newman started collecting in 1827 (Welch 1896, 161). He auctioned his collection in 1848 (BAC III, CRS to TB, 23 July 1848). EBP was active from c. 1841-50 (BM:DMAL, EBP and JBP, Antiquarian Diary 1841-62). W. Chaffers started collecting c. 1842 (CRS:J2, 3 July 1837). He auctioned his London finds in 1855 (BAC V, CRS to TB, 14 June 1855). W.D. Saull's collection was distributed after his death in 1855 (Timbs 1868, 600).
132 BAC III, CRS to TB, 25 Apr. 25 1848.
obtained a Mercury, an Apollo, and a fragmentary Jupiter.\textsuperscript{133} The finds prompted Smith to follow the dredgers upstream, where he learnt that the ballast was being used to repair the tow-path between Hammersmith Bridge and Barnes. It was here that Newman obtained another figurine, of Atys.\textsuperscript{134} Thereafter Smith regularly visited this stretch of river to make purchases. To this day, the London Bridge bronzes remain the most important group from London, and it is to Newman's credit that he allowed Smith to publish them together (Smith 1840a; see p. 137).

The Corporation of London

The year 1840 might have been a good one for Smith. Having been elected to the Antiquaries' council in June, Smith was asked in November to become secretary to the Numismatic Society, formed in 1836 (p. 155).\textsuperscript{135} Unfortunately, at the moment when his antiquarian reputation was becoming established, Smith suffered a serious blow to his financial security when his shop was compulsorily purchased and demolished for road improvements.\textsuperscript{136} The calamity engendered a rapid deterioration in his relations with the Corporation, which in turn hampered his ability to make observations and collect antiquities.

On 11 May 1840, Smith attended a committee meeting at Guildhall relative to his claim for compensation. It was chaired by R.L. Jones, who focused upon Smith's balance sheet, insinuating that the figures were exaggerated.\textsuperscript{137} Moreover, on making a request to be reinstated near his present shop, Jones rose to say "No, sir; there's no place for you in the line of Lothbury" (Smith 1883, 121). Having been thus humiliated, Smith was offered a mere £ 400 in

\textsuperscript{133} CRS:J2, 16 and 20 Jan. 1837.
\textsuperscript{134} CRS:J2, 22-25 Jan. 1837.
\textsuperscript{135} NS:CM, 12 Nov. 1840.
\textsuperscript{136} Under the provisions of 2-3 Victoria, An Act for further extending the Approaches to London Bridge ..., 26 Aug. 1839. The eviction notice survives in SM:CRS.
\textsuperscript{137} COLRO:LBCJ, 11 May 1840.
compensation.\textsuperscript{138} He immediately instructed a solicitor, who secured an extra £ 50.\textsuperscript{139} Again, Smith rejected it, so his claim was referred to the Lord Mayor's Court. The hearing, on 18 July, was the last that day. One of Smith's witnesses had already departed, and the jury were exhausted.\textsuperscript{140} They awarded Smith £ 583 9s, around 9 month's profits. This he accepted on the advice of council, who pointed out that since the judge and jury were appointed by the Corporation, he was at their mercy (\textit{idem.}, 123). Smith nevertheless wrote to the London Bridge Committee, claiming an unfair trial. His final sentence reflects a curious lack of diplomacy:

\begin{quote}
"... deny me [a retrial], and by all the lawful means in my power will I not cease until I obtain some restitution if there be justice in the higher authorities and be the day near or remote do not, because your name is legion, imagine that might is always to overcome right".\textsuperscript{141}
\end{quote}

Not surprisingly, his request was refused, and in September 1840, Smith moved from Lothbury to less well situated premises in Liverpool Street.

While his new premises offered certain advantages (p. 72), Smith bitterly resented his treatment by the Corporation and by Jones in particular, whom he regarded as "the lowest grade in mind and morals".\textsuperscript{142} Smith had indeed received rough justice, but so had tenants in adjacent premises. His lease had only three years to run, so his financial interests were technically small, and his request, to be reinstated in Lothbury with the baths, was unrealistic.\textsuperscript{143} Probably Jones had taken an instant dislike to Smith, but a theory that this was because he had mistakenly blamed Smith for an anonymous attack in the \textit{Westminster Review} is untenable (Smith 1883, 122). The journal had indeed published a criticism of the Grand Joint Gresham Committee

\begin{footnotes}
\item 138 CRS:J4, 11 May 1840.
\item 139 COLRO:LBCJ, 15 June 1840.
\item 140 COLRO:LBCJ, 28 July 1840.
\item 141 COLRO:LBCJ, 28 July 1840.
\item 142 RP:II, CRS to WHR, 6 May 1842.
\item 143 COLRO:LBCJ, 11 May 1840.
\end{footnotes}
for their choice of design for the New Royal Exchange (Anon. 1841). But the critique was clearly by an architect, so Jones can hardly have suspected Smith, and it appeared months after Smith's eviction.

Smith's theory may, nevertheless, contain a grain of truth in that at the beginning of 1841, Jones - whose interest in coins has been noted (p. 86) - may have read in the Numismatic Chronicle a serious accusation against himself, this time really by Smith (1841a). Within days, Smith was systematically being prevented from making purchases or site observations. Curiously enough, Smith's diaries and letters suggest he never suspected that this article might be to blame. It is against this background that we must consider Smith's famed lambasts against the Corporation for its complicity in archaeological destruction.

Smith's concern about archaeological destruction arose at the beginning of his involvement in archaeology:

"In Bread Street, while the workmen were excavating ... near Watling St., at the depth of about 23 or 25 feet, they came to remains of walls with paintings thereon ... similar to such as I have seen from Pompeii. I could only rescue a small specimen as the ignorant wretches employed on the works broke the fragments to pieces with their tools, and the equally ignorant lookers-on allowed almost all to be quietly carted away. Thus the remains of nearly two thousand years which might serve to illustrate the state of the arts at such a remote period, or give a lesson to progressing science, are annihilated for ever by the vulgar hand of modern barbarianism".144

Smith's desire to purchase antiquities itself aroused resentment in certain overseers:

"... a man placed over the workmen named Cook, ... exasperated that anyone but himself should have gained anything by the sale of pots etc. ... has used his influence against me ..., by insulting and annoying those whom I sent to make purchases, by discharging any workmen found selling me the smallest trifle, and lastly by ordering all pottery to be dashed to pieces".145

144 CRS:J1, 7 July 1835.
145 CRS:J1, between 11 Aug. and 7 Sep. 1835.
In general, however, Smith blamed the Corporation, rather than the workmen, commenting that:

"... interesting discoveries might have been made had the Corporation of London possessed sufficient zeal of antiquities to cause the excavations to be made under the supervision of some intelligent antiquarian".  

Although not interested in investigating or recording buried structures, the Corporation did sometimes attempt to collect antiquities. In 1835, Smith was informed by a building contractor that:

"... the workmen were ordered to take all they discovered to the Surveyor's Office for the City Museum ... and they were always remunerated for what they found".

In 1837, a small tombstone from London Wall, illicitly sold by workmen, was successfully recovered for the Museum (RCHM 1928, 173, No. 17). The following year, it acquired the "Cheapside Hoard" of late Saxon pewter brooches, which was secured by Kelsey, surveyor to the Commissioners of Sewers (Norman and Reader 1906, 237-8).

Such efforts at collection, however inefficient and intermittent, necessarily placed the Corporation in competition with private collectors. Smith nevertheless considered that:

"... any attempt [by the Corporation] to monopolise the antiquities would be pointless as there was no possible way of preventing the men from secreting them and that if antiquarians were restricted from purchasing ... that whatever was found would be either sold directly to people who perchance may throw down a shilling or half-crown to secure something ancient merely as a curiosity of the day, or that things would be secretly taken away and sold to jews".

In this, Smith was undoubtedly correct. Twenty years later, Colonel W. Haywood of the Corporation's Engineer and Surveyor's Office made strenuous attempts to secure finds for the Guildhall Museum by paying the workmen more than the collectors, but he invariably failed.

---

146 CRS:J1, 8 July 1835.
147 CRS:J1, 29 Mar. 1835.
148 CRS:J2, 29 Aug. 1837.
149 CRS:J2, 3 Mar. 1836.
150 THC I, Haywood to TH, 15 Jan. 1856.
From time to time, Kelsey also recorded buried structures in his official logbook.\textsuperscript{151} Smith was apparently unaware of these records, although in December 1839, Kelsey gave him particulars of several discoveries of which he had no knowledge.\textsuperscript{152} Unfortunately, Kelsey's interests were confined to subterranean obstructions that were large enough to delay his sewer building programme; he once commented that other than pottery and coins, nothing of antiquarian merit was found in London (Waller 1869).

In August 1840, Smith's relations with Kelsey took a serious downturn, following the discovery in Upper Thames Street of "hundreds" of reused stone mouldings from a large Roman monument (Smith 1885).\textsuperscript{153} These had been recovered from the riverside wall and other massive Roman foundations. Kelsey showed no interest in the discoveries and apparently resented Smith's presence:

"On Monday wrote to Mr. Kelsey to have the sculptured stone ... preserved. It is very annoying that while I am regarded with jealousy, no means are adopted to save any of these interesting remains from destruction. Already, one of the best has been sent to Canard's Wharf to be used again for building!!".\textsuperscript{154}

Smith sketched a few mouldings himself, and sought assistance from his illustrator friend, J.G. Waller. Unfortunately their drawings are lost. He also wrote to the Court of Common Council, urging them to make provision for the preservation of antiquities and requesting access to all City excavations. He received no reply from them, or from Kelsey. Of these potentially important remains, all that survives is one fragment of greensand moulding from Smith's collection (Smith 1854d, 2).

Two months later, works began for the current Royal Exchange. At the same time, the Corporation's Library Committee was preparing to establish a museum in a small

\textsuperscript{151} COLRO, R. Kelsey, "A Description of the Sewers of the City of London".
\textsuperscript{152} CRS: J3, 11 Dec. 1839.
\textsuperscript{153} CRS: J4, 26-29 Aug. 1840.
\textsuperscript{154} CRS: J4, 2 Sep. 1840.
room off the library.\textsuperscript{155} It was doubtless this, rather than Smith's request, which caused the Gresham Committee to instruct the contractors to preserve "any plate, coins, antiquities, or curiosities" which might be found.\textsuperscript{156} So far as may be determined, this was the first time that a local authority had provided for the preservation of antiquities in a building contract. The measure was probably instigated by R.L. Jones, who had chaired both committees.\textsuperscript{157}

During the first half of November, the Exchange site was fenced and a notice displayed stating that workmen must hand in all antiquities, or be prosecuted for felony, and that they would be rewarded.\textsuperscript{158} Smith immediately sought a permit to visit the site from William Tite, the architect.\textsuperscript{159} This was granted, but Smith was clearly irritated at losing an opportunity to make purchases, hence his article. His view of the matter seems to have been coloured not just by archaeological considerations, but by his interests as a collector.

If they were sincere, Smith claimed, no one would wish to frustrate the "City Authorities", but he doubted their motives because members of the Court of Common Council:

"... cannot understand what antiquarians would have done, and are too ignorant to be taught; but they want credit for doing something, and hence this notice."

We beg leave to ask the Committee ..., where the coins and other curiosities (as they call them) are to be found after they once some into their hands? ... What has become of the coins and other remains found in digging the approaches to London Bridge? The chairman and members of a certain committee know; and so do we, and

\textsuperscript{155} COLRO:LCM, 9 May 1840.
\textsuperscript{156} MHL, printed volume entitled "The Royal Exchange. Extracts from the Records of the City of London and the books of the Joint Committee of the City of London and Mercers Company, upon Gresham Affairs", 135.
\textsuperscript{157} COLRO, Lists of the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, Recorder, Sherriffs, and Common Councilmen, of the City of London ... 1839-40.
\textsuperscript{158} MHL:GR, 4 Dec. 1840.
\textsuperscript{159} MOLL:RE.
Smith was referring to an incident (in 1827?, see p. 86), when R.L. Jones had publicly seized a hoard of gold medieval coins on behalf of the City, presumably on the grounds that they were treasure trove, but had not handed them over. The story originated from H.O. Cureton, a coin dealer and member of the Numismatic Society, who had witnessed the event.\(^{160}\) Whereas Smith claimed not to know what had become of the coins, he had in fact heard that Jones had sold them to a certain local refiner (Smith 1883, 118).\(^ {161}\) Smith's allegation, although veiled, was potentially serious in that Jones had apparently committed a theft.

Smith's lambast was published in January, 1841. On the last day of that month, Smith returned home to find that a statue from the Exchange site had been left by two workmen. He refused to purchase it and paid the workmen to return the statue. Nevertheless, when he next visited the site, Smith was insulted and denied access by order of the Gresham Committee, on the grounds that he had bought antiquities from a workman.\(^{162}\) The nature of the accusation suggests that Jones may have sought his revenge by blackening Smith's name.

A few days later, a similar incident occurred, and Smith rashly threatened to return with a shot gun for protection. In the event, he contented himself with writing to the Gresham Committee, to explain his interest in archaeology and complain about his treatment. That he received no reply may again be due to the tone of his letter:

"That spirit of envy and jealousy ... which originating and ending in vulgar ignorance, delights to annoy and thwart, was soon at work. I was seen and known to buy fragments of broken pots, mortar, tiles and coins, and a foolish inference was drawn that these objects must possess some pecuniary worth. ... I was exposed

\(^{160}\) CRS:J5, 14 Aug. 1842.  
\(^{161}\) CRS:N1, p. 142.  
\(^ {162}\) MOLL:RE.
finally to much vexatious interference urged by persons who had they improved in manners as they [had] risen in worldly power ought to have known better”.163

Again, the reference was to R.L. Jones. Presumably, Smith was unaware that Jones had recently become chairman of the sub-committee to oversee the works!164 After a few weeks, Smith was permitted a brief visit to the site, and gained sufficient information for an article about the discoveries (Smith 1842a). But the damage to Smith's relations with the Corporation was irreparable.

The charge that Smith had been in receipt of property stolen from the excavations was repeated in 1842, and in 1845 when Smith refuted his accusers at a public meeting of the British Archaeological Association (Anon. 1845d; Tite 1845b).165 His critics made much of an Elizabethan lead medallion, which Smith argued had been found before the works began (Anon. 1842; Tite 1845a).166 In their favour, we may note that when defending himself, Smith described the medallion as a "little piece of lead", but later described it in his catalogue as a "unique piece" (Smith 1854d, No. 777). Smith had also obtained some Roman finds from the site, including a writing tablet,167 lamp (idem., No. 89), and a bell that he purchased outside the works (Smith 1859, 71, No. 316). Although unethical by present standards, Smith's behaviour must not judged too harshly. The on-site efforts to collect finds were haphazard, the ground being strewn with Roman pottery ("C.C." 1843). Numerous antiquities were obtained miles away, from spoil tips. As Smith had predicted, attempts to stop the sale of antiquities were ineffective. Moreover, items collected for the Corporation's museum were actually pilfered by members of the Gresham Committee (Smith 1845b).168 Even worse, by refusing to make purchases, Smith had offended workmen whose

163 CRS:J4, 2 Feb. 1841.
164 MHL:GR, 15 Jan. 1840.
165 MOLL:RE.
166 CRS:J5, 13 Jan. 1842.
167 BM, Acc. No. PRB 1856.7-1.1307.
168 CRS:J4, 2 Mar. 1841.
co-operation he had for years carefully nurtured. Such men were thereby induced to sell their finds outside the usual circle of collectors, so that evidence was lost.\textsuperscript{169}

The charge that by purchasing antiquities from workmen, Smith was receiving stolen goods could not be sustained in law. In 1849, the Commissioners of Sewers served a summons upon him for having purchased a figure of Atys, from Bevis Marks (Brailsford 1964, 55 and Pl. XX, No. 9). This had been hawked about for days before Smith bought it for 20s. On hearing that the Commissioners had brought the summons without even informing Smith that they wanted the statue, the magistrate stopped the proceedings, and the press reported the affair in a manner favourable to Smith (Anon. 1849g; Price 1849).\textsuperscript{170}

The Commissioners' behaviour on this occasion is a measure of their antagonism towards Smith. Following the Royal Exchange affair, they strove to prevent him from making purchases or taking notes (BAA 1850, 90).\textsuperscript{171} Workmen who helped him were liable to dismissal, and those who purchased antiquities on his behalf - to harassment. In 1842, when John Bucket purchased some samian from sewer works in Cateaton Street, the foreman called a policeman and forcibly took it from him.\textsuperscript{172} Antagonism towards Smith turned into antagonism towards archaeology, so that:

"... the Commissioners of Sewers and the Improvement Committee ... would much rather shut up an opening than suffer it to be examined" (Anon. 1843a).

It was perhaps to avoid such problems that, when Roman baths were discovered at Billingsgate in 1848, Smith restricted his involvement to publishing the small-finds (Smith 1848d; suggestion by P. Marsden). He played no part in recording or publishing the structures, which were undertaken by his friends Chaffers (1848), and Fairholt.

\textsuperscript{169 \textit{e.g. CRS:J4, 1 May 1841.}}
\textsuperscript{170 CRS:J5, 22 Feb. 1849.}
\textsuperscript{171 CRS:J4, 31 Mar. 1841; CRS:J5, 5 Dec. 1842.}
\textsuperscript{172 CRS:J5, 3 Dec. 1842.}
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Smith's Criticisms of the Corporation

In response to the ill-treatment, Smith took every opportunity to censure and insult the Corporation. In the first edition of his Collectanea Antiqua, he writes that "nowhere in the kingdom is there to be found a corporation composed of people more unintellectual and uneducated" (Smith 1848f). Such lambasts were often linked with references, direct or indirect, to Jones seizure of the coins - even in his letters to the Corporation's Library Committee.173

Smith dropped his complaint that the Corporation was hindering private collectors, concentrating instead upon its failure to provide an adequate museum, and its policy of denying antiquarians access to building sites to supervise the excavations, and record and protect what was found (Smith 1844d, 109). Ideally, the Corporation would employ the antiquarians and also authorise the overseers to reward the navvies for handing over their finds instead seizing them for no reward, which merely encouraged concealment (Smith 1849c). Even then, there would be problems, for:

"... if the Corporation ... had thought fit to employ a dozen antiquaries or an archaeological society to watch the excavations, with full power to protect and to preserve, the watchers would have been severely tasked" (Smith 1859, ii).

A model of the co-operation which Smith sought was provided by a private developer in Threadneedle Street, who around the time of the Royal Exchange affair had allowed him to excavate and record two Roman mosaics, had opened the site for public viewing, and, at Smith's suggestion, had given the pavements to the British Museum (idem., 56 fn.). This gave rise to another theme in Smith's writings - the phenomenon of private enlightenment and generosity as against corporate meanness and ignorance.

173 COLRO:LCP, CRS to H.A. Merewether, 3 Aug. 1843.
Smith's criticisms of the Corporation were clearly tainted with personal bitterness. He seems almost to have gained satisfaction in naming them as "ignorant", "vulgar" and of "low origin" - terms he regularly applied to anyone who did not share his antiquarian interests, or who denied him access to archaeological sites or evidence. In this he took a lead from Stukeley, who described those who demolished Hadrian's wall for the military road as "senseless animals" (Dunkin 1845a, 33).

In such matters Smith should not be judged too harshly. He lived in querulous times, when pragmatic responses to matters of controversy tended to be viewed as lacking in integrity. This is not to say that Smith was not warned that his invectives might be counterproductive. Following his affray with Sir William Tite, Professor Henslow expressed regret:

"... that you have felt yourself under the necessity you mention [of speaking out]; for the consequence has been unfortunate, inasmuch as the latter-day Goths have been led thereby to destroy the relics of the earlier Goths in order to spite you" (Smith 1886, 252).

Few of Smith's contemporaries took the same view of the matter. Journalistic attacks upon individuals and institutions, anonymous or otherwise, were the norm. Antiquaries and editors alike rose in support of Smith's criticisms, which were even endorsed in a Times editorial (Anon. 1849a). A tendency to portray Smith as a "strange man" as a result of his lambasts fails to take this into account (e.g. Sheppard 1991).

Had Smith approached the Corporation more tactfully, its attitude towards antiquities would probably have been not much better. From around 1844, Thomas Lott FSA, a well-respected Common Councillor, tried to improve matters through official channels, but with limited success. Apart from encouraging the creation of the Guildhall Library's

174 CRS:J2, 11 Mar. 1838.
175 Letter dated wrongly as 1844.
museum (Chapter 9), his main triumph was the preservation of the Billingsgate bathhouse. This was possible because the works came under the Corn and Coal Committee, which he chaired, and because the works were supervised by the City Surveyor who took a sympathetic attitude to antiquities (Anon. 1848a). Lott entirely failed to secure Smith's collection for the City (p. 236), and the fact that he took Smith's side in the Royal Exchange affair indicates that, for the most part, the Corporation was closed to reason (Anon. 1845d).
We now turn from the practicalities of site observation and the collection of antiquities, to consider what Smith was able to learn about Roman and medieval London. The following discussion is appropriately placed because most of Smith's London site observations were published early in his career (see Appendix 1, especially Smith 1837a; 1842a-d). His *Illustrations of Roman London*, which did not appear until 1859, is substantially a summary of previously published material, enhanced by additional engravings. Smith's only earlier general statement about Roman London appeared in 1844 (Smith 1844d), although there is an unpublished summary, which Smith wrote in 1840 in response to an advertisement offering £50 for the best essay on Roman London. Ironically, Smith's essay was returned with a note stating that there would be no award because his was the only entry! In view of his careful research, unrivalled data, and incisive literary style, this was a harsh decision, but Smith had written on cheap paper, making frequent amendments, which perhaps worked against him.\(^{176}\)

**Smith's Development as an Observer, 1834-36**

From his publications and manuscripts it appears that Smith recorded 121 observations of archaeological features in the City (for location plan, see Fig. 2). Ten more relate to sites in Holborn, Whitechapel, Southwark and Stoke Newington, and further records may survive among Smith's missing London files (see Appendix 2b). Summaries of Smith's London observations, arranged by year and location are provided in Appendix 3, and it is to this that the site numbers in this chapter refer. An analysis of these summaries shows that the majority of Smith's observations were made between 1834 and 1840 (Fig. 1). From 1841, his effectiveness was halved by the Corporation's campaign of obstruction, and after 1843 he became even less active.
This was mainly due to the demands of the BAA, although one suspects that Smith had also lost some of his enthusiasm for London archaeology (p. 125). His last personal observations date to 1854.

Even Smith's earliest records appear to provide reliable data, as shown by this description of a Roman well in the Walbrook valley (Site 55):

5 August 1835: "In continuing the sewer past King's Arms Yard towards the London Wall and about opposite the back of the White Swan in Coleman Street the workmen came to a well sunk into the gravel in which they found a vase of dark clay almost perfect ...".177

11 August: "... In the well ... a small red pan with a scroll of leaves almost perfect, the top of a double handled jar etc., and in the line towards London Wall, stags horns and pottery. From the well an Allectus rev. Virtus Aug. (ship) exergue QL well preserved. This well is excavated already to the depth of 30 feet and is planked and stoned round and has been filled up with gravel."

15 August: "... the planks were quite rotten and fell to pieces. Some pieces tho' but few of the red pottery were found in the well, and no coins that I could hear of save a 2nd B. Vespasian and an Allectus 3B...".

There is no difficulty in accepting Smith's interpretation because further box-frame wells have been found in the Walbrook valley (Wilmott 1982, 26-31). Unlike Smith, we are also able to date the artifacts found in the well. The coarsewares include Verulamium region forms of the late 1st to mid 2nd centuries (Smith 1854d, Pl. V, Figs. 1-2 and 6; cf. respectively, Marsh and Tyers 1978, forms IC1A and II.K, and MOL pottery corpus No. 31021). An unpublished sketch by Smith shows that the "small red pan" was a Drag. 35 samian cup. This is probably identifiable with a Central Gaulish vessel of AD 100-20 in the BM.178 Nevertheless, the evidence is insufficient to show whether the well remained open for

---

177 CRS:J1, entry dated 5 July 1835 - apparently in mistake for August.
178 CRS:J1, 15 Aug. 1835; cf. BM, Acc. No. PRB 1856.7-1.422.
two centuries, or whether the coin of Allectus was intrusive.

Two months after the above discovery, work began on the City of London School, on the former site of St. Mary Magdalen's church, Milk Street (Site 31; cf. Welch 1896, 174). Here:

"... there were first found, I am informed, vaults of stones with Norman inscriptions. Beneath these was a round plate with a portrait of and inscription "MARIA AUGUSTA REGINA GALLIA ET NAVARRE" apparently fixed to something.... Lower down coffins were found of wood, and deeper still coffins of stone with skeletons and coins of Ethelred are numerous.... Subsequently to this a coin of Trajanus Decius has been brought to me (much corroded, but legible) and fragments of metal vases bearing a strong Roman character in form and material". 179

Whereas Smith eventually learnt to differentiate between Roman and medieval coarsewares and small-finds, at this stage his only means of dating medieval features was by coins and inscriptions. Roman work was distinguished by the presence of samian, wall-plaster, mosaics, and coins. 180 Although Smith always noted the depths of buried features, this was the first occasion on which he recorded the sequence of Roman, late Saxon and medieval remains, familiar to all subsequent London archaeologists.

By 1840, having seen the same sequence on many sites, Smith had begun to appreciate the importance of stratigraphy:

"... the made earth may be traced to different periods of accumulation. The line of demarkation of the "Fire of London" is in many places observable at the depth of about 6 feet and ... may be recognised by a dense black line of rough earth chiefly composed of burnt bricks ashes and the carbonised débris of the houses. Some few feet lower will occasionally be noticed the Anglo-Norman tiles or fragments of sculpture and then the vestiges of the Roman epoch, tho' it may be remarked that the remains of the works of the successors of the Romans are comparatively of rare occurrence, so much so as almost to imply that the civilisation of that people supplied their Northern and barbarous inheriters with those necessary means for

179 CRS:J1, Oct. 1835.
180 CRS:J2, 5 Jan. 1836.
domestic comfort and economy which their own limited knowledge of the arts failed to furnish them".  

Smith's comment on the lack of early- to mid-Saxon finds is typically perceptive. He could hardly have guessed that the focus of mid-Saxon London lay outside the walls (Vince 1984). But he was correct in suggesting the Saxon reuse of Roman artifacts (cf. White 1988b).

In common with his contemporaries, Smith's understanding of stratigraphy did not develop much further (p. 286). Smith was nevertheless among the first to recognise that there might be several phases of occupation within the Roman era, and that finds might be used to date stratigraphy. In 1839, he argued that a tessellated pavement under Lombard Street must be late Roman because of the depth of soil beneath it, which had also produced a coin of Nero (Site 63). (Some samian stamps from the same deposit are now datable as Flavian.) In general, however, Smith did not examine features and finds in relation to archaeological strata. He was therefore often unable to interpret or date buried features, especially since he was denied proper access to the trenches and lacked the benefit of observations on nearby sites. Residual finds presented an additional difficulty, since in London, displaced Roman artifacts are common in medieval strata.

Even where he did not adequately understand his observations, Smith nevertheless understood that they might become "highly serviceable in corroborating past or future disclosures, and when put upon record will be always useful as matter for reference". Although implicit in the long-established practice of publishing observations in The Gentleman's Magazine, this is perhaps the clearest early statement of the cumulative value of fragmentary evidence gathered at different times and by different observers. In

181 CRS:E, 36-37.
182 CRS:J3, 5 June 1839.
183 CRS:J2, 7 Feb. 1836.
recent years, the potential of such evidence from London has been demonstrated by Marsden (e.g. 1987).

In January 1836, foundations were revealed of the former church of St. Andrew Hubbard, Eastcheap, together with Roman debris (Site 99). Again, the interpretation of the remains was problematic:

"... they have laid open a vaulted room which seems of Roman materials as far as the walls go which are built of large pieces of chalk and from 4 to 5 feet thick; it is also arched over with lumps of chalk of an inferior size. The impression made ... was that the walls thereof constituted part of a Roman building, but adopted by succeeding people for their use, and repaired from time to time, as the bricks round the doorway etc. will shew. Or if it be not Roman, it is built directly on Roman remains, as level with its floor has been found many fragments of tesseraed pavement, but in a broken state and some pieces turned upside-down."

Smith's second suggestion - that the vault was medieval and had merely penetrated Roman remains - was probably correct. Although there are instances from Roman London of chalk used within foundations, chalk walls are generally of medieval date (Hill 1980, 59-60; Grimes 1968, 152, 193, 201, etc.). In August 1838, Smith realised this himself, noting that:

"Above the Roman pavement in Queen St. 4 or 5 feet runs a chalk wall which demonstrates those walls or some of them to be posterior to the Roman times" (Site 43).

Thereafter he generally interpreted chalk walls as medieval (cf. Smith 1842a, 155). Others were less cautious, however, and the opinion that St. Andrew Hubbard stood on Roman foundations entered the literature (Kempe 1836a; RCHM 1928, 117).

From the beginning of 1836, after meeting A.J. Kempe - his "antiquarian godfather" - Smith's observations became more sharply directed (Smith 1883, 36; p. 92). It was apparently Kempe who advised him to examine the Roman city wall, traces of which survived in basements. Arising from

184 CRS:J2, 12 Jan. 1836.
185 CRS:J3, 15 Aug. 1838.
186 CRS:J2, 29 Jan. 1836.
187 CRS:J2, 6 Feb. 1836.
his experiences at Keston (p. 85), Kempe also seems to have
advised Smith to prepare sketch plans (which from now on
sometimes accompanied Smith's site records), and to try to
gain an over-view of the location and character of London's
Roman remains. The possibility of so doing had been
suggested by Wren (Levine 1977, 134), but the idea probably
came afresh to Kempe, arising from his observations along
the London Bridge approaches (Kempe 1832, 193-8), and by an
excursion to Silchester - the only Romano-British town whose
basic layout was known at that time. As well as having
standing walls, various buildings had been uncovered, and
crop marks of the street grid had been recorded as early as
1741 (Kempe 1833).

After meeting Kempe, Smith began to record the nature of the
subsoil, so as to determine which areas of Roman London were
marshy and which were dry. He also began to synthesise his
observations, as in this first-ever description of the Roman
revetments of the Walbrook:

"... from Lothbury to London Wall, and also thro' Princes St. towards the north are
... an almost continuous line of piles of wood, usually commencing at the depth of
about 25 feet. At Princes St. these piles were in greater abundance and went to
the extent of 50 feet downwards". 188

On the basis of Stow (1603), Smith deduced that the piles
must be related to the Walbrook, and surmised correctly that
the stream had been channelled by the Romans to drain areas
of marshland (Smith 1837a, 142-3).

Smith also tried to learn something of London's Roman street
plan. That summer he observed nothing but loam and gravel
in a trench down Pudding Lane, whereas construction work on
either side had revealed Roman foundations. 189 This
suggested to Smith that a Roman street had run below the
modern - an interpretation reinforced by subsequent
excavation (Milne 1985, 44-46).

188 CRS:J2, 6 Feb. 1836.
189 CRS:J2, 4 Aug. 1836.
Summary of Smith's Observations

We now turn from Smith's development as an observer to consider the nature of his site records and observations, and what he deduced about the nature of Roman London.

Smith's site records range from trifling notes to detailed descriptions. They are primarily concerned with remnants of masonry and brick buildings, with culverts, wooden piles, moulded stones, inscriptions and funereal remains (especially those of Roman date). Over two-thirds arose from works for new sewers and roads. Others were made during the erection of public buildings, houses, offices and warehouses, and in the course of grave-digging, in that order of frequency.

Although Smith did not usually mention post-Roman features in his publications, his journals reveal that he was the first to recognise Great Fire debris and the remains of pre-Fire houses behind the waterfront (Sites 7, 10, 57 and 91; cf. Milne 1986, 105-15). Excluding anonymous "chalk walls", the commonest medieval features seen by Smith were the foundations of pre-Fire churches (Sites 6, 7, 19, 27, 31, 84, 99 and 109). In the middle of Cheapside, he observed remnants of two buildings, one with a staircase. They contained reused facing stones from the Cheapside Cross, subsequently acquired by the Guildhall Museum, which Smith sketched and correctly identified (Site 32).

The most common Roman features seen by Smith were fragments of floors (especially tessellated pavements) and painted wall-plaster (usually loose, rather than in-situ as on Site 22). He was apparently the first Englishman to describe fragments from a wall that had been replastered and repainted (Site 130), and also floors of:

"... similar composition to that on which the tessera of an inch square are imbedded but instead of them, small broken pieces of brick, stones, etc. seem
sprinkled over and rolled in, as I have seen them construct barn-floors in our country (Isle of Wight)" (Site 95).190

One in Basing Lane belonged to a room forty feet long (Site 28; cf. Sites 34 and 130).

Like his antiquarian forbears, Smith was particularly interested in mosaics, which he regarded as the "floorings of domestic dwellings, of temples, and of other public buildings" (Smith 1859, 49). As such, they seemed to indicate the wealthy districts, and to offer the most tangible evidence - after sculptures and inscriptions - of the elevated character of Roman London and its occupants (Smith 1856a). Several mosaics overlay hypocausts, like the one at the east end of St. Paul's Churchyard, which incorporated bipedale, and sealed mid 4th-century coins (Smith 1842c, 272-3).

The most important mosaics examined by Smith were in Threadneedle Street (Site 89; p. 106). Not only were these relatively complete, but Smith gained permission to make limited excavations on the site - his first opportunity to do so. Unfortunately, setting aside his description of the mosaics, Smith's excavation report is confused. The plan of the building eluded him because it was cut about, had suffered from subsidence and, with hindsight, probably belonged to more than one phase: the square mosaic is now dated to the late 2nd century, whilst a corridor fragment, with swastika lozenges between squares, is ascribed to the mid 3rd (Jones 1988, 4). Parts of at least thirteen more coloured mosaics came under Smith's scrutiny (Sites 9, 11, 35, 47, 59, 71, 77, 78, 87, 100, 103, 110, 129), as did several rare black and white mosaics, now thought to be mainly 1st century (Sites 18, 44; Jones 1988, 3). Unfortunately, Smith's records are sometimes ambiguous, both patterned and plain pavements being described as "tessellated".

190 CRS:J2, 17 Apl. 1837.
Compared with mosaics, fragments of Roman walling seemed relatively undiagnostic. Even when portions of rooms were observed, it was usually impossible to suggest their function. Loose finds were of no assistance since:

"It is very seldom that many objects of ancient art, exclusive of remains appertaining to the buildings themselves, are found upon the site of Roman houses" (Smith 1848d, 45).

In general, the only firm information which walls might provide related to Roman building methods. Whereas a full description of a building found in Southwark was withheld as "tedious", Smith correctly deduced from its construction that:

"... the site on the Surrey side of the river is low, and in part boggy, and must, therefore, have been less favourable for building than the opposite shore. It was evidently at times subject to overflows of the river.... huge piles of timber were driven in to counteract these obstacles. On these piles were usually placed, first, a thick stratum of chalk, then a layer of rubble and tiles cemented together" (Smith 1842a, 148-9; Site 128).

Prior to Smith's work, the survival of substantial Roman masonry beneath the streets of London was unknown (Kempe 1838), permitting some to assert "that Roman London did not contain buildings of a high architectural order" - a conclusion Smith thought "absurd" given "such meagre evidence" (Smith 1883, 114). At least some of the walls, Smith considered, must have belonged to public buildings, although he saw little hope of proving this (Smith 1856a). The presence of temples was suggested by a statue of the deae matres (Site 117), and a stone block inscribed "NUMC PROV BRITA." which Smith - probably correctly - suggested was to the divine Emperor (Site 70; Smith 1859, 29-31; Collingwood 1928, 170). The only other evidence for a public building comprised a massive north-south wall found in 1840, which extended up Lambeth Hill for at least 60 yards (Site 10). By using dendrochronology, it has recently been demonstrated that the piles upon which this building was constructed were felled in AD 293-4, by which it is
interpreted as some great public work commissioned by Allectus (Williams forthcoming).

Even today, Smith's walls can generally be reinterpreted only where adjacent portions of the structures to which they belonged have subsequently been revealed. In Bush Lane, Smith recorded a "wall" twenty feet wide, which he suspected might have belonged to a city boundary (Site 56; Smith 1859, 14). Subsequent observations have suggested another possibility - that it formed part of the plinth of a public building of unknown extent and function (Marsden 1975, 20). The same applies to the parallel Roman walls beneath Knightrider Street (Merrifield 1965, 146). Although officially not discovered until 1906, manuscript evidence shows that both Smith and E.B. Price observed and recorded an arched tile drain that penetrated the northern wall (Site 16). Another mysterious wall at the west end of Cheapside, known only from Smith's journals, is described as:

"... of intense hardness, running in a direction towards the centre of St. Paul's, and which cost the labourers three or four days to cut through. In this wall were cemented two large sea-shells, evidently for ornament" (Site 13).  

The City Walls

The City walls, of which upstanding stretches could be seen (e.g. Site 5), were the only walls whose function was obvious. Unlike his successor J.E. Price, Smith's knowledge of continental parallels enabled him to assert that the visible portions contained work of Roman origin (cf. Anon. 1885a, 126). 192 From the sculptures discovered in the Tower Hill bastion, Smith correctly concluded that the solid bastions east of the Walbrook were late Roman, but was less fortunate in arguing that they were probably coeval with the wall by analogy with Burgh Castle, where the bastions were of one build with the wall at the top only
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(Anon. 1885b). They are now known to be late Roman additions (Marsden 1980, 171-2).

Apart from his well-known observation of blind arches in the wall near Aldermanbury (Site 45), Smith's most interesting records of the City wall concern a Roman tile and masonry culvert which penetrated the wall near Moorgate. Its function was apparently to drain ground water from the north side (Site 84). The open south end of the drain was blocked by five vertical iron bars, presumably to block the passage of intruders, although Smith thought they were intended to prevent weed from accumulating. He also records a report that foundations of a Roman city gateway had been found, 18 feet apart, between this culvert and Moorgate. If correct, this constitutes the only evidence for the existence of a gate in this position. A funereal inscription, until now thought to have been unprovenanced, was said to have come from its foundations. We need not share Smith's reason for doubting this information, since whereas the City wall is now dated to the late 2nd to early 3rd centuries, the inscription belongs to the 2nd century AD (Marsden 1980, 125-6; Collingwood 1928, No. 17). It is possible that the report arose from a sighting of the medieval Moorgate (RCHM 1928, 97), but Roman stonework was almost never incorporated within the medieval rebuilding of the City wall, and the given location is east of medieval Moorgate, where we now know there was an area of raised ground between two tributaries of the Walbrook. Traces of Roman metalling have been found in the vicinity (Merrifield 1965, Site 143).

Smith's observations of the Roman riverside wall in Upper Thames Street were the first to confirm Fitzstephen's account of its existence (Sites 10 and 21). More recent excavations have also confirmed Fitzstephen's statement that the wall was destroyed by river action, dispelling Smith's objection that this must be wrong because the cement was impermeable (Hill 1980). The stretch of wall between
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Lambeth Hill and Queenhithe has not been seen since 1840-1, so Smith's description of it still constitutes valuable evidence. The same does not apply to his observation that opposite Queenhithe the wall's construction changed to chalk rubble and blackened tiles. With hindsight, Smith had probably seen the foundations of St. Michael's, Queenhithe - a church destroyed in the Great Fire, the southern wall of which perhaps stood upon the lower courses of the riverside wall.

For his day, Smith's interpretations were nevertheless remarkably perceptive. We may cite for instance his remarks on the recovery from a Roman wall in Lambeth Hill (whether the riverside wall or Allectus's public building is unclear) of reused mouldings, containing "marks ... of the machinery used in carrying them" (bar-cramp holes).194 His conclusion that the mouldings came from "a frieze or entablature" and that a "trellis-work pattern ... apparently belonged to an altar", are supported by recent discoveries in the riverside wall: namely, of portions of a monumental archway, a frieze of gods and two altars (Hill, Millett and Blagg 1980; Smith 1842a, 150-1; 1847b, 139; RCHM 1928, 93 and Pl. 51).

We may now dismiss Smith's suggestion that these monuments were overthrown during the Boudican rebellion (Smith 1842a, 151), although another link between a classical literary reference and an archaeological find suggested by Smith has proved remarkably correct. Reference is made to his remarks concerning a fragmentary inscription bearing the personal name Classicianus, found with other reused stonework in 1852 when building work at Tower Hill exposed portions of the City wall and an adjoining "buttress" (bastion), from which the stonework was recovered (Pl. 8). Since Classicianus was an uncommon Roman name, Smith suggested that the inscription might have come from the tomb of the procurator Julius Classicianus mentioned by Tacitus (Smith 1859, 27-28). This
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interpretation was confirmed in 1935, when further portions of the inscription were discovered (Merrifield 1965, 42).

The Development of Roman London

Despite the disparate nature of his observations, Smith drew some eminently reasonable conclusions about London's origins and development. Whereas a pre-Roman settlement could not be eliminated, Smith had seen nothing to indicate its existence (Smith 1844d, 109). Discoveries in Southwark proved that at its height the Roman city had extended on both sides of the river, the two halves being linked by a bridge on the evidence of coins dredged from the river bed (Site 75; see Chapter 6). By analogy with Romano-Gallic towns, London must have had an amphitheatre, which on topographical grounds Smith suggested may have lain under Seacoal Lane. This has recently been disproved, but the amphitheatre's true position demonstrates the validity of Smith's observation that the configuration of modern streets and buildings may have been influenced by the position of ruined buildings, and their position in turn by the natural topography (Smith 1856a, 32-33; cf. Frere 1988, 461-2).

Like Woodward (p. 43), Smith recognised the importance of the cemeteries of Roman London in determining the City's boundaries. Whereas previously only the Spitalfields and London Wall cemeteries were known (Stow 1603), almost every extra-mural cemetery known today is represented in Smith's records by one or two burials at least (at Holborn Hill, and Sites 76, 88, 93, 115, 123, 120-1). Of yet greater interest are Smith's records of Roman burials within the walls: inhumations associated with 1st-century coins at the north end of King William Street (Site 62), cremations in Bread Street Hill, and tile-lined graves in Paternoster Row and Bow Lane (Sites 20, 4 and 33, respectively). The Roman date of the Bow Lane burial is confirmed by a Domitianic coin from its mouth, for whereas Roman coins are found in Saxon graves, it is now known that they were never used as
"Charon's obol" (White 1988b, 163). These burials raise as yet unanswered questions concerning the location and status of London's early Roman boundaries.

From the intramural burials, Smith correctly surmised that the Roman City walls were built long after the City was first established, although his suggested date - in the reigns of Constantius or Theodosius - is too late (Smith 1844d, 114). It is now known that the landward wall was built between AD 190 and 225 (Marsden 1980, 125-6). There is still no evidence of an earlier boundary, but if it existed, Smith's suggestion that it lay "within narrow compass on the rising ground bordering the river" is not unreasonable (Smith 1844d, 109). Having seen large stone foundations in Cornhill and Bush Lane, he was:

"... inclined to place the northern wall somewhere along the course of Cornhill and Leadenhall Street: the eastern, in the direction of Billiter Street and Mark Lane; the southern, in the line of Upper and Lower Thames Street; and the western on the eastern side of the Walbrook" (Smith 1859, 14; Sites 66 and 56).

Further evidence of urban expansion came from within the walls. On the Royal Exchange site of 1841 (Site 68), a 1st-century gravel pit, filled with rubbish similar to that which "at the present day is thrown on waste places in the precincts of towns", was overlain by a stylish Roman building - evidence of the "gradual progress of Londinium". By the same token, the process of draining and embanking marshy areas on the north side of Londinium was seen as evidence of a desire to make that part suitable for buildings (Smith 1844d, 110-1).

Smith's view of the development of Roman London - as one of perpetual growth until the 4th century - has recently been overthrown, most notably by Sheldon (1975; also Merrifield 1983, 140-235). The same applies to his view that since Roman times the site of London has "never been deserted" (Smith 1886, 197; cf. 1883, 112). Nevertheless, in that earlier writers had tended to regard Roman London as a
static entity, Smith's recognition that it grew in size and importance during the Roman period must be regarded as an advance that influenced subsequent writers for over a century (e.g. "S.P.Q.R." 1851).

Some Strength's and Weaknesses

Having reviewed Smith's ideas about Roman London, we conclude this chapter by considering Smith's place within the development of the subject. What little was known about Roman London before the 19th century is summarised in Chapter 2, so this section examines Smith's work in relation to that of his contemporaries and successors.

As we have seen, Smith was by no means London's first or only site-watcher. His concern to place site observations on record was shared by his fellow collectors: G.R. Corner, E.J. Carlos, T. Lott and W.D. Saull, and especially A.J. Kempe and E.B. Price, who together made a regular series of contributions to The Gentleman's Magazine (Corner 1834; Lott 1846; Saull 1844). It has been claimed that "the development of a concept of rescue archaeology is not an easy one to trace" (Jones 1984, 10), but the idea if not the term itself probably originated here, in the London of the late 1830s, with this tiny band of workers.

Unfortunately, the value of the records which they produced is diminished by a common failure to provide accurate illustrations and sketch plans, which in Smith's case, was partly due to an inability to make accurate perspective sketches. From the mid 1840s, his proficiency in this regard improved - perhaps due to tuition from his illustrator friend F.W. Fairholt - but by this stage Smith had already made the bulk of his London observations. His location diagrams are worth having, but he never learnt how to produce an accurate site plan, the only competent plan among Smith's London records having been prepared by his
"young friend" George Wilkie (see RCHM 1928, 122, Fig. 41).195

What distinguished Smith from his contemporaries was the extent of his observations, his attempt to understand the nature and layout of the Roman city, and his astute interpretations and avoidance of "theorising or wandering from a statement of facts" (Smith 1837a, 140). Thus when Albert Way gave a paper on what he imagined was a Roman pharos attached to the City wall, Smith's knowledge of upstanding Roman and medieval remains outside London prevented the error from being perpetuated (Anon. 1846f). The same academic rigour induced Smith to ignore previous accounts of Roman finds from London, on the grounds that "if true, they fail in giving us any idea of any connected plan for the city and are also often loosely described as well as erroneously".196

As a result of his caution, Smith relied mainly upon his own observations, which constitute over one half of the 82 observations made between 1834 and 1854 as listed in Merrifield's gazetteer (Merrifield 1965, 189-325). Smith's observations were nevertheless even more numerous, for Merrifield overlooked two-thirds of Smith's records, nearly one half of which are still unpublished and have been made available to London archaeologists as a result of this study.

In view of Smith's lambasts against those who failed to publish, the above statistic deserves consideration. It seems that by 1840, Smith had concluded that:

"The more we see of the subterranean parts of London, the less ought we to be inclined to attempt to lay down plans of the disposition of streets; or to adopt those already put forth ... for the sites marked in the said maps or plans, are in many instances covered by the remains of houses, or crossed by walls".197
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The only firm evidence of Roman London's street plan, he considered was provided by the gates, which he was doubtless correct in believing had been constructed on existing roads.\textsuperscript{198} This explains Smith's failure to map his observations - a technique of which Smith was aware since it had been used by George Gwilt in Southwark and William Wire in Colchester (Codrington 1915, 141; BAA 1844a, 156, respectively). Thus it was left to a popular writer, and not Smith, to produce the first provenance map of finds from Roman London, based largely upon Stukeley (1724; Knight 1841).

Smith's failure to publish many of his observations seems therefore to have stemmed from growing and understandable doubts concerning their value - doubts exacerbated by observing large excavations outside London (at Richborough and the Hartlip villa, for instance) which would have impressed upon him the difficulty of interpreting sites dug even under advantageous circumstances. Even if the Corporation had assisted instead of hindering his efforts, it remained the case that:

"... great difficulties would beset any attempt to carry on a systematic exploration of the wreck and ruins of the ancient town, buried beneath the accumulated soil of centuries and the crowded masses of modern buildings. Under the most favourable circumstances such a project would encounter objections almost insurmountable" (Smith 1844d, 108).

Whereas the possibility of interpreting Smith's observations has now improved, due to the many hundreds of subsequent observations and excavations on adjacent sites, these new observations have of themselves reduced most of Smith's records to the status of useful scraps of evidence. The most impressive remains of Roman London were revealed after he had left London, or at least after the Corporation had debarred him from making observations, as in the case of the mosaic pavement on the Excise office site (Merrifield 1965, 288) and the baths found in 1848 in Lower Thames Street.
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(Site 106). (It is perhaps a measure of Smith's irritation that although the baths were the most complete Roman structure yet found in London, Smith does not even mention them in his Illustrations.) By the time of Smith's death, J.E. Price's accounts of the Bucklersbury mosaic and Camomile Street bastion, and Henry Hodge's drawings of the Roman forum had surpassed in importance anything that he had recorded (Price 1870; 1880; Marsden 1987).

Smith's growing dissatisfaction with his site observations caused him increasingly to turn to his collection as a means of demonstrating the importance of Roman London - an approach epitomised in his Illustrations (Smith 1859, iii and 6). The shift of emphasis may be seen in Smith's account of the Roman well in Moorgate Street, in that the vessels and iron implements derived from the well were published years after the well itself (Smith 1837a, 148-9; 1854d, Pl. V; 1859, 142). The possibility of using artifacts to evoke images of Roman life had been demonstrated in an essay on Smith's museum by Thomas Wright (1845a). In name and format, however, Smith's Illustrations of Roman London owes most to Illustrations of the Remains of Roman Art in Cirencester ... by Buckmann and Newmarch (1850).

Whilst remaining one of his most attractive and readable works, from an archaeological point of view, Smith's Illustrations is somewhat disappointing - as his friend Joseph Clark recognised (see also Anon. 1859a). Smith wrote it partly to satisfy a demand for such a work (revealed by "S.P.Q.R." 1851), partly to round off his researches on Roman London, and partly to fire a last salvo at those who:

"... seem rather pleased to find some daring champion who will decry the glory and honour of Roman London ... to shield them from their share of reproach, under the pretext that what never existed could never have been destroyed" (Smith 1859, 6).
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Thus, despite his desire to study archaeological remains to determine the condition of man in former ages—high or low, Smith's *Illustrations* sometimes presents the evidence in a propagandist manner, and the humble site observations which he made early in his career are relegated to a summary at the beginning.

Despite its shortcomings, Smith's *Illustrations* nevertheless remained the principal general volume on Roman London until the relevant Victoria History was published early this century (Smith, Reader and Walters 1909; cf. Haverfield 1911). It also succeeded in reaching a wider public. According to the *Times*:

> "How much there was of this Roman city to be still detected and disinterred from beneath our cellars and streets was never known adequately till this volume ... the importance of Roman London may be recognised as a great fact which it will be vain now to deny or disparage" (Anon. 1859b).

For this reason, and for demonstrating the value of a systematic approach to site observation, Smith undoubtedly deserves his commendation as "the outstanding name in connection with the antiquities of Roman London" (RCHM 1928, 10).
CHAPTER 6: The Roman Antiquities and Coinage from London Bridge

Having discussed Smith's London site observations, we now touch upon his collection of London antiquities. Smith's research on his collection is covered in Chapter 11, in a brief review of his work on small antiquities as a whole, whereas this chapter considers the significance of Smith's collection, both in the mid-Victorian era and today. It focuses upon the finds dredged from the bed of the Thames at London Bridge, many of which are now generally regarded as votive offerings tossed into the river from a Roman bridge on much the same alignment as its medieval successor. In 1841, Smith published a report on the coins, thus providing the first evidence for the existence of a Roman bridge, and included in it one of the earliest statistical summaries ever produced for a collection of Roman coins (Smith 1841b). With the benefit of new analytical techniques and subsequent discoveries, Smith's records would now appear to offer valuable new insights into the development of Roman London bridge, and the development of the City and Southwark.

In offering a reinterpretation of Smith's data, the latter part of this chapter differs in character from the narrative passages and critical analyses that comprise the greater part of this thesis. It is included because, in the context of a test piece, the writer wishes to demonstrate a range of approaches to the study of historic archaeological information, and because it would not do justice to Smith if a major study of his works were not to produce new information on at least one aspect of Roman Britain.

The Significance of Smith's Museum

Smith's collecting activities ran broadly in parallel with his site observations, and continued until just before he sold his collection in 1856 (AI 1856, 289). But by 1841,

---
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when he became less active as an observer, Smith had already secured most of his important pieces, and his collection was substantially complete (p. 109).\textsuperscript{201} In the late 1840s, the prospect of publishing a book on Roman London encouraged further purchases, including the limestone statue of Atys (Smith 1859, 2; Brailsford 1964, 55 and Pl. XX, No. 9).\textsuperscript{202} In 1853, however, faced with increasing poverty, Smith told Bateman that:

"It is only now + then I put forth my hand to stay an ancient weapon or relic. The stage is now occupied by dealers of all kinds".\textsuperscript{203}

Although he obtained items from other sources, the bulk of Smith's collection was recovered either from sewer trenches or from what he referred to as "my storeroom, the bed of Father Thames!".\textsuperscript{204} It was the outstanding quality of the finds from this source that helped persuade Lieutenant Waghorn - at Smith's instigation - to correspond with the Pope with a view to dredging the Tiber for its treasures (Smith 1891, 66).

The general character of Smith's collection has been summarised by Kidd (1977), and is readily apparent from his published catalogue (Smith 1854d). Despite many objets d'art, it consisted primarily of objects collected not for their artistic merit, but as relics of everyday culture. Thus, in the same way that the Faussett collection was to transform the prevailing image of the Anglo-Saxons (Chapter 9), so Smith's collection provided:

"... an insight into Roman London which no books can do ... the peacefulness, the prosperity, and the high cultivation which the south of England enjoyed ... during a great part of the period of the Roman occupation" (Bruce 1855).

\textsuperscript{201} THC III, CRS to TH, 9 July 1869. Smith acquired the enamelled late Saxon brooch from Thames Street in 1839 (CRS:J3, 24 Apl. 1839), the bronze forceps in 1840 (Smith 1844c, Pl. XXIV) and the hand of a colossal Roman bronze in 1841 (CRS:J4, 1 July 1841).
\textsuperscript{202} BAC III, 18 Jan. 1849.
\textsuperscript{203} BAC V, CRS to TB, 27 Sep. 1853.
\textsuperscript{204} LOA 13/54, CRS to JOH, 8 Aug. 1848.
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In its ultimate form, Smith's museum comprised around 5,000 items, ranging from prehistoric flint tools, Roman potsherds and leather shoes, to medieval jewelry and stone sculptures, and post-medieval trade tokens (Pl. 9). It also included items of comparanda, like a collection of prehistoric stone implements from Denmark, presented by the King of that country (AI 1854, 179). To this day, the BM's Department of Prehistoric and Romano-British Antiquities regards its part of the collection as its major single acquisition, while Smith's medieval finds form the nucleus of the archaeological collections of the Department of Medieval and Later Antiquities (Kidd 1977, 105).

When Smith's collection was purchased by the BM in 1856, the only collections to rival it in terms of the quality of the artifacts and their associated records were those obtained from barrows in Wessex by Sir Richard Colt Hoare and William Cunnington, in Derbyshire by William Bateman and his son Thomas from 1821-32 and 1843-60, respectively, and in Kent by Bryan Faussett, which collection Smith himself rediscovered and later published (Marsden 1978; Chapter 9). Only Bateman's collection approached Smith's in size, mainly because it was augmented by non-archaeological materials (Bateman 1855).

Unlike these other major collections of native antiquities, however, Smith's museum was readily accessible to anyone with a genuine interest in antiquities. It attracted a flow of important visitors (Smith 1886, 208-9),\(^{205}\) and when Smith advertised that it was open during the Great Exhibition of 1851, he drew visits from eminent continental scholars (Smith 1886, 223; Rendle 1888, 237). Joseph Mayer, whose continental travels made him a good judge, called Smith's museum "perhaps the most interesting private collection in Europe" (Mayer 1849). The Critic hailed it as "one of the sights of London; and one much more accessible to the

\(^{205}\) CRS:J3, 10 and 15 June 1839; CRS:J4, 12 June 1841;
student than many of the professed public places ... a
general educational museum of antiquities" (Anon. 1855f).

Thus as well as providing an almost unique insight into the
lives of Roman and medieval Londoners, Smith's collection
served as an influential model of what might be achieved by
the proposed museum of British national archaeology (Wright
1845a, 149-50; see Chapter 9). Its potential as the core of
such a collection was recognised by C.J. Thomsen, curator of
the Danish National Museum, who in 1843 wrote in Smith's
visitor's book:

"Remember, that the Scandinavian Museum in Denmark was begun with seven pieces;
you, as a private man, are where we, a Comité, were after ten years' work!" (Smith
1886, 150).

It also provided a model for local museums at a time when
most were furnished with natural history specimens and
curiosities. In 1860, when fears were aroused that
Liverpool Corporation's public museum would develop as an
old-fashioned museum, dominated by Lord Derby's stuffed
birds and animals, it was natural that Smith's support
should be enlisted in a campaign to promote a central
position for human history (Smith 1859-60; Hume 1859).

Setting aside the Roman inscriptions and statuary, and some
important Saxon and medieval items (notably an enamelled
late Saxon brooch similar to the Alfred jewel) the perceived
archaeological importance of Smith's sewer trench finds has
diminished since they were recovered, due to the volume of
subsequent discoveries. For a while, after Smith left
London, no one continued his work,206 but from 1863 to 72, a
Gracechurch Street ironmonger, John Walker Baily, stepped
into the breach, and like Smith, recorded the provenance of
his acquisitions in a beautifully illustrated catalogue
(Anon. 1874).207 Another collection was formed by James

206 LOA 29/26, FWF to JOH, 7 June 1857.
207 GL, MS. 17,151: "London antiquities. Sketches and
watercolours of Roman and medieval antiquarian finds
made between 1863 and 1872...".
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Smith, popularly known as "Sir James Roach Smith", a Whitechapel workman who as a young "bone-grubber" had once collected antiquities for the real Roach Smith (1891, 175). The Guildhall Museum eventually purchased both of these collections (Welch 1903, vii-xii). Broadly comparable assemblages of everyday artifacts have also been made outside London, for example the "Salisbury Drainage Collection" of around 1350 medieval and later objects found while laying the City's sewers in the 1850s. This was purchased at auction in 1859 to form the basis of Salisbury Museum (Saunders 1986).

Within London, the vogue for collecting building site finds has continued virtually uninterrupted to the present day, and since the Second World War has been supplemented by vast quantities of finds from controlled archaeological excavations. As a result, objects considered by Smith to be exceptionally rare, such as items of Roman and medieval footwear, are now regarded merely as good examples among hundreds of comparable finds (Smith 1854d, 66). This is not to deny the presence of some exceptional items, like the upper of what is arguably the finest late medieval shoe found in Britain, embossed with inscriptions in French and Latin (idem., No. 623). The archaeological value of Smith's finds has further diminished because, unlike recent finds, most lack a reliable stratigraphic context.

A claim frequently made during the campaign to save Smith's museum, that "such a collection could never be made again", is therefore exaggerated (see Smith 1855-7a), at least with regard to the sewer trench finds. The claim nevertheless does appear to be substantially correct with regard to the coins and other Roman finds dredged from the Thames near London Bridge. This is because, since the dredging operations extensively removed the river bed, it is unlikely that either Smith's finds or his records of the coins found here will be superseded by future discoveries. It therefore

208 Cuming museum, exhibition label.
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seems appropriate to reappraise the London Bridge finds in further detail.

The Existence and Probable Location of Roman London Bridge

As we have seen, the antiquities from London Bridge were recovered between 1824 and 1841 while the bridge was being rebuilt, and during subsequent dredging operations to deepen and clear the river channel. The antiquities fetched high prices with the result that they were quickly dispersed, and workmen were induced to enhance the value of extraneous relics by claiming that they had been found in London. Such problems could be overcome by being present when they were found, and from May 1836 Smith would occasionally work alongside the ballast-heavers to help retrieve objects of interest (p. 91).

During the work, parts of at least three broken statuettes were separately found and reunited (Smith 1854d, 5 and 9). This suggests that a high rate of retrieval was achieved for larger items of metalwork, although there is evidence that the workmen discriminated against less saleable items of pottery and wood (Ehrenberg 1980, 4-5). It is clear, however, that many coins escaped their attention. Hundreds were picked out of the ballast where it was deposited on the banks of the Grand Surrey Canal at Deptford, and of the Thames at Battersea and Barnes (Smith 1859, 163-4). Smith made every attempt to record these coins, although with characteristic caution he did not incorporate them into his list of coins from the Thames (Smith 1841b).

With regard to the provenance of the coins and antiquities, Smith's principal observation was that:

"Throughout the entire line of the old bridge, the bed of the river was found to contain ancient wooden piles; and when these piles, subsequently to the erection of the new bridge, were pulled up to deepen the channel of the river, many thousands of Roman coins, with abundance of Roman tiles and pottery, were discovered; and

immediately beneath some of the central piles, brass medallions of Aurelius, 
Faustina, and Commodus" (Smith 1844d, 113).

Whereas dredging was by no means confined to one place, Smith's journals show that the coins mostly came from a particular location:

"The workmen after a long lapse have again come into the spot where the Roman coins are found and brought up some".210

This was "about twenty yards below the second arch of the new bridge" (Smith 1841b, 149). Fig. 3 shows its position in relation to the old and new bridges, as revealed by a contemporary street plan.211 Smith's famous enamelled votive plaque was found here also.212 His observations seem to corroborate an earlier record that in demolishing one of the starlings, "two hundred Roman coins were found in the same hole, as if they were the contents of a lost purse or bag" (Anon. 1833).

In 1831, when the starlings of the old bridge were demolished, it was found that they had enclosed piles from earlier medieval(?) bridges (Knight 1831). There was no suggestion at that stage of a Roman bridge on the same alignment. The idea developed in Smith's mind when it became clear that the coins came mostly from several feet under the river bed and seemed to have been laid "in series, as if there had been more than one deposit ...".213 Towards Adelaide Wharf, lumps of "conglomerate" were found which, when examined by Smith, contained only Roman coins. He therefore dismissed suggestions that the coins were from a coin-dealer's shop on the medieval bridge, maintaining that they provided evidence of a Roman bridge - an idea both novel and controversial (Smith 1841b, 154-8).

Doubts have since been raised about Smith's interpretation, on the grounds that the coins could have been deposited

210 CRS:J2, 1 Dec. 1837.
211 COLRO, Reg. No. 33b.1829, Plan of London Bridge Approach.
212 CRS:J3, 23 Feb. 1838.
213 CRS:E, 18.
around the medieval starlings through tidal action (Parsloe 1928). The coins themselves show that this was not the case. Although some did indeed show signs of abrasion, as noted by Smith, the great majority of those which survive in the British Museum are generally unabraded and exceptionally sharp — a sure sign of undisturbed burial in anaerobic silts.²¹⁴

As Smith recognised, the existence of bridges in Roman Britain is well attested by place-names, one of the clearest examples being Durobrivae (Rochester, Kent), where the Medway was not much narrower than the Thames at London (Rivet and Smith 1979, 346-8, and cf. Ad Pontem, Durocobrivae, Pons Aelii, and Pontibus). It might further be argued that if a bridge was deemed necessary at Rochester, presumably to facilitate the swift passage of troops and communications between Richborough and London, then it is unlikely to have been tolerated that military personnel and Imperial messengers approaching the seat of government in London should be obliged to wait for daylight and favourable river conditions for a ferry from Roman Southwark to the city proper.

In addition to the coin evidence, the position of a Roman river crossing near medieval London Bridge, and the existence of a bridge here in Flavian times is strongly supported by recently acquired archaeological evidence (Fig. 3). On the Southwark bank, the location of the Thames crossing has been demonstrated by the discovery of two Roman roads, which converged towards the site of medieval London Bridge (Sheldon 1978, 13-27). On the north bank, excavations in Pudding Lane have revealed what may have been a Roman pier base, aligned with the downstream side of medieval London Bridge (Milne 1985, 44-54).

Taken together, the evidence for a Roman bridge at London remains highly persuasive, although it falls short of the

²¹⁴ See also: JE:LP, CRS to JE, 24 Dec. 1878.
degree of proof which might for example be provided by the recovery from midstream of piles datable by dendrochronology. The ensuing reinterpretation of the coins is therefore offered with this caveat

Votive Offerings

According to Smith's records, the London Bridge coins covered a wide date range: from the reign of Augustus to that of Honorius. In the absence of previous research on Roman coin statistics, neither Smith nor his contemporaries had grasped that the volume of Roman coinage fluctuated from reign to reign. Thus when he observed the relative abundance of Flavian, Carausian and early House of Constantine coins at London Bridge, he was able to conjecture that they represented a series of "commemorative memorials", deposited to mark the repair or rebuilding of the bridge, or the accession of new Emperors "precisely as such objects are used for similar purposes at the present day" (Smith 1859, 21). This interpretation is characteristic in that Smith always gave insufficient credit to the force of superstition in Roman and Saxon times (p. 262).

There is now little doubt that the coins were votive offerings to the divinity of the bridge or the river (Merrifield 1987, 26). The practice of making oblations at fords and bridges appears to have been widespread throughout Italy and the northern provinces of the Roman Empire (Frier and Parker 1970, 90, fn. 1). Elsewhere in Britain, coins have been obtained from the line of Roman river bridges at Piercebridge and Newcastle-upon-Tyne (Pons Aelii) (Casey 1989; Gedye 1910). Another possible site is at Kirkby Thore, Westmoreland (Smythe 1846).

Smith himself accepted that the coins were probably votive after coins were recovered from the site of a Roman ford at St. Léonard (Mayenne) (Smith 1866; 1879a, 127).
Nevertheless in 1876, when John Clayton recovered around 13,487 coins from the shrine at Coventina's fountain, Smith maintained that they represented the contents of a military chest deposited during a crisis. He argued that they were not in sequence, and that - unlike the coins from London Bridge - many showed the wear of centuries. A heated antiquarian dispute ensued. At first John Evans sided with Smith, but by 1880, he had changed his mind, having observed that early Roman brass coins were mostly absent in late Roman hoards, whereas the coins from Coventina's fountain extended over 350 years (Smith 1879a, 219). The fact that the coins were out of sequence is now explained by the turbulence of the spring (Allason-Jones and McKay 1985).

The finds from Coventina's well throw light on those from London Bridge by demonstrating that jewellery, small bronzes, and other small valuables were also offered to water deities. This is confirmed by finds from the bed of the river Liri (about 80 km north-west of Naples, Italy), and from Piercebridge (Frier and Parker 1970, 90; Houghtalin 1985, 67-68; Casey 1989, 37). Unbeknown to Smith, most of the other Roman finds from London Bridge may have been votive offerings also, including anatomical features cut from large bronze statues - the head of Hadrian, and a hand in Smith's collection (Kempe 1835b, 493; Smith 1954d, 6, No. 15). The Roman practice of offering anatomical representations at venerated waters is now well established (Merrifield 1987, 97-102). Whereas he recognised the votive nature of the bronze prow of a galley (Smith 1859, 75; Brailsford 1964, 71 and Fig. 37, No. 1), Smith could not satisfactorily explain an enamelled plaque of a Roman altar, which he ascribed to the Dark Ages (Smith 1854d, 84; Pl. 10a). The five bronze statuettes, Smith suggested, had been defaced and disposed of by Christians (Smith 1840a, 45). It now seems equally plausible that they were pagan offerings that had been ritually "killed" prior to deposition (Merrifield 1987, 30 and 97-101). The same may apply to the

clamp adorned with deities, now thought to have been for ritual human castration (Smith 1844c; Francis 1926; Pl. 10b).

Two broken silver denarii and about nine "defaced" bronze coins from London Bridge may also have been ritually damaged (Smith 1841b, 160-3). The ritual bending or defacement of medieval coins has been noted by Merrifield (1987, 109-11). To judge from bent coins from Piercebridge and the bed of the Liri (but surprisingly not from Bath), it now seems likely that the practice extended back to Roman times (respectively: Casey 1989, 41; Houghtalin 1985, 68; Walker 1988, 285).

The concentration of coins at a particular point along the line of London bridge has a parallel on the line of the bridge over the river Liri (Houghtalin 1985). There is more than one possible explanation. It may be that it was considered more efficacious to cast offerings into deep water, and that this was the first point along the bridge at which there was a sufficient depth. A more compelling explanation is that the bridge was furnished with an altar or shrine, which provided a focus for acts of devotion. A lead curse tablet to "Metunus" (i.e. Neptune) found in 1984 on the foreshore near London Bridge suggests the possible dedicatee (Hassall and Tomlin 1987, 360-3). In Smith's day, the nature of lead curse tablets was unknown; any such finds would have been discarded by the ballast-heavers.

At Chesters, the possibility of a shrine to the nymphs is suggested by stonework from a structure over a cutwater of Bridge 2 (Bidwell and Holbrook 1989, 46). A closer parallel to London is provided by the bed of the Tyne at Newcastle, which as well as coins has yielded supposedly Roman timbers solid enough to be turned into furniture, and matching altars to Oceanus and Neptune, presumably from the bridge, with a dedication slab of c. AD 155-9 (Bruce 1905, 157 and 334; Heslop 1903-4; Collingwood and Wright 1965, Nos. 1320-
2). The manner of their deployment on the bridge is suggested by the surviving Roman bridge over the Cendere Çay, Turkey. This retains three of its four original altars, each of which stands next to a dedication slab. Originally, the four stelae, each with its altar, stood in opposing pairs on either side of the carriage way, about a quarter of the way across the bridge from either end (Humann and Puchstein 1890, 393-5 and Tafn. XLI-XLIII).

The coins from London Bridge are not the only ones to have been found in the Thames. During 1984-5, nearly 380 coins were recovered by metal detector users from fly tips of spoil derived from the Billingsgate Lorry Park site (for location, see Fig. 3). The coins were submitted to the Museum of London for identification and recording, and have now mostly been returned to the finders. A number of additional coins have been published by de la Bedoyère (1986). Since the site lay to the south of the Roman quays, the coins were undoubtedly derived from the Roman river bed. They are interpreted as votive offerings, tossed into the river from boats or perhaps a floating jetty.

**Coin Statistics**

The most remarkable aspect of Smith's report lies in its presentation of statistical data; it was one of the first Roman coin reports so to do. Smith was nevertheless not the first to prepare quantified coin lists. Within Britain, the practice had originated with Taylor Combe, who from 1807 was Keeper of the British Museum's newly created Department of Antiquities and Coins (Miller 1974, 100). Beginning in 1814 with a hoard of Saxon pennies from near Lancaster, Combe had pioneered the reporting of hoards judged to be treasure trove, which the Treasury submitted to the Museum (p. 158). Although the Lancaster hoard was incomplete, Combe had summarised the numbers of each type and mint among the portion submitted to him (Combe 1817). His successor, Hawkins, developed this approach in his study of a hoard
from Beauworth, Hants., by which he had hoped to solve the long-standing problem of how to distinguish between the coins of William I and William II (Hawkins 1836). This proved impossible until the beginning of the 20th century (Brooke 1916), but Hawkins' paper marked a growing realisation that the sequence of issues might be determined by comparing hoards, the contents of which overlapped (Hill 1936, 239).

Even Smith's earliest records of coin assemblages list the types represented, and from 1839, Smith followed Hawkins in counting the coins of each ruler and type. His first statistical coin list arose from an exhibition at the Antiquaries, in March 1839, of Roman grave goods including 600 coins, from the Roman and Saxon cemetery at Strood, Kent. Smith immediately obtained an introduction to the exhibitor and, that Easter, visited the site, which later formed part of his estate at Temple Place (Smith 1842e). The coins ranged from the 1st to 4th centuries, and it was pointed out to Smith that coins of different dates seemed to be concentrated in different parts of the field (idem., 219).216 His subsequent paper - which included the first quantified coin list produced for a Roman assemblage - may have helped his election to the Antiquaries' Council since he was nominated shortly after it was read (Smith 1840b). Smith's London Bridge paper appeared the following year, and before long the practice of quantifying Roman coin lists became widespread.

Smith was generally unable or too cautious to interpret his statistics, and does not state why he thought them important. Since he quantified the contents of private collections, he may have been motivated partly by his desire as a collector to establish the comparative rarity of the various types. When dealing with coins from Roman occupation sites, however, Smith's principle concern was probably to clarify the principal periods of occupation (of.

216 CRS:N2, p. 76.
Smith 1853-4, 117; 1858a, 25), and that he recognised the potential of coin statistics as realised in the work of Casey and Reece (1974) is evidenced by his remark that the coins of the Constantine family from Richborough:

"... bear a very inferior proportion to those of the two Romano-British emperors [i.e. Carausius and Allectus], when the length of reigns is compared" (Smith 1850a, 154).

Any reappraisal of the London Bridge coin statistics is reliant upon Smith's data, because many of the coins are no longer available for study. Although in theory the BM purchased his entire collection we know that Smith retained some of his coins (Smetham 1890), and by hearsay, the BM selectively sold some of those it had purchased as inferior duplicates.

Since we are unable to check his coin lists, it is fortunate that Smith was a proficient numismatist. In the first half of the 19th century, Roman coin studies had already been placed on a sound basis by Eckhel (1792), whose work had been disseminated within Britain through two working manuals by Akerman (1834, 1836). Nevertheless, as with his contemporaries, Smith's coin descriptions are inadequate by modern standards, not least because he used the size classification, of 1st or large, 2nd (or middle), 3rd and 4th (or small) brass, which had become widespread during the 18th century (e.g. Banduri 1718; popularised by Eckhel 1792; cf. Stevenson, Smith and Madden 1889, 135-6). This is now largely obsolete because it overlooks the importance of weight and metal in determining denomination, so that, for example, dupondii and asses cannot be distinguished. Ironically, the Roman coins from London Bridge were among the only ones in Britain that were bright enough to reveal the colour of the metal without being cleaned (R. Bland, pers. comm.), and Smith noticed that similar coins could

218 MP, CRS to JM, 2 July 1856.
219 Pers. comm. P.J. Casey, who was told this years ago by someone from the BM:DMLA, which then curated the coins.
occur in both copper and brass, but did not know why. This aside, Smith's identifications are often sufficient to be matched with types in RIC, and are usually adequate for broad dating at least.

It is fortunate, too, that by his own account Smith's list of coins from London Bridge includes most of those which he saw or purchased (Smith 1841b, 152-3 and 194). It may therefore be used for comparison with recent coin data for Southwark (Hammerson 1988), and also with the first accurate statistics from the City. These have been compiled by the writer from computerised tables derived in the main from identifications by Jenny Hall. They include coins from post-1945 excavations by the Guildhall Museum and, from 1975, by the Museum of London's Department of Urban Archaeology. Records of the Billingsgate finds have also been examined, although they await a full assessment.

Care is required in comparing these sites because whereas the coins from the City and Southwark were lost during everyday use, those from London Bridge and Billingsgate are from votive deposits (see Walker 1988, 282-5). This probably accounts for most of the more unusual coins, which include several gold and silver rarities as well as bronze medallions of Faustina, Commodus and Aurelius.

There are no signs at London Bridge of a predisposition against offering the deity coins of high value, for which some evidence has been claimed at Bath (idem., 284). For every silver coin from London Bridge of AD 43-238, Smith recorded 12.1 bronze coins. This compares with 1 silver to 17.3 bronze among the coins from recent City excavations. The discrepancy may have arisen because Smith paid special attention to coins of precious metal.

220 CRS: J4, 19 Oct. 1840.
221 The Faustina and Commodus medallions survive in the BM: DCM, Reg. Nos. 1935-4-4-3 and 1935-4-4-2, respectively.
To compare Smith's statistics from London Bridge with other sites, it is necessary to translate them into a coin loss diagram of the kind advocated by Casey (1974, 41-43; Fig. 4). There are two difficulties in so doing. Firstly, Smith excluded forged denarii of the 1st to early 3rd centuries (Smith 1859, 154). This will have slightly diminished the figures for periods 3-10. (It is fortunate for present purposes that there were apparently no forgeries of periods 1-2, see below.) He also provided a round figure of 100 for "minims" in which category he seems to have included the small radiate and diademed copies of late 3rd- and 4th-century coins. Smith was never sure how to date his "minims", ascribing them in one place to "the Romans or Romano-Britons, in late times", and in another to "unknown princes or rulers of Britain, after the departure of the Romans, and before the establishment of the Saxons" (respectively, Smith 1859, 163; 1850a, 156). This second view became widely accepted until their true nature was revealed by Sutherland (1937, 115 and 126), although by 1883, Smith had correctly surmised that they were "mostly of the time of the Tetrici" (Smith 1883, 294). For present purposes, Smith's "minims" have been placed in period 18 (AD 260-73), as have the late 3rd century "barbarous radiates" from the City and Southwark. This permits the use of period 19 to denote the coinage of Carausius and Allectus. It is nevertheless recognised that many numismatists consider that the production of radiate copies continued until the introduction of the follis around AD 295-6.

Fig. 5 permits comparisons between the figures for London Bridge (1685 coins), the City (998 coins, counting each hoard as one coin) and Southwark (701 coins). The figures from Billingsgate are not given; except in one respect described below, they do not differ significantly from those from the City. Coins too corroded to reveal the identity of the Emperor were excluded, but only after it had been ascertained that had they been included their presence would have made no difference to the chart other than to smooth
out the peaks and troughs. For present purposes, no
distinction has been made between regular and irregular
coins; Smith's coin list does not distinguish between them.

Interpretation of the Statistics

For Southwark and the City, the overall pattern of coin
loss, with Flavian, Gallic Empire and Constantinian peaks,
is typical of many other continuously occupied Roman sites.
The main difference is the conspicuous shortage of
Valentinian coins in comparison with Silchester, Corbridge
and Verulamium, for example (Casey 1974; Curnow 1974).
Since this is also apparent at London Bridge and
Billingsgate, the low volume of late Roman coinage cannot be
blamed upon a general truncation of late Roman deposits due
to the digging of medieval foundations and pits. From coin
periods 3-17, the pattern of coin loss on all three London
sites is remarkably similar. This draws into focus some
significant points of divergence between the sites in
periods 1-2 (Claudian-Neronian) and onwards from period 20
(late 3rd century AD).

The most notable feature of coin periods 1-2 is the
relatively high loss in Southwark of Claudian coins. This
suggests that during the first decade or so of London's
existence, the focus of activity was in Southwark, rather
than the City. The figures for the City may be slightly
depressed because the earliest levels are not always fully
excavated on rescue excavations, but this is probably
balanced by the fact that on other sites, only the earliest
layers survive. The relatively high number of Claudian
coins from Southwark has already been noted by Hammerson,
who concluded that most were in circulation during the
earliest phases of occupation, and that since a majority are
high grade imitations, they are suggestive of a fort or
military supply base (Hammerson 1978, 588-93). As
Haverfield once suggested, if early settlement was
concentrated in Southwark, this might explain why Ptolemy,
apparently using 1st-century sources, placed Londinium within the territory of the Cantii, south of the Thames (Haverfield 1911, 146, fn. 2; Frere 1974, 75).

The relatively low number of Claudian coins (period 1) from London Bridge is consistent with evidence from the 1984 excavations at Pudding Lane, that the bridge may not have been a primary feature. Here a landing stage dated by dendrochronology to AD 69-91 was found to be cut through by a possible bridge pier. This was made of timbers felled in AD 79-118, but was probably constructed around AD 90 because it also was cut through to accommodate a timber quay of AD 86-105 (Milne 1985, 37). The landing-stage may have served a ferry, which preceded the bridge (G. Milne, pers. comm.). Since crossing the river would have been easier by bridge, its construction would be expected to lead to in increase in traffic and hence in votive offerings. On this basis, the bridge was probably constructed during the main period of loss of the period 2 coinage. Allowing for circulation, this was presumably during period 3 - AD 68-81. After the construction of the bridge, it seems that the City assumed its traditional pre-eminence over Southwark (periods 3-17).

Like many other Romano-British sites, the City has produced large numbers of radiates (period 18; nearly 25 annual losses per 1000 coins). Their relative scarcity in Southwark, for reasons unknown, has already been noted by Hammerson (1978, 594). The figures for London Bridge appear to mirror those from Southwark, but the smaller radiates and minims are more likely to have been missed by the ballast-heavers and, in that they were mainly unofficial copies with unidentified portraits, may have been discriminated against by Smith and other collectors. Nevertheless, sufficient were found to show that they were not considered inappropriate as offerings to Thames water-deities (cf. Casey 1989, 42).
Positive discrimination in favour of collecting and recording coins of Carausius and Allectus (period 20) must be at least partly responsible for the apparent high numbers from London Bridge. A type series of them collected by Smith survives in the British Museum.\textsuperscript{222} There had been a long antiquarian tradition of interest in Carausian coins (Piggott 1985, 139-41). Moreover, Smith's journals show that he became interested in them early in his antiquarian career (cf. Smith 1837c),\textsuperscript{223} and from 1849 started preparing a monograph on them which he later incorporated into Collectanea (BAA 1849; see Appendix 1a).

A different explanation is required of the large number of period 22 coins from London Bridge. Since Smith detailed three-quarters of the reverses, thus permitting close dating by reliable modern sources, we may be confident that the high figure is not due to errors of identification and dating. (Only in recent years has the 4th-century coinage been satisfactorily sorted out; Casey 1974, 37.) The best explanation is that they include one or more particular votive deposits, such as a bag of coins. Several such groups have been identified from the sacred spring at Bath (Walker 1988, 310). This explanation is supported by the presence of thirty coins of Crispus, including an extreme rarity - a gold solidus from the Trier mint (RIC 363).\textsuperscript{224} By comparison, just two bronze coins of Crispus has been recovered from the City during the last forty years of systematic excavation. This explanation is by itself insufficient, in that whereas the Billingsgate coins generally follow the pattern of coin loss in the City, they include the same proportion of Period 22 coins as at London Bridge. Therefore it may be that there was a genuine increase in votive offerings to the Thames water deities in the early 4th century, the reasons for which can only be a matter of speculation.

\textsuperscript{222} Part of Reg. No. 1935-4-4. 
\textsuperscript{223} CRS:J2, 23 Jan. 1836; CRS:J4, 15 Apl. and 17 May 1840, and 19 Aug. 1841. 
\textsuperscript{224} Presumed sold, as no longer extant in the BM. 
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For periods 23-27, the very low coin figures from London Bridge might imply that the bridge had been swept away, so that the Thames crossing was once more by ferry, presumably on a trajectory well clear of the remains of the bridge. If so, the loss must have occurred before AD 330 because the period 23 peak seen on most Romano-British sites is entirely missing. Some might consider this early, but a timber bridge 300 metres long must have been expensive and difficult to maintain. An alternative explanation - that there was a sharp decline in the veneration of the water deities - is unconvincing. Period 23 is well represented at Billingsgate, and depositions in the spring at Bath remained at a high level during periods 23 and 24, and did not begin to fall until AD 353-68 (Walker 1988, 283). Other evidence puts the widespread decline in pagan practises even later (Frere 1974, 333-4). The early loss of the bridge might also explain the relative economic buoyancy of Southwark during periods 24-25, in that trades and activities previously confined to the City might now tend to be duplicated in Southwark.

The absence on all three London sites of the typical Valentinian peak (period 25), show that despite London's continuing administrative importance, and the presence of the treasury, both the City and its southern suburb were by then in sharp decline. It is a point for debate whether the failure to maintain London Bridge contributed to, or was itself a consequence of this process.
CHAPTER 7: Excursions and Societies, 1836-43

This chapter introduces the second main theme of this thesis - Smith's contribution to the institutions of British Archaeology. It begins by summarising Smith's early antiquarian excursions and what his journals reveal about the state of antiquarianism in south-east England from 1836 to 1843. It then describes how Smith began to address the need for an organised approach to archaeological recording, preservation and publication, and how developments in France encouraged him in December 1843 to collaborate with Thomas Wright in forming the British Archaeological Association.

The Nature of Smith's Excursions

Starting in 1836, Smith made a series of antiquarian tours through the south-east of England, initiating a life-long "investigation of the country, and search for antiquities". In 1839, 1842 and 1843, Smith extended his excursions to Northern France, where he found that the scale and sophistication of antiquarian organisation were in advance of the rest of Europe. He subsequently ranged even further afield, visiting the West of England, Hadrian's Wall, and ultimately Germany, the South of France, and Rome itself. Although he visited historic towns and buildings, Smith's primary concern was to examine field monuments and antiquarian collections. In a country lacking adequate museums and antiquarian publications other than Archaeologia, such visits provided an essential means of learning about antiquities. Inspired, apparently, by Stukeley's Itinerarium Curiosum, Smith recorded his visits in his journals - making them a valuable source of information.

Smith's accounts of his excursions reveal the extent of his archaeological zeal (Pl. 11). He carefully noted snippets of hearsay about collections and monuments, clipped or
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copied reports of discoveries from periodicals, and followed every lead by a visit or a letter requesting further information. By 1843, Smith had inspected almost every collection and known archaeological site in south-east England (for details see Appendix 4). His visits to Kent from 1838 amounted to an informal survey. Everywhere he went, landlords were questioned about the locality, and jeweller's, watch-maker's and silver-smith's shops were scoured for coins. Upstanding walls were scrutinised for reused Roman building materials, ancient monuments were explored and sketched, and the fields surveyed for scatters of Roman tile or the crop-marks of roads and buildings. Collectors and local antiquarians (often perfect strangers) received unexpected visits in the hope that they might exchange information. If they were out, Smith would return on another occasion. Through his lively interest in everyone he met, Smith gained an informal network of friends and supporters, who would call to see his museum and discuss antiquarian matters when visiting London. Many of them subsequently joined the BAA.

Within Britain, Smith's excursions are typified by his first visit, in October 1836, to Sandwich, Richborough and Reculver. This made such an impression upon Smith that he describes it at the beginning of his Retrospections (Smith 1883). Smith made this tour alone, although he often preferred to travel with one or two male companions, especially when abroad. Among the most eminent were the art historian J.G. Waller, who accompanied him down the Rhine in 1850, and the South of France in 1858, and the antiquary Charles Warne, who accompanied him to Normandy in 1853, and the Loire in 1854 (Smith 1886, 127 and 286-99; 1853-4; Barton 1891; Warne 1886).

---
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To reach Kent, Smith took the steamer from London to Ramsgate. He caught an "omnibus" from there to Sandwich, and stayed overnight at the Fleur-de-Lis. On learning that E.S. Reader and W.H. Rolfe were "the Antiquaries of the town", Smith spent the next morning visiting them. Although unexpected, he was courteously welcomed, especially by Rolfe, whose good conversation ensured that he became a regular correspondent (Smith 1861b). Previously a farmer, Rolfe had sold his land to provide an annuity that enabled him to devote his retirement to antiquities and borough council affairs (Matson 1961). His extensive collection included Roman coins from Richborough, samian from Pudding Pan sands, and brooches from what are now recognised to have been Saxon barrows.227

Having made notes on Rolfe's collection, Smith tramped through the rain to inspect Richborough, then crossed the marshes to Reculver (twelve miles). He slept at the "King Ethelbert", but not before questioning the landlord about the erosion of the walls and demolition of the church. He spent Sunday morning exploring Reculver, then walked along the shore to Ramsgate. On Monday, Smith walked to Canterbury (eighteen miles) where he visited the cathedral, St. Augustine's, and the Philosophical Association museum. He then took the coach to Rochester, and walked from there to Gravesend (eight miles) to catch the London steamer.

Smith's French tours of 1839-43 proceeded upon similar lines to his English excursions, with visits to town walls, cathedrals, and museums (public and private). Smith was keen to observe foreign habits, especially those which might throw light on Roman antiquity.228 He also tried to purchase coins and antiquities, but found that French shops contained little of interest (but see Smith 1846d).229

227 CRS:J2, 15 Oct. 1836.
228 CRS:J5, 3 Sep. 1843.
229 CRS:J5, 31 Aug. 1843.
Smith liked the French, and in later life spelt his name "Roche" after the Norman-French spelling (Smith 1883, 204). Although not fluent in conversation, he read French sufficiently well to publish translations, and his choice of destination reveals careful preparatory reading, and familiarity with French antiquarian works, notably Millin (1790-5; e.g. Smith 1883, 281; p. 56). The Bayeux tapestry, Lillebonne amphitheatre, and the Roman altar in Halinghen church had all figured in recent publications (Rickman 1836; Smith 1843d; 1886, 130).  

During these visits, Smith met around fifteen French antiquarians, who showed him their collections, and made gifts of publications and antiquities (Akerman 1846a; Smith 1886, 148-9). Such contacts convinced him that British and foreign antiquities should be studied together and hence of the need for regular contact between English and continental antiquarians. In 1842, he proposed that the Numismatic Society should send its proceedings to foreign societies, "but could only get them to sanction a few".  

Travel

Smith's Richborough excursion described above illustrates the long distances that he travelled on foot. Before the advent of steam transport, the only alternative was to take a horse-drawn coach or van. These were infrequent, slow and uncomfortable, so Smith - a great walker since childhood - generally preferred to hike. He would sleep at inns, or, in France, at wayside auberges or cottages, where he could rely on:

"... a cleanly pallet, undisturbed by visitations [i.e. bed bugs] which but too commonly afflict the reposers on the downiest couches in the grandest hotels"

(Smith 1861d, 207).

230 CRS:J3, 3 Sep. 1839; NS:MOM, 30 Apr. 1840.
231 CRS:J5, 7 and 10 Sep. 1843.
232 CRS:J5, 26 Sep. 1842, and 2 Sep. 1843.
233 CRS:J5, 8 Oct. 1842.
Smith continued this pattern long after rail transport had become available. To explore the countryside thoroughly there was no substitute for walking, and like his antiquarian forebears (Chapter 2), Smith was keen to explore the fields near Roman roads, and the roads themselves, some of which took the form of holloways, retaining the appearance of antiquity. Smith never shirked exercise if he thought antiquarian information might be gained - or if it enabled him to demonstrate his stamina and archaeological zeal (e.g. Smith 1886, 41 and 47). On one occasion he walked from Bishop Auckland to Housesteads to examine forts along Hadrian's wall, and later commented that:

"One great reason why this class of ancient monuments has been, comparatively, overlooked and neglected is, the physical strength as well as zeal demanded of the explorers. Roman roads are not to be travelled in gigs and carriages; and castra and ruined towns are seldom to be attained by railways" (Smith 1855b, 130).

Because of his business, Smith had to fit his excursions into the occasional day off or a weekend. The availability of steamer services to Colchester and Gravesend, and the introduction of rail transport in the late 1830s, were therefore invaluable in extending the number of sites accessible within his free time. Smith's ability to make useful cross-channel excursions during his brief September holidays was equally dependent upon transport improvements. In 1843, he and his sister, and two companions, visited France using the new South Eastern Railway in conjunction with a cross-channel steamer. Earlier that year this service had for the first time enabled Londoners to travel to Boulogne and back in just 14½ hours (Anon. 1843b). Smith's two-week tour along the Rhine of 1850 would have been impossible in 1839, since when the journey from London to Trier had been cut from five days to two (Smith 1851a).

235 e.g. CRS:J4, 8 and 17 Aug. 1841.
236 CRS:K, CRS to FWF, 8 Sep. 1849; e.g. BAC III, CRS to TB, 3 July 1844; FWF:BAA1, CRS to FWF, 27 July 1848.
237 e.g. CRS:J4, 22 Oct. 1841.
238 CRS:J5, 31 Aug. 1843.
Collecting in South-East England

It appears from Smith's diaries that by the late 1830s the public museum movement was already taking root in south-east England, in that Smith records visits to museums at Canterbury, Chatham, Chelmsford, Chertsey, Chichester, Donington, Dover, Ipswich, and Newport, IOW. These museums had mostly been formed in recent years by societies established along the lines of the Leeds Literary and Philosophical Society (founded 1781) whose aim was:

"... the promotion of Science and Literature, by the reading of papers, the delivering of lectures, the formation of a Museum, the collection of a library, and the establishment of a laboratory" (Hume 1847, 143, etc.; cf. Lewis 1984, 28).

Unfortunately, these society museums seem to have comprised poorly labelled and documented accumulations of curiosities in the Tradescant tradition (p. 41). Only where they received strong support from local antiquarians - as at Canterbury and Ipswich - had the collections acquired a significant archaeological value. The fate of local finds mostly depended upon private collectors.

Smith's diaries name around seventy private collectors in the south-east of England. Again, their collections were mostly small and of recent formation, reflecting the growing rate of archaeological destruction, due increasingly to railway construction. With the significant exception of the Faussett collection (Chapter 9), such collections were usually dispersed when their owners died.

The collectors fell into three commensurate groups: coin-collectors, collectors of local antiquities, and antiquarians whose collecting supplemented a scholarly interest in antiquity. All tended to base their collections

---


240 e.g. CRS:J3, 4 May 1838 and 4 Aug. 1839.
around coins, which were retained for their resale value, as curiosities, or for study collections, and attracted interest from tradesmen, gentry, and even women!\textsuperscript{241} Whereas Greek and Republican coins - the trophies of foreign travel - were mainly collected by gentlemen,\textsuperscript{242} those who collected only coins minted in Britain belonged primarily to the lower middle- and upper working-classes. They included many inn- and shop-keepers, whose hobby perhaps arose from a desire to make the best of any "bad" money that crossed their counters.\textsuperscript{243}

Persons of every rank liked to retain curiosities found on their land; the occupant of Silchester farm had a particularly notable collection.\textsuperscript{244} Otherwise, like Smith himself, most collectors of British antiquities relied on their own chance discoveries or on purchases from labourers or shops, and generally lived near the source of their acquisitions. In this regard, Robert Fox FSA, of Godmanchester, who possessed Roman antiquities from Bath,\textsuperscript{245} was an exception, as were certain well-known collectors who made regular purchasing trips outside their locality. John Huxtable made twice-yearly visits to Dorchester, for instance.\textsuperscript{246} John Dennett of Newport, IOW, and Thomas King of Chichester, had formed their collections by excavating burial sites.\textsuperscript{247} Most of the barrows which Smith saw on his excursions had already been opened (p. 60, ff.).

A few collectors, like the Colchester watch-maker William Wire, had a pecuniary interest in their hobby. Wire began as a dealer in antiquities, but in 1840 established a small museum next to his shop accessible for a small entrance charge. Poverty later forced him to sell his best exhibits.
which eventually found their way to Colchester Museum (Rudsdale 1947).

Others collected to strengthened a claim for recognition as an antiquarian, of which one or two might be found in most county towns.\(^{248}\) The principal collector at St. Albans was "Antiquary Brown"\(^{249}\) - a title that illustrates (as does Scott's novel, p. 55) that the local antiquarian held a recognised social position, which might appeal to a gentleman or professional person. Status by association with the genius loci is similarly reflected in Smith's practice of referring to antiquarians as "So-and-so of Somewhere".

**Coins**

Despite the popularity of coin-collecting, the only major public coin collection was in the British Museum. The Bank of England, Bodleian and Hunterian Museums had collections of great interest, but access was "so jealously guarded and restricted by statues ... that practically their contents are almost ... unknown and useless to students" (NS 1844). The Antiquaries paid little attention to numismatics, and there was no adequate means of publishing numismatic papers (Smith 1883, 119). From 1836, J.Y. Akerman responded by publishing the *Numismatic Journal* and by helping to create the Numismatic Society. In December 1839, the Society recognised the *Journal* as its official publication, but renamed it the *Numismatic Chronicle*. It remained in Akerman's hands, but from 1841 the Society appointed a special committee to select which papers and plates to publish.\(^{250}\)

Although the Numismatic Society drew its support mainly from Fellows of the Royal Society and Society of Antiquaries, it

\(^{248}\) For list of Chichester antiquarians, see CRS:BAA3, J. Pitt to CRS, 21 Apr. 1846.

\(^{249}\) CRS:J2, 22 July 1836.

\(^{250}\) NS:CM, 14 June 1841.
was relatively free of the class-consciousness that marred the parent bodies. Its council consisted entirely of active numismatists, it admitted dealers (which the Antiquaries did not do), and whereas the Antiquaries' four-guinea annual subscription deterred all but the well-to-do, the Numismatic Society set its subscription at one guinea (Evans 1956, 227). It soon acquired over one hundred members (Carson 1986, 3).

Smith was elected to the Society at its first general meeting on 26 January 1837. He immediately became one of its most active members in obtaining recruits, in acquiring numismatic information and procuring casts of, or borrowing coins for study.251 From 1840 to 1844, and again from 1847 to 1851, Smith held the office of secretary, winning admiration for his "zeal, ability, and indefatigable industry" (NS 1840b, 6; 1844, 37; 1847, 21). On resigning the post in 1844, Hawkins and Birch of the BM organised a collection and presented Smith with an inscribed silver tea service.252

Despite its merits, the Society took no official measures to prevent the destruction and dispersal of coins. Although they stood more chance of preservation than items of less obvious worth, coins of precious metal were at particular risk of being melted down.253 Even where they were uninteresting, Smith deplored this practice, asking:

"Why not make them up in small and cheap parcels with a few printed illustrative notes for the use of schools?"254

Most collectors seemed unconcerned that coin finds might constitute evidence of occupation, and when they changed hands details of provenance were usually forgotten. For

251 e.g. CRS:J2, 29 Jan. 1837; CRS:J3, 20 Nov. and 10 Dec. 1839; CRS:J4, 6 Mar. 1840; NS:MOM, 30 Jan. 1840; 22 Apr. 1841.
252 SAL, Part MS. 857, Ephemera relating to CRS, printed leaflet, 25 Sep. 1844. The tea service survives in the hands of Mrs. Fardell, IOW.
253 e.g. CRS:J2, 27 July 1837; CRS:J3, 31 Jan. 1838.
254 CRS:J3, 7 Nov. 1838.
this reason, Smith was keen to record common coins as well as rarities. Information was also vulnerable when rare coins were owned by uneducated persons or sent for auction. It was common practice to put one or two rare coins in with some common ones to ensure that they sold;\textsuperscript{255} in 1840 Smith had to purchase an otherwise worthless lot to obtain just one unpublished coin of Carausius.\textsuperscript{256}

The discovery of a coin hoard was generally followed by immediate sale and dispersal, after which it was difficult to gain accurate information. The need for immediate scholarly investigation was impressed upon Smith in 1837 when he followed up a report that silver coins had been found near Maidenhead, in building the Great Western Railway. The company officials were unhelpful, but Smith's persistent enquiries produced details of the find spot, the mode of burial (in two pots, each holding 300-500 coins) and information that most of the coins had been sold at Bray Fair for twopence to sixpence each. By tracing some of the purchasers, Smith managed to examine about forty coins of the 1st and 2nd centuries AD. Back in London, he called upon Isambard Brunel, who grudgingly produced forty more.\textsuperscript{257} Ten turned up in Hounslow, (Smith had to walk there twice to examine them),\textsuperscript{258} and he found six more in a Maidenhead watch-makers' shop, during a subsequent visit.\textsuperscript{259}

The Maidenhead find should have been handled in accordance with the medieval law of Treasure Trove. This stated that whereas treasure found in the sea or on the ground belonged to the finder, secreted treasure (including grave goods) belonged to the King or his grantee (i.e. the lord of the manor), the penalty for concealment being a fine or imprisonment. "Treasure" was generally taken to mean objects of precious metal and all coinage, including copper.

\textsuperscript{255} e.g. CRS:K, CRS to WHR, 21 Mar. 1849.
\textsuperscript{256} CRS:J4, 15 Apl. 1840.
\textsuperscript{257} CRS:J2, 21-27 Oct. 1837.
\textsuperscript{258} CRS:J2, 10 and 24 Dec. 1837.
\textsuperscript{259} CRS:J3, 13 Apl. 1839.
(Blackstone 1768, I, 295). Nevertheless, because inquisitions were usually more costly than the treasure itself, the Treasury generally took no steps to recover treasure trove unless it was especially valuable (Hill 1936, 239).

Smith regarded treasure trove law as "unjust and oppressive", citing a rumour that the Duke of Northumberland had imprisoned someone for years for retaining brass coins.\(^{260}\) (In truth, the man had been jailed for one year for refusing a court order to turn the coins over, see Bruce 1871.) But the law undoubtedly undermined the interests of science by encouraging concealment, and allowing the landowner to melt down whatever was turned in (e.g. AI 1850b, 194).

If we may momentarily step beyond the chronological confines of this chapter, it is noteworthy that in 1852, when Daniel Wilson addressed the Archaeological Institute on the need for legislation to ensure that portable antiquities were passed to an appropriate scientific authority, Smith strongly opposed his suggestion. He did so on the grounds that legislation would lead to the confiscation of private collections and because the only way to ensure preservation was to remunerate the finder (which since 1752 had been the system in Denmark), and perhaps the lord of the manor also (Smith 1852g, xv; Hill 1936, 182).\(^{261}\)

As a result of Worsaae's tour of 1846 (Worsaae 1846-7), the benefits of the Danish system became widely recognised (Anon. 1849f; AI 1850b, 194), and in 1858 Lord Talbot de Malahide tried to achieve a proper system for remunerating the finder by introducing a bill into the House of Lords (1857-8, 355).\(^{262}\) Unfortunately, Malahide's bill was abandoned under pressure from the Treasury. Nevertheless,

\(^{260}\) BAC III, CRS to TB, 17 Dec. 1849.
\(^{261}\) DW:S, CRS to DW, 8 June 1850; see also 29 June 1850.
\(^{262}\) Bill 185, Session 1857-8.
following a meeting in 1855 between the Prime Minister and Lord Talbot, the Treasury was more conscientious about submitting hoards to the BM and allowed them to purchase whatever they wanted before rewarding the finder (AI 1855, 200). In 1886, this practice was formalised when a Treasury minute authorise the payment to the finder of a percentage at least of the value of a find (Hill 1836, 240).

In the late 1830s, however, the situation was wholly unsatisfactory, and in the absence of adequate arrangements, Smith urged the Numismatic Society to adopt a more positive role in preserving and acquiring numismatic information. In November 1839, on hearing of the discovery of 454 silver coins of James, Elizabeth and Charles II, Smith wrote to the Earl of Sandwich, into whose hands they had been placed, who gave permission for the Society to catalogue them. Soon afterwards, he suggested to its council that the Society should:

"... no longer be content to be merely the passive recipient of information but be actively engaged in seeking from all parts the means to supply its increasing wants and energies."

He recommended sending a printed circular to a clergyman in every parish, asking them to catalogue or take casts of any significant finds which could not be sent to the Society for inspection. Being leisured men of classical education, he reasoned, the clergymen thus approached would probably join the Society, defraying the initial expense. Although the Society did not adopt Smith's idea, it remains of interest because it suggests that at this stage, Smith's ideas on recording and preservation were influenced less by the French Comités than a traditional English idea harking back to Aubrey, the 17th-century parochial questionnaires (p. 41), and an 18th-century attempt to revive the idea by the Antiquaries (Evans 1956, 123).

Historic Sites and Monuments

263 CRS:J3, 18 and 29 Nov. 1839.
264 CRS:J3, 10 Dec. 1839.
In addition to finding out about coins and collectors, Smith was equally assiduous in obtaining information on archaeological sites and monuments. Away from county towns and celebrated monuments like Richborough and Kits Coty House, visitors to historic sites prior to the introduction of railway transport were so infrequent that it was often possible for Smith to pick up Roman coins or antiquities. But it was the sites themselves, not the possibility of making finds, which most attracted Smith. At Silchester he commented that:

"... the feeling generated is to remain forever among such ruins and gather from them some narrative of the various scenes that ... have been enacted within their bounds." 265

Whereas by the mid 1830s, many historic buildings had already been illustrated and published (p. 57), a great majority of archaeological sites and ancient monuments had received no more than a cursory examination. Printed accounts - largely confined to the works of Gale, Stukeley, the county histories and Gough's Britannia - were often unreliable, and Smith made it his business to evaluate them. 266

At first Smith's ideas were no better than his contemporaries': he regarded the Silchester amphitheatre as defensive, 267 and "Caesar's Camp", the Iron Age fort at Keston, as "unquestionably Roman". 268 But by 1840, Smith's knowledge had improved, aided by a cautious approach to interpretation that set aside the traditional reliance upon literary sources, ancient and modern. This is illustrated by his contribution, in 1841, to newspaper correspondence arising from the discovery of skeletons in road-works on the Pilgrims Way near Wrotham, Kent. One writer supposed that the skeletons were those of murdered Canterbury pilgrims,

---

265 CRS:J2, 25 July 1837.
266 e.g. CRS:J4, 4 May and 9 Aug. 1841.
267 CRS:J2, 25 July 1837.
268 CRS:J2, 16 Apl. 1837.
buried in the road to elude discovery (Leney 1841). Another considered them Danish, quoting a record that Edmund Ironside beat the Danish King at Otford in 1016 and pursued him to Aylesford ("J.P.A." 1841; p. 59). Such fanciful interpretations stand in sharp contract to Smith's restrained comments that the burials had probably preceded the road, and that one could sometimes distinguish British from Roman burials by the grave-goods (Smith 1841c).

When visiting field monuments, Smith enjoyed the company of local antiquarians with whom he could exchange ideas and information. Thus, in March 1840, on inspecting St. Martin's church, Canterbury, Smith was advised that reused Roman tile could also be observed in the fabric of other Kentish churches. He decided to make an informal survey, noting numerous instances, which he took as evidence of nearby Roman occupation. The walls of St. Paul's Cray were also seen to incorporate pieces of flattened mortar, which Smith considered must have come from the painted walls of a nearby villa. Its existence still awaits confirmation.

Such observations developed Smith's interest in Roman masonry, on which he later became an acknowledged expert. His initial interpretations, although based on careful observation, were nevertheless sometimes seriously mistaken. Whilst noting that the tile in the vaults below Colchester Castle lacked evidence of reuse - broken edges and adherence of mortar - as seen in Kentish churches, Smith nevertheless assumed that the structure was of one build. Since the mortar used in its superstructure was akin to that in nearby ecclesiastical buildings and too sandy for Roman, he dated the castle as post-Roman and concluded that Roman style tile was made after the Roman occupation - a common fallacy today (pers. comm. Dr. I Betts). The notion was seemingly

269 CRS:J4, 17 Mar. 1840.
270 CRS:J4, 5 Apl. and 31 May 1840, and 7 Aug. 1841; CRS:J5, 22 May, 27 June, 12, 17, 23 and 25 Aug. 1842, respectively.
confirmed by an arch of apparently unused Roman tile that
connected the Dover pharos with the adjacent Saxon chapel.\textsuperscript{272}
Thus, to the end of his life, Smith maintained that
Colchester castle contained nothing whatever of Roman origin
(Smith 1886, 33).

In fairness to Smith, his arguments against the Roman origin
of Colchester castle were archaeologically more valid than
the Revd Henry Jenkin's arguments in favour of its origin as
the temple of Claudius, the truth of which is now confirmed
(Jenkins 1853; 1869). Moreover, within hours of
misinterpreting Colchester castle, Smith made an important
discovery: the guard room of the Balkerne gate (perhaps the
most complete structure of its kind in Britain), which had
been blocked with brickwork and was unknown to local
antiquarians (Smith 1846e, 32).\textsuperscript{273} He also made sensible
observations at Porchester and Pevensey, where:

"A close attention ... to the walls ..., together with comparison with other
similar work in this country, will easily determine the proper appropriation of the
different parts ... that the outer walls are in fact Roman, but in places repaired
and coated at various times; that the whole of the interior is of far later
date".\textsuperscript{274}

Archaeological Destruction

Having recognised the importance of Porchester castle, Smith
was alarmed to hear that it was threatened with
demolition.\textsuperscript{275} He cannot have been too surprised, however,
for indifference to historic monuments was widespread, and
in the absence of restrictive legislation, even structures
of national importance were vulnerable. The famed Roman
mosaics at Crondall had been:

"... wantonly destroyed by ... the jealousy of some neighbours of the present
labourers who inhabit the cottage near the field, and who having formerly had the

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{272} CRS: J4, 20 Sep. 1842.
  \item \textsuperscript{273} CRS: J4, 22 Oct. 1841; CRS: J5, 23 Aug. 1842; RP: II, CRS
to WHR(?), 25 Aug. 1842.
  \item \textsuperscript{274} CRS: J4, 12 Aug. 1841.
  \item \textsuperscript{275} CRS: J3, 30 Dec. 1839.
\end{itemize}
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The owner had not intervened. Other monuments were being eroded by tourists, who liked to remove pieces of them as souvenirs. In 1842, Smith asked the Duke of Wellington to station a sentry by the Dover pharos to prevent further damage. Two years later, he returned to find that a cheaper solution had been adopted - the entrances had been blocked with masonry.

The same indifference was manifest in ecclesiastical buildings. These were frequently damp and dilapidated, their fittings damaged or sold off, their precincts strewn with rubble and rubbish (Piggott 1976b, 176). At Quarr, IOW, an early font was in use as a bird-bath. Architectural details revealed during alterations were seldom recorded. A wall-painting of monks, found at Priory Farm, Carisbrook, IOW, was immediately destroyed. There were numerous instances of demolition, often with official sanction as in the case of Reculver church.

Because of subsequent acts of destruction, the descriptions and sketches of archaeological sites in Smith's journals include valuable data, as yet unincorporated within our Sites and Monuments Records (for summaries, see Appendix 2a). For instance, cropmarks near Hook, Hampshire, indicated walls whose Roman origin was suggested by pottery, tesserae, and a coin of Constantine I. A nearby pond was said to be "paved", and brickwork had been found in a hedgerow. Presumably these remains have since been destroyed without further record; in 1954, limited

276 CRS: J2, 26 July 1837.
278 CRS: J3, 6 May 1838.
279 CRS: J3, 26 Jan. 1839.
280 CRS: J3, 13 Nov. 1839.
281 CRS: J2, 9 Nov. 1837.
282 CRS: J4, 8 Aug. 1841.
283 CRS: J2, 25 July 1837.
excavations prior to gravel pitting revealed Romano-British ditches, but the published report makes no mention of buildings (see Ashbee 1987).

From around 1838, the need for protective measures and archaeological rescue work became acute as the pace of railway construction and associated town growth quickened. Smith was alerted to this as newspaper reports of discoveries and destruction became correspondingly more frequent. 284 In the winter of 1838-9, he heard that two mosaics discovered in building the Great Western Railway near Basildon, Berkshire, were faced with imminent destruction. Smith immediately informed J.G. Nichols of The Gentleman's Magazine, 285 and at the next meeting of the Antiquaries, remarked to George Godwin:

"... on the great want of energy in the Society in regard to their obtaining correct and circumstantial information on discoveries ... which from want of being investigated by competent persons with the assistance of a good draftsman are too often suffered to remain unrecorded". 286

It was left to Smith to investigate the Basildon finds. Although the associated buildings had been destroyed without record, coloured drawings had been prepared of the mosaics, and Smith gained permission to copy them. He also visited the site, established the former position of the buildings from a cottager and a scatter of debris, and published his findings (Smith 1840c; 1844f). 287 On reporting his efforts to the Antiquaries, the Director, John Gage Rokewood, advised Smith:

"... to write to him whenever I wanted the sanction of the Society for engaging assistance of an artist in cases of emergency". 288

Unfortunately, Rokewood died sixteen months later. 289 There was no one else to whom he could turn, and Smith doubtless

284 CRS:J3, 23 Dec. 1838.
285 CRS:J3, 12 Dec. 1838; for Smith's first encounter with Peto, see 10 Nov. 1838.
287 CRS:J3, 16 Mar., and 10 and 13 Apl. 1839.
288 CRS:J4, 17 June 1841.
289 CRS:J5, 18 Oct. 1842.
had in mind the Basildon pavements when in 1844 he called upon the Government to make provision in railway bills for the preservation of Roman villas - at least until they could be recorded (Smith 1844f, 68). In Germany and Austria, similar measures were already in effect (Sklenár 1983, 82).

Meanwhile, in Britain archaeological rescue work was limited to intermittent unofficial efforts by local antiquarians. The only excavations which Smith encountered during his excursions comprised an inconclusive dig at Centurion Apse, near Brading, IOW, and the Revd Henry Jenkins' excavation, at Gosback Farm, Essex, of a "Roman villa", now shown to have been a temple (Jenkins 1847; Smith 1850e; Hawkes and Hull 1947, 10-11).\(^{290}\) (In Smith's day, Roman ruins and rubble in the countryside were generally interpreted as villas.) The Society of Antiquaries gave neither help nor encouragement. In 1840, when the Dean of Hereford announced his intention to excavate Kenchester and sought financial assistance from the Society, Sir Henry Ellis immediately refused.\(^{291}\)

**French Archaeology 1815-1843**

By contrast, French societies actively promoted excavations, as Smith was well aware. In 1842, he visited Etaples (Pas-de-Calais), to examine a Roman coastal settlement excavated by the Society of Antiquaries of the Morini (Smith 1886, 133).\(^{292}\) In 1843, when Roman remains were found near Calais, the same Society provided 400 francs for excavations.\(^{293}\)

Since in all such matters the French were in advance of the English, it is paradoxical that the intellectual impetus for developments in France came largely from England. Whereas

---

\(^{290}\) Respectively: CRS:J2, 9 Sep. 1836; CRS:J5, 24 Aug. 1842.

\(^{291}\) BL:DMS, Add. MS. 36653(7), Diary of Sir H. Ellis for 1838-9, 26 Oct. 1840.

\(^{292}\) CRS:J5, 25 Sep. 1842.

\(^{293}\) RP:II, CRS to WHR, 27 Dec. 1843.
contacts between England and western Europe had been severely restricted by the Revolution, the restoration of stability following Waterloo had permitted a new generation of Antiquaries to cross the channel. Initially, their attention was drawn to megalithic monuments and the Bayeux Tapestry, the early date of which was established on art historical grounds (Gurney 1818; de la Rue 1814; Stothard 1821; 1821-3). But it was their studies in medieval architectural which set the standards by which contemporary theoretical developments must be judged, and which most influenced antiquarian thought in Northern France.

Within Britain, the foremost architectural writer was Thomas Rickman who, in attempting to provide a basis for judging designs for "Commissioner's churches" and restorations, established the present nomenclature ("Early English", "Decorated" and "Perpendicular") for the first phases of the Gothic style in England (Rickman 1817; Pevsner 1972, 29). He then proceeded to determine the relationship between English Decorated and the French "flamboyant" (Rickman 1834; 1836).

Rickman's approach was developed by R. Willis and W. Whewell. The latter's Architectural Notes on German Churches is remarkable for basing its dating on "the internal evidence of derivation and succession" instead of consecration dates, and its:

"... sound speculation ... founded on the accurate knowledge of an extensive collection of particular instances" (Whewell 1830, 25 and 70-71, respectively).

Unlike earlier writers, Whewell arranged his descriptions not by buildings, but by architectural elements, such as profiles of mouldings of which he provided an extensive series. Willis was interested in comparing styles within Gothic, to which end in 1832-3 he travelled through France, Italy and Germany. His subsequent essay became the first of several marked by rigour of description and attention to engineering aspects of architecture (Willis 1835). His 1842 paper "On the Construction of Vaults..." took the novel
approach of studying mason's guide marks and the upper surfaces of vaults, thereby establishing "a standard of insight and meticulous accuracy which has never since - in England or anywhere else - been surpassed" (Pevsner 1972, 54).

Although all these men became members of the Société Française pour la Conservation des Monuments Historiques (SFCMH 1843), it was the more modest work of slightly earlier English writers (Britton, Kerrich, Gally-Knight, Cotman, etc.) which inspired "the founders of French archaeology", - le Prévost, de Gerville, and especially Arcisse de Caumont (Pevsner 1972, 18-45; Evans 1956, 233-4; Caumont 1838). Although Smith never met de Caumont, who was out when he called in 1843, he spent several days with de Gerville, who became a correspondent and later attended the BAA's Winchester congress (Smith 1883, 25 and 117). De Gerville was well known to English antiquaries, having taken refuge in England from 1798-1801. On returning to France, he had loaned English architectural books to de Caumont, thereby assisting his classification of French architecture (Caumont 1824).

De Caumont was a great teacher and proselyte. His famous Cours d'antiquités monumentales was inspired by his efforts to train younger members of the local archaeological society he created in 1823: the Société des Antiquaires de Normandie (Caumont 1830-41). Whilst exploring France in preparation for this work, de Caumont met various like-minded antiquarians, who in 1832, united to save the baptistery of Saint-Jean de Poitiers. The following year, inspired by the German scientific congress of 1828 (p. 180), de Caumont held at Caen a Congrès scientifique et archéologique de France, which in 1834 spawned the Société Française pour la Conservation des Monuments Historiques. Many of the antiquarians whom Smith met in France were members (Smith 294 CRS:J5, 11 Sep. 1843.)
1883, 76). De Caumont immediately supplied the Société with a journal, which he edited - the Bulletin Monumental.

Before long, the Société was holding several meetings a year in different provincial centres. Reports and papers were read, questions were asked to stimulate investigation, sums of money were voted for research and building conservation (mostly church repairs), and those attending were taken on antiquarian excursions. The Société held these meetings by invitation from local antiquarians, whose aim was often to enlist support for their efforts to save local ancient monuments. (Local authorities in France did not always share the enlightened views of the French government.)

One meeting each year was held to coincide with the Congrès Scientifique..., which united archaeology with other disciplines.

These developments encouraged the growth of local museums and of archaeological and historical societies, who now took over the tradition of local studies formerly sustained by the Sociétés des Belles-Lettres. Some local museums, like Caen, were run by these societies. Others, like Rouen, already received support from one of the regional départements created by Napoleon in 1800 (Chirol 1924, xiv). (There were ninety such départements, each headed by a Préfet appointed by the Ministère de l'Intérieur.) Although sometimes displayed without "classification", and rarely supplied with catalogues, Smith gained a favourable impression of French museums, commenting that:

"Those only ... who have examined the museums ... can form a correct notion of their rich and varied contents, of their systematic arrangement, and of the courteous and kind attentions with which strangers at all times are welcomed"

(Smith 1848a, 170).

---

297 CRS:J5, 9 Sep. 1843.
The growth of the French societies encouraged governmental support for archaeology. Some of the départements had already established their own regional Commissions. These met several times a year to advise on the preservation and conservation of historic monuments and to disperse local government grants for museums and excavations. It was grants by the Commission départemental des Antiquités de la Seine-Inférieure which funded the excavation of the Lillebonne amphitheatre in 1824, and which from 1835 set the Abbé Cochet on his antiquarian career by enabling him to excavate Roman remains in his parish at Étretat (Haute Marne) (Chirol 1924, xiii; Manneville 1978, 88).

At national level, the Ministère de Commerce et des Travaux publics had for some years employed an inspector of historic monuments and national antiquities (Grenier 1831, 61-62). Now, in 1834, the year of the Caen Congress, a Commission des Monuments historiques was established at the Ministère de l'Intérieur to conserve historic monuments. In 1836, the Ministère set aside 120,000 francs for this purpose, which by 1848 had risen to 800,000 francs (Léon 1951, 165-6). At the same time, the historian Guizot, Minister for Education, created two related committees at the Ministère de l'Instruction publique: a Comité des Travaux historique to compile an inventory of French historical documents and, in 1837, a Comité des Arts et Monuments to do the same for historic monuments. Over the next decades these Comités were to produce numerous weighty tomes, the compilation of which depended upon a supply of information from local antiquarians. To this end Guizot fostered links with local societies, created local correspondents, and encouraged the Comités to distribute lists of questions about local antiquities and advice on answering them (Grenier 1931, 58-59).
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The results were immediate and impressive. In 1841, those attending meetings of the Société heard that a statistical survey of 700 churches in Le Mans diocese had shown that 500 of them dated from the 11th or 12th centuries, an inventory of monuments of the Upper Loire - chronologically and geographically arranged - had been compiled, and archaeological maps had been produced of the Anjou region and of Celtic monuments in Le Maine. The local society at Angers had preserved a Roman aqueduct; the French government had excavated at Jublains, which it had recently purchased; and a course in archaeology had been established at the Diocesan Seminary of Touraine (SFCMH 1841).

In reality, many of these achievements lacked substance. The French vogue for archaeology was short-lived, there was no ancient monuments legislation, and after 1871, government support was largely withdrawn, the image of archaeology having been tarnished by its association with former authoritarian regimes (Schnapp 1984). By the 1850s, even Smith was beginning to recognise that the situation was far from perfect (Smith 1853-4, 79; 1860d, 172). But compared with the position in England during the late 1830s, Smith found much to admire in France, and during the 1840s, constantly pointed to the French system as a model of what English archaeology might become if it could but attract state support (e.g. Anon. 1850d).

English Societies and Publications

In the event, not until the foundation in 1908 of the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments, was there an effective English equivalent to the French Commissions and Comités des Arts et Monuments. There had been six Record Commissions from 1800-31, but lacking specialist knowledge, the commissioners had improved neither the conservation nor the accessibility of Britain's national records, and had squandered large sums on publications of dubious
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scholarship. In 1838, the British government remedied matters through the Public Record Office Act, which placed the national records under the Master of the Rolls, reduced the exorbitant search fees, and recognised the need for a central repository (although building did not begin until 1851). Nevertheless, the failure of the Commissions probably contributed to a persistent unwillingness to provide state funds to preserve the national monuments, let alone the appointment of further commissions on historical matters (Levine 1986, 101-3 and 122).

Where the state failed, however, private effort in part succeeded, for in 1838, the year of the Public Record Office Act, T.C. Croker, president of the Noviomagians, founded a historical printing club, The Camden Society, which Smith immediately joined. It became the most successful of over thirty similar clubs established in the wake of the Surtees Society, founded in 1834 (for an incomplete list see idem., Appendix II). Building upon the traditional method of printing by subscription, the clubs aimed to publish old documents and source books, filling a gap left by the Record Commissions. However, whereas the Commissions' publications had been cumbersome, costly and poorly edited, the clubs used smaller, inexpensive formats, benefiting from a recent trend towards cheap literature led by the new popular periodicals (Heyck 1982, 33-34).

The clubs' success encouraged attempts to establish new antiquarian periodicals. From September 1841, J.O. Halliwell, publisher of manuscripts and founder of literary societies, collaborated with his former university friend, Thomas Wright, in editing The Archaeologist and Journal of Antiquarian Science. It aimed to review archaeological publications, to be "a depository for ... notices of local antiquarian discoveries" and to summarise the proceedings of antiquarian societies, British and foreign. Smith supplied

---

300 CRS:J2, 5 Apl. 1838.
it with reports of meetings of the Society of Antiquaries (see Appendix 1a).

The Archaeologist ... achieved little more than the antiquarian sections of The Gentleman's Magazine, and folded within six months. But the need for a better means of publishing local antiquarian discoveries remained. Smith's excursions had made him aware that large amounts of unpublished information were held by local antiquarians. By encouraging them, he obtained several papers for Archaeologia (Smythe 1842a; 1842b; Charles 1844; Chaffers 1844c). But others, like W.H. Rolfe, E.T. Artis and William Wire, lacked the confidence or ability to publish. On one occasion, Wire complained that:

"The local newspapers are not willing to put anything in them relating to antiquities... beside if they were to insert them, some one who has had a classical education... would most probably... hold me up to ridicule".

Artis was a self-educated man who could not commit his ideas to writing; it was perhaps because for this reason - as much as his desire to avoid giving free copies to the copyright libraries - that his work on The Durobrivae of Antoninus... consists of plates with no text (Artis 1828; Anon. 1851a). Such people were nevertheless often willing for Smith to write up their discoveries. Smith, it must be said, relished every opportunity to get into print, yet could claim to have "never written on the discoveries of friends unless asked; and so most have been lost". He discovered this role for himself in 1840, when an enquiry about caves at Settle, Yorkshire, led to the delivery of a parcel of Roman antiquities. Smith obtained a scientific report on the bones, and subsequently published a joint article with the finder in Archaeologia (Smith and Jackson 1842).
Smith was nevertheless increasingly dissatisfied with *Archaeologia*. His research had shown the need for "facts, copiously illustrated but sparingly dilated with theory", (Smith 1848b, v). *Archaeologia* was frequently the reverse. Smith was understandably upset when drawings and maps submitted for publication were omitted, partly to save costs, and partly because of poor editorial judgement. The Antiquaries' publications, like those of the Record Commissions, had for years suffered financial problems, and for the same reasons (Evans 1956, 236-7). The variable academic quality of *Archaeologia* arose because high office in the Antiquaries depended more upon social rank than upon scholarly achievement (Evans 1956, 202; Smith 1854i). Items for publication had to be presented as letters to influential Fellows, with a request that they be submitted for publication if worthy. Thereafter no-one could query their merit without questioning their sponsors' judgement - an impertinence where he was of higher status.

Against this background, Smith commenced *Collectanea Antiqua* - the first journal devoted to archaeology in the modern sense, which also expressed the then novel concept that it is an archaeologist's duty to publish. First appearing in 1843, *Collectanea* was produced in parts, at irregular intervals, when material became available or an issue arose upon which Smith wished to comment. It contains most of Smith's important short articles, and eventually filled seven volumes, the last issued in 1880.

Recently described as "a unique microcosm of the whole of Victorian archaeology" (Gretton 1979), *Collectanea* was hailed by one of Smith's contemporaries as a standard work of reference, to replace Horsley and Gough (Anon. 1849b). Another writer classed it with Stukeley's *Itinerarium Curiosum* (Anon. 1852c), while *The Saturday Review* regarded it as mere:
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"... odds and ends; they do not make a book; they are more like a collection of magazine papers. One hardly knows why Mr. Roach Smith should have chosen this form for the results of his own researches" (Anon. 1868b).

In truth, there is no other archaeological publication quite like Collectanea - in content, form or appearance. It concentrates upon the illustration of minor antiquities, but also includes accounts of excavations, structural remains, and from 1851, of Smith's antiquarian excursions (for contents, see Appendix 1a). In the number of illustrations, Collectanea surpassed every contemporary archaeological journal, British and foreign. To achieve this, Smith avoided the elaborate and expensive plates of Archaeologia, for a simpler and cheaper mode of execution. At first, he both drew and etched the plates himself, although he gave up etching as soon as he could obtain professional assistance (Smith 1886, 20-21). As the work proceeded, the plates become subordinate to the text, but the early parts of Volume I consist of plates of antiquities supported by brief descriptions on the pattern of Caylus (1752-66). Even the title "Collectanea" recalls the French "Receuil" (p. 51).

Although a private venture, Collectanea relied upon collaboration and financial support from many other antiquarians. Smith's papers draw heavily upon the private collections he visited during his excursions, and many of the plates and woodcuts were freely provided by friends, as was the index to Volume I (Smith 1883, 151). It also includes papers by other writers. Some contain information of considerable interest, such as the first archaeological evidence for the site of Saxon Southampton (Keele and Smith 1855; Addyman and Hill 1968-9, 65, etc.).

It is nevertheless unlikely that Smith hoped his Collectanea, like Caumont's Bulletin and Akerman's Numismatic Journal, might become the journal of a new
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society. Smith placed too high a value upon his editorial freedom, commenting that:

"I have no one to interfere with me... I can do with it what no societies can effect; I can give just as many illustrations as I please."  

The freedom nevertheless carried a penalty in both time and money. Although Collectanea was obtainable through the bookseller J.R. Smith, around half of the copies were purchased directly from Smith by subscription. This involved Smith in the considerable labour of circulating prospectuses, reminders for payment, and the volumes themselves. The small print-run (around 250) meant that by the time Volume II had appeared in 1852, Volume I was already scarce and, to Smith's chagrin, fetched more second-hand than he had charged subscribers (Anon. 1852e).  

Meanwhile, Smith had made a loss of £100 and £250 on Volumes I and II respectively.  

With his chemists' business in decline, the future of Collectanea hung in the balance: "... my friends are pressing me to go on ..." Smith complained - "I know not how to do so and I know not how to decline". He decided to proceed only after the Antiquaries had refused an important paper on Saxon grave-goods found in 1846-7 at Ozingell (Osengal), Kent, which he had offered for Archaeologia on condition that they defrayed his artist's expenses. Smith therefore used the paper to begin Collectanea Vol. III, which he supplied by subscription only in an attempt to stop it being sold above or below the publication price. This was a gamble since the only certain benefit of publishing by subscription was that it avoided having to donate five free copies to the copyright libraries.  
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increase the subscribers from 136 to around 250 (Smith 1854g).

**A Society to Preserve National Monuments**

From its inception in 1843, *Collectanea* provided an ideal platform for Smith to promulgate his views on archaeological rescue and preservation, which were that: "what has been done for France, may be accomplished in England" (Smith 1843c, 27). The scale of archaeological destruction was evident from newspaper articles and letters from fellow antiquarians, and Smith observed it daily in the City of London. As a result of his excursions, Smith had made contact with numerous local antiquarians. Given a little instruction, they undoubtedly could do something to help if only they could be organised, and if only the government would legislate and provide financial assistance. All of this had been achieved in northern France, and Smith had personally seen the results.

Others were of the same mind. In January 1842, Britton told Smith how in 1835 he and E.W. Brayley had issued a prospectus for an "Archaeological and Topographical Institution of Great Britain". Its aim, under the direction of a metropolitan and county committees, would be to do for Britain what the Comité des Arts et Monuments was doing in France: to investigate and publish the country's antiquities, in classified and chronological order, by county, beginning with Kent (Smith 1886, 91). Lack of time (and one suspects support) had caused Britton to abandon the idea (Britton 1850, 37 ff.). It nevertheless seems to have struck a chord with Smith, in that six days after his conversation with Britton, Smith and C.T. Smythe were compiling a list of potential members for a society to obtain "statistical information" on the antiquities of
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Kent. Smythe was urged to issue a prospectus, but failed to act (Smith 1883, 148).

At this time, Smith began at intervals to discuss with Thomas Wright the possibility of a British equivalent of the Société Française (Smith 1880d, 247; p. 167). An Anglo-Saxon scholar with a remarkable capacity for work, Wright had settled in Brompton shortly after receiving his Cambridge M.A. in 1836. As well as acting as secretary or treasurer to various historical and literary societies, Wright made his living by writing brilliantly, if sometimes inaccurately, on all sorts of historical subjects (DNB; Levine 1986, 14). This was unusual - most FSAs lived off private income and, like Smith, Wright suffered from social prejudice by the Antiquaries, who according to Smith, accepted his contributions "more as favours conferred on him" (Smith 1883, 81; Levine 1986, 22). Having a French wife, Wright was a frequent visitor to Paris and spoke the language fluently. He was acquainted with Guizot, through whose influence he was elected in 1842 to the Institute des Arts et Sciences and made Foreign Correspondent to the Académie des Inscriptions et belles Lettres.

Wright was disposed to wait until the government had appointed an equivalent of the French Minister of Public Instruction. There were some grounds for optimism because the idea of providing free access to Britain's national monuments had gained ground during the 1830s, attracting a petition to the Queen (HCPP 1837-8). The principal signatory was the radical M.P. and educational reformer, Joseph Hume, who in 1841, had chaired a Parliamentary select committee to:

"... inquire into the present state of the National Monuments and Works of Art in Westminster Abbey, in St. Paul's Cathedral, and in other Public Edifices; to consider the best means for their protection, and for affording facilities to the
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We may note in passing, the utilitarian justification for conserving and studying antiquity, which since the time of George II if not earlier had been regarded as able "not only to inform the minds of men, but also to incite them to virtuous and noble actions" (e.g. Evans 1956, 104). From the early 1840s, however, as well as distracting the public from "frivolous amusements and criminal pursuits" (Smith 1845c, 268), Smith and his contemporaries began to link antiquarian studies with:

"... a loyal and patriotic feeling ... inseparable from the growing interest in the conservation of all National Monuments, in the keen search after Historic Truth, or in tracing the establishment of National Institutions" (AI 1855, 399; cf. Way 1844; Smith 1848b; Levine 1986, 93-94).

Hume was hoping for a British version of the French Commission, which would produce an inventory of British national monuments. In March 1841, immediately before the select committee began its work, he asked J.B. Nichols privately to organise a petition along these lines. He also corresponded with Smith on the subject, and later sent him a copy of the committee's report (Smith 1873). Among those interviewed by the committee was John Britton, who argued strongly for a commission and the need for cheap illustrated guide-books. The committee were greatly interested in his views, but raised a number of concerns: that the number and range of potential national monuments was potentially huge, that a commission might lack taste and judgement, and (assuming it was obligatory at least to consult the commission about renovations and restorations) that it might interfere with the rights of owners, or deter them from making repairs, particularly in the case of deans and chapters of cathedrals. Unfortunately, the committee had to terminate its work abruptly due to the unexpected

dissolution of parliament. It recommended improved access to Westminster Abbey and St. Paul's cathedral, observing that measures were needed to preserve and repair them, but was unable to investigate the matter further (Parliamentary Committee 1841, viii).

At the beginning of 1843, Smith discovered that lobbying – private and public – might be as effective as governmental action in preserving ancient monuments. In April, he learnt from Thomas Lott that the Corporation intended to allow the demolition of the finest surviving portion of the city wall at Tower Hill. The Metropolitan Church Fund Society had requested the site for building purposes, and Smith's adversary, R.L. Jones, had agreed to exchange it for some church property near St. Paul's Cathedral, which he wanted for a Corporation development. The Society's request was signed by the Tory M.P., Sir Robert Inglis: a former Records commissioner who had just been elected to the Antiquaries' council (DNB). Smith immediately informed the press, wrote to Sir Robert, and contacted various officials of the Antiquaries, who elected to draft a memo to the Church society jointly with the Royal Institute of British Architects. Sir Robert subsequently received a petition from thirty FSAs. (This was probably the first occasion upon which the Society had used its weight to preserve an ancient monument.) Sir Robert was highly embarrassed. He decided to invite Smith to accompany him to the site at Tower Hill, where he was heard to remark that:

"... these were not times in which people could do exactly as they pleased with such records of antiquity which chance might give them brief possession of; there was a growing feeling ... for the preservation of our works of ancient art; he thought the wall, being useful to illustrate two of three styles of architecture, as well as being the old City boundary, should remain intact".
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Thus the wall was saved, although in 1852 it was incorporated within some warehouses and stables, and hidden from view (Anon. 1852b).

Since publicity alone could deter destruction, Smith now argued that the next step would be to compile details of demolitions and instances of archaeological destruction, so that those responsible for acts of vandalism would know they risked public censure (Smith 1843c, 28; Smith 1852g, xiii). There was no possibility of the Antiquaries undertaking the work. The Society was in a state of torpor; its council was resistant to change; its meetings were dreary, and unless royalty was expected, poorly attended (Planche 1872, 90).327

Meanwhile, 1839 had seen the formation of the Cambridge Camden Society, which aimed to monitor the restoration and design of churches and encourage the reintroduction into the Anglican church of catholic ritual. The aesthetic accompaniment to high church Tractarianism, it typified a tendency to create societies in order to influence government and public opinion; the trend arose no doubt from the growth of political Reform Clubs, and their counterparts: King and Country clubs (Gregg 1965, 78-82).

The trend was further encouraged by the success of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. Like the Société Française ..., the British Association was inspired by the 1828 congress of the Deutscher Naturforscher Versammlung (Howarth 1922; p. 167). Whereas, the Versammlung had previously gained little attention, the acquisition of Royal patronage and the introduction into the programme of excursions, fêtes and concerts had turned the 1828 congress and all subsequent ones into sparkling social occasions. In 1831, the British Association was formed in its image to counter a decline in British science. Thus, in the autumn of 1843, when Smith and Wright concluded that there was no hope in the short term of a Royal Commission on

327 CRS:J4, 21 May 1840; CRS:J5, 27 Jan. 1842.
historic monuments, and that the only way forward was to create a British Archaeological Association, there were precedents at home and abroad for the organisation that emerged.
CHAPTER 8: Archaeological Societies, 1843-51

The formation of the British Archaeological Association, and hence the Archaeological Institute, both of which continue to this day, must rank among Smith's greatest achievements. Yet in 1851, with the exception of the Antiquaries and Numismatic, Smith withdrew from all societies, prefacing Volume II of his Collectanea with a complaint that their growth had promoted "display and drawing-room patronage" instead of "genuine archaeology" (Smith 1852g, xii).

Such remarks naturally caused offence, but many agreed with them, and most reviewers thought them worthy of attention (e.g. Anon. 1852c). They nevertheless drew sneers from The Athenaeum, who asked why, if societies were not benefiting archaeology, Smith belonged to so many — a reference to the title page of Collectanea where Smith had listed the numerous honorary memberships conferred upon him (Anon. 1852d). The jibe highlights a paradox that would appear to support Joan Evans' opinion of Smith as a self-seeker with a chip on his shoulder (p. 74). In outlining Smith's contribution to the BAA, and assessing in what respects and why it failed to achieve his original aims, this chapter also seeks to explain Smith's seemingly contradictory attitudes towards archaeological societies.

The BAA - Aims and Objectives

The BAA was inaugurated on 5 December 1843 at a meeting attended by Wright, Smith, and Dr. Bromet, brought in for his links with French antiquarian societies. The Association's descent from its French precursors is reflected in its name, the term "archaeology" having been more prevalent in France, where it was used to denote the study of arts and monuments (Wright 1866, 5).
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At this initial stage, Smith and Wright contemplated:

"... a small Committee or Club of our more zealous antiquarian friends for the purpose of advising and assisting ... the numerous provincial inquirers who were working apart and unobserved ...; these were to be appointed correspondents; and as we thought of meeting quietly at each other's residence without expense, we asked for no subscription, but we looked forward to having a sufficient number of correspondents to support a journal, which was to be our chief means of communication. As we intended to have no members in London, except the small number of members of our Committee, we were necessarily to be self-elected" (Jones 1845).

Accordingly, they compiled a list of 22 names for a provisional committee, including the Antiquaries' Director, Albert Way - "an accomplished scholar, a man of great refinement and erudition" (Bruce 1905, 124) - who had also recently visited Normandy (Way 1842).

At the next meeting, a week later, Way proposed many more names unknown to Smith, and a prospectus was drafted (Wright 1845c). According to this, the Association's purpose would be:

"... to investigate, preserve, and illustrate all Ancient Monuments of the History, Manners, Customs, and Arts of our forefathers, and in furtherance of the principles with which the Society of Antiquaries of London was established, to render available the researches of a numerous class of lovers of Antiquity, who are unconnected with that Institution".

The committee would achieve this by corresponding with antiquarians and institutions like the Comité des Arts et Monuments, by meeting regularly to discuss communications from correspondents, by promoting research and the observation of antiquities found in public works, by collecting drawings and descriptions of national monuments, and by publishing a new inexpensive journal. It would also endeavour to preserve national monuments by lobbying the government and encouraging a "correct taste" for archaeology.330
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Any potential clash between the BAA and the Antiquaries was averted by Way, who argued that their aims were complimentary - the Antiquaries being an elite local body while the BAA was an inclusive, national society (Way 1844, 3). It was agreed that important papers contributed to the BAA should be published in Archaeologia, and in June most of the Central Committee was elected to the Antiquaries' council (Planché 1872, 93; SAL 1843-9, 39).

If Smith made any distinctive contribution to the BAA, it was perhaps in advocating the "utter rejection of any spirit of exclusion" (Anon. 1848b). It was later noted that this policy "secured the co-operation of those who were ex-officio guardians of national monuments" (Anon. 1846a). Smith's intention, however, was to enhance the flow of information, for as Britton had relied upon data from unknown men of humble station (Britton 1850, 49), so Smith's excursions and researches had shown him that such men:

"...will, from local circumstances alone, often be able to render more important and accurate information on particular points, than others with the highest attainments, who happen to be at a distance.... The professed antiquary is often the propounder and supporter of some favorite theory to which he refers all facts or opinions submitted to him.... A simple observer ... with no preconceived notions to sustain, will often furnish more useful materials" (Smith 1845d, 38).

This statement is remarkable also for recognising the value of separating archaeological observation and interpretation - evidence that the BAA was responsible for encouraging a more positivist approach to archaeology. This is further illustrated by Wright's reminiscence that initially:

"...the communications we received from the country consisted for more in opinions and speculations upon antiquities than of detailed and accurate descriptions of them, and it was some time before we could sufficiently impress upon our correspondents that the collecting of facts must precede the deduction of science from them" (Wright 1866, 5).

1843-4, Early Promise
The BAA was soon undergoing exponential growth. By 28 December, seventy correspondents had been enlisted, many from among Smith's contacts, and the Puseyite publisher, J.H. Parker, had offered to publish the Association's Archaeological Journal (Smith 1880d, 246-8).\(^{331}\) The Central Committee now settled down to fortnightly meetings. Smith and Way became honorary secretaries, and Lord Albert Conyngham FSA, M.P., the President. Hundreds enrolled as supporters. Whereas the Numismatic Society numbered 178, a BAA prospectus of June 1844 lists 778, including 95 noblemen and the Archbishop of Canterbury (NS 1844, 37-42).\(^{332}\)

As the Association grew, so did Smith's ambitions:

"Every county will possess its local committee; and every parish at least one member interested in keeping a lively watch over its monuments still remaining and discoveries" (Smith 1845d, 34).

Sadly, this level of organisation was not achieved until the late 1970s when the Inspectorate of Ancient Monuments appointed part-time locally based field monument wardens, so that each scheduled field monument might be checked once every three years (P. de Lange, pers. comm.). The BAA's system of correspondents nevertheless proved very successful, and from 1854 was emulated by the Antiquaries (Evans 1956, 303).\(^{333}\) It was assisted no doubt by the vogue for letter-writing that followed the introduction in 1840 of the penny post. Thus antiquarian information began to pour in from all quarters: reports on discoveries and the condition of monuments, news of excavations and impending publications, drawings of church brasses, details of inscriptions, and parcels of objects for inspection.

The burden of handling this correspondence fell to the Association's secretaries. At first, Smith had declined the office, because:
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"I cannot afford to give up the immense deal of time ... and because I do not think it will add to the influence of that body, that a person in trade as I am, struggling to retain that trade, should fill a post which by rights should only be filled by some one who could afford to throw away a few hundreds per annum. But the very kind and complimentary reply of Mr Way, conquered me".334

In the event, it was Way who, due to delicate health, failed to keep pace with Smith and Wright. When in consequence the first quarterly issue of the Journal was delayed, Wright took over as editor (BAA 1846a, ii). Thus, from the spring of 1844, Wright and Smith handled most of the reporting, and Smith the bulk of the correspondence (Smith 1880d, 248). Smith was a model correspondent, and invariably answered letters on the day of their receipt.335 By November, his health too was suffering.336 It is no coincidence that his manuscript journals terminate in 1843, for the burden of work obliged him to resign as secretary of the Numismatic Society (he nevertheless resumed his services in 1847; Smith 1883, 120). Smith also virtually suspended his Collectanea Antiqua, not least because items that might have appeared in it were now published in the Journal (idem., 150).

The Journal was a considerable achievement. In form and content, it differed from every other archaeological periodical, at home or abroad. Unlike Archaeologia, it was published in octavo for cheapness, and avoided genealogy, local history, and "long and elaborate dissertations". Instead it adopted a polemical tone, with well-illustrated reviews and introductory articles on various topics, by which it aimed to provide model descriptions of historic monuments (Way 1844). Before its first appearance in March 1844, the intention to include within it summaries of Central Committee meetings encouraged the Antiquaries' to publish their own proceedings (SAL 1843-9). The Journal also aimed to cover foreign finds illustrative of British antiquities. Encouraged by donations from French
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antiquaires and the Ministère de l'Instruction publique, it made a particular attempt to review French antiquarian activities and publications.

In June, the Association scored a notable success when it assisted Revd John Sydenham in saving the Saxon barrow cemetery in Greenwich Park, which was threatened by plans to build a reservoir (BAA 1845, 167). The campaign reached the correspondence columns of the Times, where Smith refuted an argument that the barrows had been destroyed by Douglas's excavations (Smith 1844b). His comments placed Lord Lincoln and others in an unfavourable light, causing Crofton Croker to conclude that Smith's letter "neither in tone or temper is likely to advance the interests of the ... Society".  

It nevertheless helped to bring the issue before the House of Commons, which received an assurance that the workmen had been ordered to replace on the barrows the earth that had been removed (BAA 1845, 249-52)! Despite the damage, at least twenty barrows are visible today - comprising the only Kentish barrow cemetery to survive as seen by Smith and Faussett.

The positive outcome of this campaign demonstrates a growing public interest in barrows, engendered by recent work on the "Bartlow Hills", Essex, (the largest group of Romano-British tumuli). A series of excavations here by Lord Maynard and John Rokewood Gage - watched by ladies and dignitaries including Whewell, Henslow and Lord Braybrooke - had produced spectacular grave goods (Gage 1834; 1836; 1840; Rokewood 1842). These excavations later inspired Hon. R.C. Neville's important Saxon cemetery excavations in Cambridgeshire (Smith 1886, 48; p. 264).

September 1844 - The Canterbury Congress

Privately, the Central Committee had hoped from the beginning to hold an annual congress to consider local
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monuments and encourage local gentlemen to communicate information and display their collections. The newly established railway system made such gatherings possible, and Canterbury, placed within its reach since 1842 and near Lord Albert's country seat, provided an obvious first venue (James 1983, 89).

Due to Way's illness, preparations for the Congress fell largely to Smith. While he laboured away, various members of the Central Committee went about prognosticating ridiculous failure. But suggestions that Way's illness was diplomatic (cf. Marsden 1984, 27) are probably incorrect because immediately before the Congress, Way wrote Smith a letter of warm encouragement.

In fact, the Congress exceeded its organisers' wildest hopes, and sealed a life-long friendship between Lord Albert, Smith, Wright, and other leading participants (Smith 1861b, 261-9). Nearly two hundred attended, including Whewell, Buckland and Henslow of the British Association (Howarth 1922, 27 and 300). The influence of its scientific precursor is also evident also in organisation of the Congress, in that it too appointed subject committees, namely: medieval, architecture, history, and primeval (a term invented by Smith to denote everything prior to the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons in the 7th century AD). Similarly, the exhausting schedule of lectures was interspersed with excursions, and followed by music and dancing (cf. p. 180; Pl. 13).

There was a surplus of papers, some of importance, by persons such as Bateman, J.A. Repton, Professor Willis and Thomas Wright. The latter gave a sparkling paper on social history as revealed by Canterbury's municipal archives.
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Previously unarranged in a damp cellar, the impending congress had encouraged the Corporation to transfer the archives to a dry room above the town hall (Wright 1846a). Here was further proof that the BAA's influence might improve the care of "national monuments".

The exhibitions and excursions provided for many a first opportunity to examine English antiquities. Among other items, Smith exhibited some pilgrim badges - a class of object previously unrecognised in England (Smith 1883, 11). On day two of the Congress, around fifty carriages transported the entire assembly to "Breach Down" (more correctly, Derrystone Down, Barham), where Lord Albert had arranged for eight Saxon barrows to be excavated to within a foot of the interments so that the company could participate in the process of discovery (Pl. 12). Despite heavy showers, the exhumations aroused enormous enthusiasm, giving a further impetus to barrow digging (Dunkin 1845a, 97-114; Marsden 1974).

The Congress received full press coverage, and was praised for dispelling ignorance of the past and having:

"... generated in the public mind a more healthy and elevated tone than had previously prevailed, in regard to the works of art and national monuments of the past" (Anon. 1844b).

It nevertheless drew derision from Peter Cunningham of The Athenaeum, a disciple of Walpole (p. 54), who thought the Association ought instead to improve the restoration of Gothic architecture and establish a museum of British church brasses and the like. Complaining that "Roman remains in Britain will add little or nothing to our stock-book of architectural models", he proceeded to ridicule Smith as "father of these broken pottery displays" (Cunningham 1844a; 1844b). Smith was understandably upset, but it was pointed out to him that The Athenaeum was probably just taking an opposite position to its rival The Literary Gazette.342

342 CRS:BAA1, W. Masters to CRS, 4 Oct. 1844.
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Winter 1844-5 - The Schism

For a while, the Congress seemed to have crowned the many successes of the past nine months. During this brief period, the Association had acquired over 800 supporters; it had established a highly innovative journal, which was attracting a regular flow of antiquarian information and papers; and its influence alone had proven sufficient to ameliorate the fate of archives and field monuments. It was therefore a genuine disaster that the Athenaeum article should prove to be a portent of things to come, in that by March 1845 the Association was rent into two rival factions, by what Smith called "the demons of discord and mischief who severed friends and broke ranks for their selfish ends".343

The following description of the events surrounding the split is necessarily abbreviated, although it does incorporate some new insights derived from manuscript sources. Further details may be found in a contemporary account, probably by Smith and Wright (BAA 1846a), and summaries by Marsden (1984, 25-35) and Taylor (1932).

The schism arose partly because the Association lacked a workable constitution. It comprised a self-appointed committee of London residents, regional correspondents appointed by them, and self-declared supporters without any rights. No subscriptions were required, the intention being to cover expenses from donations and the sale of the Journal (Way 1844, 4). Although published at Parker's risk, one half of any profits were to go to the Association (BAA 1846a, xii).

It was an issue concerning publication that triggered the dissensions, in that immediately following the Congress, Smith, Wright and their colleagues hoped to consolidate

343 BAC III, CRS to TB, Aug. 14, 1847.
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their success by publishing a volume of proceedings. To this end, Wright advised that they should form "a very close and very strict committee; and must admit none of the rubbish". Unfortunately, the BAA's Printing Committee disagreed, causing Smith to complain that they "have overruled me as usual. Some [papers] will come in the 'Archaeologia', some in the 'Journal' and some not at all".

This decision ignored the golden opportunity provided by the Congress for popular archaeological publications, and so opened the door to private initiatives. A.J. Dunkin, with Smith's sanction, began a volume on the Congress based upon his private notes and newspaper accounts (Dunkin 1845a). An Antiquarian and Architectural Year Book was announced, to summarise every paper presented that year (Anon. 1845f). Meanwhile, a bookseller had asked Wright to prepare The Archaeological Album, which although different in style and content to The Archaeological Journal, bore a similar name and began by summarising the Canterbury congress.

When the first part of Wright's Album appeared in December 1844, Parker immediately complained that it would damage sales of the Journal, arousing fears that he might abandon its publication. There followed an acrimonious Printing Committee meeting, after which Smith grumbled that:

"The Committee would not support me in wishing to have a separate Report and now
cry out bitterly at our not having one instead of Mr Dunkin and Mr. Wright".

Privately, Parker had another cause for concern, for whereas Wright had previously edited the Journal for nothing, in September he had written suggesting an annual fee of sixty to eighty pounds. Unknown to Wright and the Printing
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344 CRS:BAA1, TCC to TW, 22 Sep. 1844; JOH to CRS, 25 Sep. 1844.
345 CRS:BAA1, TW to CRS, undated.
346 BAC III, CRS to TB, 6 Oct. 1844.
347 AJD:BAA1, CRS to AJD, 9 Oct. 1844.
348 AJD:BAA1, CRS to AJD, 28 Nov. 1844.
349 BLO:MAL, W. Bromet to CRS, 7 Jan. 1845.
Committee, Parker had been running the Journal at a loss (Dunkin 1845b)!

Way, who through illness had attended only one Printing Committee meeting since June, now saw his chance to regain control, and at its meeting on 28 December proposed to issue a circular stating that The Archaeological Journal was the only publication authorised by the BAA. His motion was passed by three to two. Smith and Wright immediately threatened to resign from the Printing Committee because the circular contradicted the Association's aim of encouraging publications. Although it was issued in the name of the BAA, it had also not been approved by the Central Committee.

Smith and Wright were persuaded to stay on by Lord Albert, whereupon Way decided to seek assistance from his supporters. Hence the Central Committee meeting of 22 January was well attended by persons who had done little for the Association, who passed a motion from Hawkins, calling for Wright's resignation from the Printing Committee because he was "editor also of a rival work". On hearing the news, Lord Albert requested the Committee to withdraw this resolution, but at its next meeting on 12 February, Hawkins and another member stoutly refused. Sir Richard Westmacott then asked Wright if, to restore harmony, he would agree to resign, to which, according to Wright:

"I acquiesced without any hesitation, and Sir Richard walked around the table to me and told me, that he thought I had ... 'behaved very handsomely'. Nevertheless, the mover and seconder of the original resolution now carried another, stating, that my resignation was a condition upon which the old resolution was to be erased" (Jones 1845).

It was an action for which Smith never forgave Hawkins, although Hawkins viewed Smith in a kindly light; it was Wright he opposed.351

On learning of the attempt to humiliate Wright, Lord Albert resigned the Presidency, following which T.J. Pettigrew, the

351 SM:CRS, J. Berque to CRS, 6 Dec. 1847.
treasurer and de facto vice-president, received 162 requests for a Special General Meeting. With the Central Committee left under Way's control, Pettigrew (perhaps unwisely) decided to call the SGM himself (BAA 1846a).^352 Thus on 5 March 1845, a gathering of most of the BAA's active workers reformed the Association upon sound lines with Smith and T.C. Croker as secretaries.

For a moment it looked as if Way and his friends were beaten. Wright and Smith had secured the Association's funds, its President, and most of its active workers. They had nevertheless failed to take account of Way's personal following, and, given the lack of a rule-book, of their weak constitutional position. The door was thereby left ajar for Way's Printing Committee to refuse to recognise the meeting.

Thus, amid a flurry of pamphleteering, Way and his friends continued to issue the *Archaeological Journal*, and to press their claim to be the true BAA. Wright's BAA responded by publishing the *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, edited by Smith and Wright, but there ensued deplorable complications. Many supporters were listed as adherents of one half of the Association when they wished to belong to the other; others would join neither while there was dissension;^353 Pettigrew was accused of seizing the funds; and that summer, rival congresses were held in Winchester (BAA 1846b; AI 1846). Fortunately, at its congress, Way's party renamed itself The Archaeological Institute, and a measure of order was restored.

The personal rivalries underlying the split in part explain why Way's party refused every subsequent attempt at reconciliation (Mereweather 1845).^354 For what cause Hawkins should wish to demean Wright is uncertain, but Wright's private correspondence reveals another side to his otherwise
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jolly and engaging character - a love of disputation, bragging, womanising, and joking at another's expense - which might have irritated the very proper Hawkins (cf. Smith 1883, 79). It is also likely that Way had vied with Smith and Wright in demonstrations of antiquarian zeal, and felt humiliated when illness and what Smith termed his "extreme caution" caused him to lag behind. In this regard, Smith records an illuminating incident:

"For some time he [Way] had weekly informed us that he was in hopes of securing for us, through the medium of friends, the particulars of a newly discovered Roman villa and a quantity of coins near Bisley in Gloucestershire. He was not a little surprised at my producing at a further meeting a full account of the whole. "How did you manage this?" inquired Mr. Way. "By writing to the owner," I replied (Smith 1891, 87-88).

The anecdote reveals Smith's characteristic insensitivity in not recognising that such behaviour might cause resentment, especially since Way considered himself socially superior to Smith and Wright, and that they underrated the extent to which his "station and extensive connections" had secured the Association's success (Taylor 1932, 188-9; Wright 1845b). This explains Way's retort, when Pettigrew attempted a reconciliation, that "We will not be dictated to" (Jones 1845). In these circumstances, it must have been tempting to attribute Wright's enthusiasm for archaeology to a desire for pecuniary gain, especially with Parker insinuating that:

"The society consisted of two distinct classes of persons - the one, gentlemen of property and amateurs of Archaeology, ... the other ... professional Archaeologists" (Parker 1887).

Way's best efforts were devoted to despoiling the other party's forthcoming Winchester congress, which took place in the summer of 1845. To this end (according to Smith), Albert Way, Professor Willis and William Vaux of the British Museum had:
... poisoned the minds of the clergy and citizens against us by saying we were radicals, low people, upstarts and plebeians...".356

In *The Athenaeum*, Peter Cunningham expressed such views publicly, deriding Smith and Wright as "the Canterbury Mountebanks", and urging that:

"The traders must go .... We must have no repetition, at Winchester, of the Canterbury cockneyisms of last year... The Secretaries must be disinterested men, of name and standing, ... not zealous for the exultation of themselves..."

(Cunningham 1845).

Such language is typical of the exchanges that took place between February and September 1845 in the correspondence columns of the *Literary Gazette* and its rival *The Athenaeum*. Both factions must bear some of the blame (see Pettigrew 1845; Mereweather 1845), although a neutral observer remarked that:

"The virulence with which that portion of the original committee who appealed to a general meeting of the subscribers, has been assailed by the friends of the other portion, is quite unexampled, and the mode of attack adopted is fraught with dangerous consequences to society at large..." (Anon. 1845k).

In the event, Way's congress was better attended, mainly by new recruits from among the clergy of Oxford and Cambridge and members of both houses of Parliament. Only one hundred attended Wright and Smith's, but their supporters produced a plethora of papers, and it was acknowledged that whereas Way's had prevailed "in the dinners and in the show" Wright and Smith's had made these things "subsidiary to nobler and more legitimate objects" (Anon. 1845n, 19; Smith 1883, 35).357

The Consequences of Schism

By the close of September 1845, both parties had held a successful congress and had thereby shown themselves to be
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viable. Each was able to continue according to its lights, but the consequences for British archaeology were to be serious and long-term.

The issue of who was to blame would not go away. In September 1845, having studied the pamphlets, The Times gave its verdict: that Way and his supporters had wrongly censured Wright, and were guilty of fraud (Anon. 1845o; 1845p). This was small comfort for Smith, who in hope of reconciliation had followed the advice of Dawson Turner in withstanding the sneers and slander without public comment.358 Writing to Bateman, he complained that:

"... I have done everything for peace and harmony.... It is a sad tale to tell, but it must be told and not written. Look at the motion to be made by Wyse after Easter! On this I depend. How will Government like to aid us when we are quarrelling among ourselves?"359

The reference here is to a private member's motion by the Irish radical and former Lord of the Treasury, Sir Thomas Wyse (DNB). This called for two Royal Commissions respectively to draft proposals for a museum of national antiquities, and for the conservation of national monuments. Unfortunately, Wyse argued his case badly, permitting the Chancellor to assert that such measures were unnecessary and unrealistic because most art in England was privately owned (Hansard 1845, 1330-4). Smith's fears concerning the split were nevertheless justified in that Wyse's motion might have fared better if, instead of indulging in dissensions, the Association had rallied public support (Anon. 1845a).

The dissensions also spread to the Antiquaries, where for years to come one society or another attempted to dominate affairs, so that office often depended upon party sympathy more than antiquarian achievement. In 1845, the former prevailed when Smith and every other leading BAA member was
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voted off the council (SAL 1843-9, 87).\textsuperscript{360} Their fortunes were reversed in 1849 and 1850 when, having generated consternation at the Antiquaries by seeking a Royal Charter, the Institute party rarely attended its meetings, which permitted Smith's re-election (SAL 1849, 5; 1850, 73).\textsuperscript{361}

The rivalries delayed by decades the introduction of legislation to protect ancient monuments. Not only did the societies lose credence by their disunity, but whilst paying lip-service to the need for legislation, no society would support a measure proposed by another (Evans 1956, 301; Fox 1872, 172). The same applied to Treasure Trove legislation. After Daniel Wilson's 1852 lecture on the subject, the Institute (aware no doubt that the Antiquaries' had established a committee to examine the subject) referred the matter to the councils of "kindred bodies", and thus stifled the possibility of action (Smith 1852g, xiv; Evans 1956, 273). There were also those in the Institute who held that:

"... many are the cases in which an intelligent Local Association may prove far more effective than any system of legislative control" (Anon. 1848c).

The numerous instances of destruction demonstrated that this was over-optimistic, and Smith roundly condemned the societies for "contenting themselves with expostulations which are not regarded; and in not petitioning Parliament" (Smith 1883, 58).

Smith perhaps had in mind the occasion in 1854 when the Institute and Antiquaries unsuccessfully petitioned the Home Office concerning a bill that allowed railway companies to acquire churchyards without preserving or recording the monumental inscriptions (AI 1854, 176-8). A report to Parliament in 1872 by the Antiquaries' Sepulchral Monuments Committee was similarly disregarded (Smith 1880a, 243; Evans 1956, 307-9). Moreover, when the first Ancient Monuments Act was passed in 1873, it arose not from one of the main
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societies, but a committee of the Ethnological Society. Consequently, the Act protected only national monuments of "pre-historic times", which Smith and many others considered too limited (Thompson 1977, 58-60; Smith 1873; 1880d, 250; Anon. 1873, 250). Not until the Ancient Monuments Protection Act of 1900 was there any means of preserving Roman and Christian monuments.

The rivalries caused further harm in 1851, when the Duke of Northumberland asked the Antiquaries' president to appoint a committee drawn from the Antiquaries, BAA and Institute to recommend a plan for research on Hadrian's Wall. Smith, Wright, and Captain W.H. Smyth, the Antiquaries' new Director, wanted to agree, but the Antiquaries' council declined, doubtless because it knew the Institute would not collaborate (Smith 1883, 81). Its attitude stands in contrast to that of the German historical and antiquarian societies who during the following year established a commission to co-ordinate local research initiatives on the Roman limes (Johnson 1989, 19). The Duke was highly offended, and proceeded to excavate without taking advice from any national society (Smith 1854f, 155).

The split also prevented the emergence of a centralised organisation for British archaeology, in which local societies might have operated under the BAA's overall authority. Following the Canterbury Congress, BAA branch committees were established in Cheltenham and Maidstone (BAA 1845, 388 and 404), and, after the split, in Leeds, Ipswich, and Derbyshire (Taylor 1832, 186). But most of the eighteen local societies that existed in 1851 followed the Norfolk Architectural Society (founded 1845), in choosing autonomy (Evans 1956, 265-6). It was argued at the time that they lacked influence as a result (Anon. 1852d). Thus the archaeology movement did not follow the developing pattern

362 DNM:CRS, CRS to JJAW, 28 Mar. 1851; RP:III, CRS to JCB, 29 Apr. 1851.
364 NRO:DT, GJ to CRS, 12 Dec. 1845.
of government in Britain, which through legislation such as
the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, and the Public Health Act,
1848, was moving towards a system wherein central government
agencies were intended primarily to guide and supervise the
local authorities (Lubenow 1971).

The absence of a universally recognised co-ordinating body
exacerbated the difficulty of producing co-ordinated
national surveys. The societies neither attempted to set
standards, nor to publish guidelines for good antiquarian
practice; Akerman's Directions for the Preservation of
English Antiquities ... had to be published privately
(Akerman 1851). The disunity also prevented the compilation
of a central archive of drawings and information about
national monuments (p. 183). The most suitable repository
was the Antiquaries' library, but the other societies did
not encourage its development until the formation in 1888 of
the Congress of Archaeological Societies (Levine 1986, 53).

For many such reasons, Smith and Wright strove hard to
achieve a reconciliation and reunion between the Association
and Institute (Wright 1850). This proved impossible because
the original antagonists remained active, and because the
Institute saw no need: like the Antiquaries, they lacked
Smith and Wright's vision of obtaining government support
for archaeology. In 1849, when Parker and the Institute
separated, Smith and Captain Smyth asked the Antiquaries'
president, Lord Mahon, to mediate, but he was decidedly
unenthusiastic.365 In 1850, the BAA again called for
reconciliation, having in view "the formation of a central
museum of British antiquities".366 To this, the Institute's
president replied that the BM had already provided a room
for British antiquities, and that two bodies could do more
work than one. When the BAA then offered union under the
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name "Institute", the Institute advertised that BAA members could join without paying an entrance fee, and BAA life members could transfer for half price (AI 1850a). Way and Hawkins had concocted the measure to block a genuine union.\(^{367}\) Smith's immediate reaction was to think up ways in which the BAA, Institute and Antiquaries might collaborate to provide a regional structure.\(^{368}\) Three years later, Lord Albert (now Londesborough) and Smith were exploring the possibility of a "union antiquarian society ... drawing upon the Institute, BAA and neutrals", but they gained little support.\(^{369}\) A parallel attempt by Smith, Wright and Waller to form a new printing club (The "Warton") to publish "works connected with the old literature, history, and antiquities of the country", also failed.\(^{370}\)

**Smith's Disillusionment with Societies**

For Smith, the split had another undesirable consequence in that he felt obliged to continue as secretary to ensure the Association's success.\(^{371}\) On the positive side, this enabled him to correspond with antiquarians all over the country, to gain a rare over-view of contemporary discoveries and research, and to become established as an expert on Roman Britain - the first authority on the subject from whom the general public could seek advice. But Smith's duties were arduous. They gave rise to incessant visitors who interrupted his business,\(^{372}\) and vast amounts of correspondence. In 1846, after a few days' holiday in the Isle of Wight, Smith returned to find fifty letters awaiting his attention.\(^{373}\) Editor of the journal was especially
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burdensome.374 So too was dispatching it when everyone preferred a different method - by hand, rail, or via bookseller.375 Smith consequently had little time to develop a social life or attend the theatre.

According to Smith, his disillusionment with societies began as early as the Winchester congress of 1845,376 although his first lambasts against them date from 1848, after an instance of shabby treatment by the BAA Central Committee.

For many members, Smith was the Association's "life and soul", and his contribution was recognised as being "much greater than that of any individual that could be named" (Smith 1883, 52 and 59).377 Yet in 1848, when Lord Albert proposed a testimonial for Smith, the Central Committee, or certain leading members of that committee,378 firmly refused. Their action so disgusted Lord Albert that he subsequently resigned as President.379 Smith was especially wounded because whereas many learned societies, including the Antiquaries, employed paid secretaries, his labours for the BAA were free of charge. Only Bateman and Rolfe ever thought to buy medicines from him,380 and while he had been giving over half his time to the Association, his business had started to fail.381 He was increasingly short of money,382 to the extent that from 1850 he could not even afford to attend BAA congresses.383 The worry gave rise to
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poor health, and a "presentiment" that his physical and mental strength would soon break down.\textsuperscript{384}

From 1848, when these factors caused Smith increasingly to miss BAA meetings, he began to receive sharp letters from T.J. Pettigrew, who had doubtless led opposition to the proposed testimonial.\textsuperscript{385} Despite many kindnesses to his allies, it was said that Pettigrew could "live comfortably only in an atmosphere of disturbance" (Anon. 1855d). From around this time, his poor management and increasing domination of the BAA, combined with a mounting paranoia, were to lead the Association almost to destruction, giving the Institute yet another reason to refuse a reunion (Hugo 1854).\textsuperscript{386} His influence over BAA committee meetings became such that all decisions were made in advance, and he would "hurl defiance at every one who dares to offer the slightest opposition".\textsuperscript{387} Independent activity was viewed with suspicion, so that when Smith received an antiquarian communication from Rome and sent it on to the Antiquaries, he received a curt note from Pettigrew, complaining that the letter should have been passed to him, so he could present it on behalf of the Association.\textsuperscript{388} An informal "congress" which Smith had organised at Colchester the previous spring, aroused only disapproval from the Central Committee instead of encouragement (Smith 1886, 37-38).\textsuperscript{389} It was soon after this that Smith and Wright resigned as editors.\textsuperscript{390}

In the summer of 1849, Smith also resigned as secretary. This was partly for the reasons given above, and partly because he wanted to put his increasingly limited time to
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better use.\footnote{391} Thereafter, his health improved, and for the first time in years Smith was able to concentrate upon archaeological research and publication, some results of which will be summarised in Chapters 10 and 11.\footnote{392} Recognising that the loss of Smith as secretary would greatly weaken the BAA, Pettigrew persuaded him to not to retire publicly. Although absent from meetings, Smith therefore remained secretary in name until 1851 (Smith 1883, 258).\footnote{393} Yet despite this helpful gesture, ill-feeling towards Smith resurfaced again in 1850 when he sought subscriptions for his excavations at Lympne in his own name rather than that of the BAA (idem., 210).

Following Smith's resignation as secretary the BAA fast deteriorated. In the autumn of 1849, Pettigrew engineered the expulsion from the Association of Croker, Smith's co-secretary, and Wright resigned in sympathy.\footnote{394} It was the first of a long series of resignations whereby the BAA lost most of its best men (Anon. 1855e; Hugo 1854).\footnote{395} Without Smith and Wright, the congresses were poorly attended (Anon. 1850f), letters went unanswered and the JBAA became "no longer a record of facts but of \textit{opinions} often obsolete, trite + puerile".\footnote{396} In 1854, a dispute between Pettigrew and secretary Revd Thomas Hugo, led to another schism, and the creation by Hugo of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society (Anon. 1854g).\footnote{397} Pettigrew's supporters excused his behaviour on the grounds that he had been depressed following his wife's recent death (Dawson
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1931, 114), but the problems continued unabated until Pettigrew died in 1865. By this time, having virtually monopolised the support of the clergy, the nobility, and the staff of the British Museum, the Institute had firmly established its position as the dominant society.

Smith's final break with the BAA came in 1852 when on losing his "chief source" of income, he decided to implement an economy he had been contemplating for two years - to withdraw from "all money-extracting societies". Fortunately, under Hawkins' influence, the Numismatic Society made Smith an honorary member, and the following year re-elected him to its council (NS 1853, 32). Smith also retained his life-membership of the Antiquaries although, following their refusal to pay for etchings of Saxon grave goods from Ozingell, he resolved never again to sit on its council after retiring from it in 1851 (p. 175; SAL 1851, 155; Smith 1883, 115). When, however, Smith declared his intention to retire from the BAA, Pettigrew deeply offended Smith by quietly erasing his name from the membership list. Insult was added to injury in 1853, when Smith asked the BAA if he might borrow some woodcuts of items in his museum for inclusion in his museum catalogue. Pettigrew not only refused, but went about gloating over the additional expense this would cause him. It is no wonder that F.C. Lukis could comment to Smith that:

"Your frequent visits to France will have added much to your contempt for the ruling Societies of our Fatherland, & in truth how paltry are the petty jealousies which flourish there!!".

Following his withdrawal, Smith took the view that:

---
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Oppressed by poverty, Smith risked becoming a prickly and disappointed man, and visitors to Liverpool Street were subjected to diatribes on every aspect of archaeological politics. From now on, he actively discouraged others from joining societies, and was greatly irritated when Wright was reconciled with Pettigrew and rejoined the BAA. He allowed his name to appear on the provisional council of the "London and Middlesex Archaeological Society", but reluctantly, and with his friend Hugo as secretary and Lord Londesborough as president, Smith probably had no option. He did not attend meetings, and in 1857 asked to retire as he could not afford the subscription. His only praise was reserved for the Numismatic Society, which had granted him an honorary membership (Smith 1883, 119). In 1858, Smith's friends pressed him to stand as Director of the Society of Antiquaries, in which position he would have been hugely successful, but in view of his previous experiences it is no surprise that Smith should very firmly refuse.

Having rejected societies as the way forward for British archaeology, Smith set out to prove that he could do without them - with a large measure of success. He easily outstripped them in gaining subscriptions for his excavations and for his own and his friends' publications, for example, Charles Warne's Ancient Dorset (1870).
Instead of reporting communications to the BAA and Antiquaries, he published them in The Gentleman's Magazine (from 1866-8) or in his Collectanea, which from 1847, he began to issue at quarterly intervals.\(^{413}\) Wright did much the same, placing his communications in The Student and Intellectual Observer .... In terms of their archaeological content, there is much truth in Halliwell's comment to Smith that his:

"... Collectanea ... contains more real new and valuable matter than the whole mass of the journals. It is not flattery ..."\(^{414}\)

Many reviewers agreed, commenting that:

"It is a remarkable fact that the cheapest, most learned, and at the same time, most useful and popular work on Archaeology should not be the publication of a Society or of an enterprising bookseller, but of a private gentleman" (Anon. 1855a).

**Archaeological Societies: Their Successes and Failures**

Recognising that Smith is potentially a biased source, we must now review the successes and failures of the societies that he helped to initiate, looking primarily at the period of Smith's active involvement.

Despite, and even because of the rivalries, both the BAA and Institute gained a band of strong supporters, and for a while were successful in popularising their subject. They encouraged the foundation of many county archaeological societies, which increased from around six in 1843 to 49 in 1886 (Levine 1986, 48, 182-3). The congresses proved useful in bringing together antiquarians from different parts, in disseminating information and generating enthusiasm; so did the fortnightly members' meetings initiated by the BAA in the autumn of 1845, and followed by the Institute (Anon. 1846a).

\(^{413}\) CRS:KP, copy of CA I, No. XI, in paper covers.

\(^{414}\) RP:II, JOH to CRS, undated, c. 20 Aug. 1852.
The societies played an important role in providing for the first time a body of recognised experts from whom local antiquarians could seek advice on matters of archaeological interpretation, conservation and preservation. In response to such requests, the BAA committee might despatch a panel of experts, as in September 1846, when Smith, Fairholt and J.A. Repton examined some newly discovered frescoes in Childerditch church, Essex (BAA 1847, 313).

As Smith acknowledged, the societies were also successful in publishing transactions, and hence in swiftly disseminating and preserving vulnerable information (Smith 1880d, 250). They were nevertheless generally unwilling to publish or to sponsor monographs, such as Smith's Richborough volume, which was produced at Smith and Fairholt's "sole expense and risk", the outlay being around £200.415

The societies made only slow progress with regard to their stated aim of fostering links with foreign societies; despite Smith's best efforts, both they and most of their foreign counterparts lacked sufficient interest (Smith 1851a, 68).416 Abroad, the only notable exception was the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries, based in Copenhagen (Jensen and Jensen 1987). Otherwise, international correspondence remained "merely nominal", and the exchange of publications, intermittent (Smith 1854g; 1886, 214-5).417 In Germany, even Archaeologia was unknown, yet instead of exchanging publications with German societies, the Antiquaries sold its remaindered back issues as waste paper (Smith 1851a, 67; Evans 1956, 261).

According to Smith, part of the blame lay with the British government, which erected bureaucratic obstacles to foreign travel, and additional to the high cost of posting letters abroad (5-6 shillings), levied "vexatious duties ... upon

415 DNM: CRS, CRS to JJA, 13 July 1848.
416 NLW: DMR, 5118D, M. Duprés to CRS, 24 May 1853.
417 cf. SANUT: C VI, CRS to JA, 7 Feb. 1851; THC II, CRS to TH, undated, 1858.
scientific books, sent as presents to literary and antiquarian societies and to private individuals". In 1851, Smith won a concession whereby the Treasury agreed to waive the duty on gifts of foreign publications to the Numismatic Society, of which he was secretary. With characteristic selflessness, Smith immediately requested his foreign correspondents to direct gifts for other antiquarian societies through the Society, so he could distribute them and save money (cf. Smith 1886, 214-5). Despite his best efforts, Smith could still boast in 1854 that Collectanea had a wider continental circulation than the Societies' publications put together (Smith 1854g). One nevertheless suspects that Collectanea's foreign circulation was boosted by gifts to persons with whom Smith exchanged publications, placed on his subscribers' lists for "the moral influence ... attached here ... to the appearance of the names of foreigners". This was certainly true with regard to his Illustrations.

Whereas the societies were to play an important role in forcing the trustees of the British Museum to accept British antiquities (Kidd 1977), in the absence of legislation, they could do only a limited amount to preserve historic monuments. In 1852, before the wider antiquarian world was aware of the threat, the Corporation of London ignored pleas by the Antiquaries, and destroyed the 13th-century crypt under Gerrard's Hall ("J.W.B." 1852; Welch 1896, 202). The societies nevertheless did much to mobilise public opinion and were thereby able to persuade certain individuals to avoid the public disapprobation that might follow acts of destruction. In 1845, urged by the Archaeological Institute, the Institute of British Architects advised its members to "exert their influence" to this end (Anon. 1845m). In 1846, an appeal by Revd W. Barnes, C. Warne, and

418 SANUT:C VI, CRS to Anon., 19 Apl. 1849.
419 BMA, CRS to JBdeP, 7 Feb. 1851.
420 BMA, CRS to JBdeP, 16 Nov. 1851.
421 BAC V, CRS to TB, 24 May 1854.
422 BMA, CRS to JBdeP, 17 Dec. 1855.
the BAA prevented Maumbury Rings from being disfigured by the Weymouth Railway (Anon. 1846e; Smith 1891, 177). A similar appeal by Dorchester council preserved the hill-fort at Poundbury.\(^{423}\) Further BAA interventions helped save Roman Caistor, Battle Church, Shakespeare's birthplace, and medieval frescoes in Carpenter's Hall, London (Anon. 1846d).\(^{424}\) Here at least they achieved more than the Society of Antiquaries, which in 1852, faced with a serious threat to Verulamium, decided to do nothing (Evans 1956, 272).

To gain influence in such matters, the societies needed support from persons of high social status. What annoyed Smith was a tendency to give such persons high office irrespective of antiquarian ability, when:

"Science has its own aristocracy which should never stoop to mere aristocracy of birth or station".\(^{425}\)

In 1846, the newly formed Sussex Archaeological Society ruled that members entering Parliament should automatically be vice-presidents (Salzman 1946). In protest against such practices, Smith subsequently refused a vice-presidency of the Kent Archaeological Society,\(^{426}\) although he did become an honorary member.\(^{427}\) In such matters, Smith tended to overstate his case. This applies equally to his remark that the Marquis of Northampton was elected president of the Institute "for the sake of his name and the feedings he used to dole out to them...".\(^{428}\) Although unsuitable on grounds of antiquarian ability, Northampton's appointment arose because he was president of the Royal Society (DNB).

Smith particularly resented the attention given to the aristocracy at BAA congresses because it stole the limelight which he considered should have gone to himself and other leading archaeologists. Thus when Lord Albert obtained

\(^{423}\) CRS:BAA2, J. Sydenham to CRS, 14 Sep. 1846.
\(^{424}\) CRS:BAA4.
\(^{425}\) BAC III, CRS to TB, 17 Aug. 1846.
\(^{426}\) THC II, CRS to TH, 14 Nov. 1857.
\(^{427}\) LOA 179/30, CRS to JOH, 26 Dec. 1859.
\(^{428}\) DNM:CRS, CRS to JJAW, 9 Mar. 1851.
nineteen noble patrons for the BAA's Gloucester Congress, Smith regretted the measure as "somewhat humiliating to men dignified by science and literature" (Smith 1852g, ix). There was nevertheless genuine cause for concern in that the tendency to promote persons of great status but small learning had for years diminished the effectiveness of the Antiquaries, and now threatened to impede the new societies (Anon. 1850f; Smith 1854i). For instance, under Northampton's misguided influence, the Institute emphasised medieval antiquities, and tended to regard earlier remains as less important. In 1847, Smith commented that "Parker now refuses to give cuts for anything primeval". Having attracted so many clergymen and leading architectural historians like Willis, it was perhaps inevitable that the Institute should emphasise a subject in which it was genuinely stronger, but it redoubled Smith's determination to fill the JBAA with primeval antiquities. "We shall shock those who dote on church windows and doors and piscinas", he told Bateman.

The involvement of nobility also attracted into the archaeological community persons interested mainly in social advancement or the latest trend (cf. Planché 1872). This is illustrated by a spoof letter, supposedly by a London lady, published in Chamber's Edinburgh Journal:

"It is now a kind of fashion to show a love of antiquities, and as the taste is taking a practical turn, and introducing a finer order of architecture, with domestic furniture and ornaments to match, the reign of Victoria I in England bids fair to rival that of the illustrious François Premier in France.... As it would never do for Uncle Philip and his family to be behind their neighbours in this universal rage, we have all become great antiquaries" (Anon. 1845i).

As a follower of the Camden school of antiquarian self-sacrifice, the "fashion" was distasteful to Smith, who complained that "It is not true science that seeks display

429 THC I, CRS to TH, 19 Jan. 1856.
430 BAC III, CRS to TB, 14 June 1845.
431 BAC III, CRS to TB, 29 Sep. 1847.
432 BAC III, CRS to TB, 5 May 1848.
and drawing-room patronage; or pursues its research in crowds" (Smith 1852g, xii).

The involvement of socialites led to sycophancy, squabbling and offensive instances of class distinction. The (necessarily) high subscriptions, the formality of proceedings and the elevated nature of social events ensured that Smith's classless ideals for the BAA were effectively forsaken (Levine 1986, 54). The Institute boasted openly "that altho' we [the BAA] have `the workers', they have the `money and names'". For this reason, Smith considered that:

"there will never be much sympathy between them and the humbler people who have not much to boast of except unselfish devotion to archaeology".

According to Smith, the members' sincerity could be judged by their willingness to provide financial support. Thus in 1852, when falling membership led the Antiquaries to halve their four-guinea annual subscription, Smith strongly opposed the measure, advocating instead the election of Honorary Fellows "whose antiquarian services should be considered as equivalent to pecuniary contribution" (Smith 1852e; 1883, 225-6; Evans 1956, 265).

Evidence of sincerity was singularly lacking at the congresses, so that Smith became wary of popularisation:

"I do not object to making archaeology popular if it can be done without sacrificing its essential character. But can you call the results of our Congresses making it popular? I doubt it. Archaeology is a matter of serious thought and is not even likely to become popular ..."

I complain, moreover, that the results are not commensurate with the heavy expenses incurred on such occasions. At least £ 150 will be spent on the public dinner at

---
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Even successful journals, like the *Numismatic Chronicle*, had to restrict the number of plates, and authors sometimes had to pay for them.\(^437\) The Societies of Antiquaries of Scotland and of Newcastle-upon-Tyne also lacked the funds to publish their proceedings regularly - an activity which Smith regarded as "absolutely necessary to the healthy vitality of every society" (Smith 1848b).\(^438\)

After publishing transactions, few societies had money for anything else. There were exceptions: the Antiquaries of Newcastle-upon-Tyne repaired the castle keep as a meeting place;\(^439\) the Caerleon Antiquarian Association built a museum (Anon. 1850e). But unlike the Société Française neither the BAA, nor the Institute could contribute much towards church restorations (BAA 1844a, 91 and 249-51). Nor could they hope to preserve archaeological sites by purchase. When Burgh Castle was put up for sale in 1846, it had to be bought by Sir Colin Boileau to ensure its safety.\(^440\) The Society of Antiquaries' "Conservation Fund", established in 1855 was likewise unsuccessful (Evans 1956, 311-2).

The BAA and Institute gave only token amounts for excavation - as in 1847, when Smith raised £5 from each to uncover the Roman theatre at Verulamium.\(^441\) In this they achieved more than the Antiquaries, who prior to 1853, when they sponsored Akerman's excavation of the Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Harnham,
consistently refused to fund excavations of any kind (Akerman 1859; Evans 1956, 306-7). After the Verulamium excavation, Smith established a BAA excavation fund, but his too was largely ineffective.\footnote{FWF:BAA2, BAA auditor's financial report, 20 Mar. 1848; BAC III, CRS to TB, 21 Dec. 1847.} 4.42 A claim by the Association to have excavated at Maidstone, Colchester, Richborough and Upchurch, was empty in that these excavations were financed solely by the excavators, and in some cases had been started before the Association had come into being (Anon. 1847).

For his excavations at Lympne, Smith did not even request support from the BAA, knowing that they had insufficient funds, and that following his unofficial resignation as secretary, they might well have refused. In April 1850, he sought assistance from the Treasury (Smith 1852a, 3). When the Treasury declined, Smith asked the Duke of Wellington to loan some soldiers. When he received no reply, Smith appealed to the subscribers to his Collectanea (Smith 1883, 208). This raised £138, which was ample, making the Lympne excavations the first to be wholly funded by public subscription (Smith 1852c). Further assistance came from the South-Eastern Railway which waived his fares to and from the site – Smith having pointed out that the excavations weekly attracted hundreds of visitors (Smith 1883, 206). In 1853, Smith again successfully raised funds for his excavations at Pevensey, and again obtained free travel (Smith 1858a; Lower 1853, 274). Where Smith led, others followed, as in October 1851, when Buckman and Newmarch placed in The Times an appeal on behalf of the first systematic excavations of Corinium (Anon. 1851b).

Smith nonetheless recognised that excavation by public subscription was not the best way forward. He was probably the only Englishman who could have raised enough money by this method. Moreover, when important finds were made, there was generally no alternative to reburial, which in certain cases – the Verulamium theatre and Woodchester
mosaics for instance - was highly undesirable (Smith 1848b, v-ix; Anon. 1846c). In such matters, as Smith recognised, the only hope lay in obtaining:

"... a Minister of Public Instruction. Such a power could raise museums all over the land. We could keep open the Woodchester Villa; and others; and make them schools for the public." 443

Hence he continually reported developments on the continent where historical commissions of all kinds, national and local, were being established (e.g. Smith 1853-4, 101; 1868e).

It was central to Smith's thinking that where societies led, government support would follow. Thus when John Adamson explained the Newcastle society's difficulty in publishing, Smith's advice was "to print two volumes yearly and get into debt. You could then appeal to Parliament with excellent grounds." 444

Smith's hope had been that the creation of the BAA would trigger the establishment of a Government commission, which would be empowered:

"... to see that the funds granted by parliament are properly expended; to call to their assistance persons of ability; and, as a first step, to obtain the statistics of the national antiquities yet remaining, and then to devise measures to place them beyond the reach of danger" (Smith 1848b).

He was therefore greatly disappointment that:

"... the Government, when pressed to take the national antiquities under its own care, appeals at once to the existence of societies as an excuse for its own indifference" (Smith 1852g, xii; see also 1845d, 34; 1848b).

Apart from Monumenta Historica Britannica, which was strewn with errors and hard to gain sight of, the government had published virtually nothing on national antiquities.

Smith's goal of obtaining government support was not wholly altruistic, in that he privately longed to escape his chemist's business and gain employment in archaeology:

443 BL:DMS, MS. 41496, ff. 63-64.
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"Nothing short of a Parliamentary Commission could do anything for me, and when this is formed I may be dead, or jobbers and charlatans may get before me. I have no friends among the great and influential." 445

As he recognised, such aspirations were mere daydreams:

"I am also too well aware how things are 'jobbed' in England ever to expect being recognized in the event of the appointment of a Commission of Monuments. The persons appointed would be people of influence ... with large salaries." 446

Such comments may help explain why in 1839-40, shortly after the foundation of the Numismatic Society, Smith strongly opposed a suggestion that its secretary should receive a salary, like the Antiquaries' secretary. 447 The idea was quashed when Smith persuaded twelve supporters to requisition a Special General Meeting (NS 1840a, 284-6). Not long afterwards, Smith himself accepted the post of secretary - for no remuneration.

In view of the lack of recognition of his efforts, one can imagine Smith's feelings when in 1848, Worsaae wrote to say that he had been raised by the late King to the Order of the Dannebrog and had been appointed to a Royal Commission for the preservation of Danish national monuments as Inspector of Ancient Monuments, with the task of planning and drawing the best monuments, and helping to recommend which should be acquired for preservation by the government. 448 A year later, Cochet was made inspector of historical monuments of Seine Inférieure, with a handsome allowance from the Departmental Prefect (Manneville 1978, 90). Equally, one can understand Smith's exasperation in 1852, when he heard that Hawkins, on being asked by the Parliamentary Commission on the British Museum why its antiquarian departments were staffed by inexperienced persons, had asserted that there were no archaeologists in England, so that the Trustees were forced to take gentlemen from college (Parliamentary Commission 1850, 166, para. 3230). 449
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Personal Recognition

There nevertheless remained many ordinary members of the BAA who deeply appreciated Smith's efforts and regarded him as the champion of humble antiquarians. A.J. Dunkin's volume on the 1848 Worcester congress is dedicated to Smith, as:

"The first Englishman whose patriotic zeal attempted to unite his countrymen, for the study and preservation of Our National Antiquities... whose unselfish elevation to science for her own sake, unwearying industry, solid learning, and unimpeachable integrity, have so long in vain contended with the despicable vanity, ignorant assumption, and greedy selfishness of little men" (Dunkin 1851).

Further acclaim came in 1855, when after Smith had assisted John Hillier to publicise his excavation of the Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Chessel Down, IOW., Hillier organised a public dinner at Newport in his honour, chaired by the mayor and attended by friends and local dignitaries. Despite initial objections, Smith regarded this as a moral victory in that it followed a desultory BAA congress held there by Pettigrew; he subsequently published an account of the proceedings (Smith 1855e).

Smith's ceaseless correspondence, his numerous publications and his liberality in donating them made him widely known to antiquarian societies at home and abroad. He was made honorary member of many of these societies, notably of the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries and Society of Antiquaries of France, who elected him at the time he was withdrawing from the BAA (Smetham 1929, 6; Anon. 1851c).

Eventually, in 1872, Smith was made honorary member of the Institute, and in 1875, having the previous year been placed on the BAA's Congress Committee, Smith was elected vice-president of the BAA itself (BAA 1874, 15; 1875a; 1875b, 219).

450 CRS:IOW, p. 58; G. Hillier to CRS, undated and c. 20 Aug. 1855.
451 RP:II, CCR to CRS, 8 Feb. 1850.
452 LOA 202/39, CRS to JOH, 9 Dec. 1872.
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Time brought a measure of reconciliation, but although in 1866 Smith could claim to look back without "angry feelings", his comments of six years earlier reveal the extent of his frustration and disappointment with the archaeological societies:

"They were intended by the projectors (at least I can answer for myself) as a substitute until Government, on a great and comprehensive scale, should provide for the National Antiquities properly. That was the picture I drew. This is the picture they present: They have served for intriguers and charlatans to take up positions their merits never justified them to take; to make capital out of others' work; to introduce into eminent places the superficial and vain, and to degrade pure archaeology by trickery, by triflings, and by pretentions of all sorts. They have served to introduce respectable men to back up and support the superficial and the intriguing: - add if you please, the immoral."
CHAPTER 9: Towards a Public Collection of National Antiquities

After withdrawing from the BAA, Smith had more time for research, and the years 1848 to 1857 saw the publication of his most important works. His interests developed in several directions. In particular, he made the first systematic investigation into the Roman forts of the Saxon shore, and made some further visits to France in an attempt to understand them in the light of continental discoveries. Smith also continued to publish all manner of Romano-British and medieval artifacts, as outlined in Chapter 11. Since a full examination of Smith's contribution to the study of Roman Britain and Gaul would amount to a thesis in its right, the next two chapters examine Smith's contribution to Dark Age studies. This accords with the writer's desire to explore the parallel development of archaeological ideas and the institutions of British archaeology, since it was progress in this field which provided the strongest academic arguments for a national collection of British antiquities.

The present chapter focuses upon the rejection by the British Museum's trustees of the Faussett collection of Anglo-Saxon antiquities. It explains Smith's involvement in the furore which ensued, and how this came to mark a watershed in the Museum's attitude towards national antiquities, as revealed by its subsequent purchase of Smith's own collection in 1856. To avoid retracing ground covered elsewhere, the writer has avoided detailing the events which led to the purchase of Smith's collection, which have already been described by Kidd (1977). Although the story could be fleshed out from the newly-identified manuscript sources, Kidd's paper needs no major revision.

The Faussetts and Douglas

The importance to Dark Age studies of the work of Bryan Faussett and James Douglas has been outlined in Chapter 2 (p. 60, ff.). Between 1760 and 1773, Faussett excavated
over 700 graves and tumuli on the East Kent downs, and thereby amassed a remarkable collection of Anglo-Saxon grave goods, mostly of the 7th century. Faussett's grave 172 from Sibertswold, remains one of the key dated grave-groups of 7th-century Kent (Hawkes 1990, 8), and the jewelry he recovered is surpassed in importance only by the grave goods from Sutton Hoo. An assiduous observer, Faussett made grave-by-grave descriptions of his investigations in his journals - the Inventorium Sepulchrale - whose value is enhanced by the fact that many of Faussett's cemeteries have since been destroyed by ploughing (idem., 13).

Faussett's antiquities might have been dispersed after his death, had he not included in his will two less than usual requests. The first was that his sermons should be burnt, every one. The second related to his antiquities concerning which:

"... as I have been at great pains and expense in collecting them, that they may never be disposed of by sale or otherwise but upon the greatest necessity, but that they may still continue in my family and at Heppington, humbly trusting in God that my posterity will some of them at least wisely prefer polite literature and refinement to ignorance and dissipation, and books and medals to hounds, horses and gaming men".455

Thus for two generations Faussett's collection was to remain half-forgotten in the family home at Heppington (Smith 1856b, 201-7).

If few outsiders gained access to the collection, Bryan Faussett's "posterity" certainly appreciated its importance. His son, Henry Godfrey Faussett (b. 1749) had himself exhumed the famed Kingston fibula - the finest Kentish jewelled composite disc-brooch yet found - and had skilfully drawn many of the illustrations in his father's notebooks.456 Although his legal career prevented him from completing an intended publication about the finds, he remained interested

455 PRO, Prerogative Court of Canterbury, Quire 64, proved February 1776.
456 Now in LM.
in archaeology, and became friendly with Douglas in 1779 or 1780 (Hawkes 1990, 13). Douglas subsequently gained access to the collection, but apparently not the notebooks (Jessup 1975, 52).

Bryan Faussett had died in ignorance of the true nature of his discoveries, and it was left to Douglas to show that the majority were Anglo-Saxon, which he deduced from a coin found in a grave at Gilton (p. 60). Douglas's contemporaries were nevertheless unprepared for his rejection of the literary tradition of interpretation. Not until around 1840, when J.Y. Akerman and Roach Smith became interested in Anglo-Saxon antiquities, did anyone fully appreciate the principle he discovered of applying relative dating from a known to an unknown source.

**Faussett Rediscovered, 1841-4**

By this time, Faussett's collection had passed to his grandson, Dr. Godfrey Faussett, an Oxford professor and Canon of Oxford cathedral, who was away for most of the time. Nothing had been heard of the collection for years, although Smith knew about it from Douglas (1793) and Hasted (1778-99, Vol. III, 185 and 557, etc.).

On 9 August 1841, during one of his Kentish excursions, Smith found himself walking past Heppington, and allowed an impulse to overcome caution. Having tramped from the Gravesend ferry to Canterbury, Smith was proceeding to Lympne along the Roman road called Stone Street, which passes Heppington about four miles south of Canterbury. As Smith approached the turning, he walked past:

"... for I had no introduction to Dr. Faussett; and I had heard that he had an objection to shewing the collection. As I walked slowly onwards I reflected;

---

457 SAL, MS. 723, letters from Rev. J. Douglas to H.G. Faussett (published by Jessup 1975, and in part by Smith 1856b).
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paused; turned back, and went to the house. I was courteously received. Dr. Faussett said that it was partly true what I had heard; and at the moment it would be rather inconvenient for him to shew me the collection; but that there would be no difficulty at some future time” (Smith 1883, 67-68).

Smith eventually gained access to the collection on 17 October 1842. The antiquities “far exceeded my expectations, which from the mention made of them by Douglas were rather high”. As well as grave goods, they included "red Roman pottery from off Margate", and "tiles from Dover Castle". The accompanying manuscript volumes `would make two valuable 8vo books of print'.

So impressed was Smith, that when the BAA chose Canterbury for its first annual congress, he made every effort to bring the company to Heppington. That this was possible was due to Smith's tact in overcoming Dr. Faussett's understandable concern for the collection's safety. Thus on 11 September 1844, when the guests arrived, there were policemen outside, and the visitors were admitted to the museum in small detachments, under Smith's supervision.

The interest of the antiquities would have been much enhanced by the previous day's events, when the entire company had participated in a Saxon barrow-digging excursion on "Breach Down" (p. 189). But whereas this had produced only a few trifles, the Faussett collection transformed the visitors' image of the Anglo-Saxons:

"... we are accustomed to regard them as half savages, without refinement, rude in their manners, and skilful only in the use of their weapons. But [...] the followers of Hengist and Horsa seem to rise up before us ... our previous notions vanish ... we see at once the refinements of Saxon life ..., and the skill and taste of Saxon workmen" (Wright 1845a, 10).

Regional Variation, 1838-50
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At the time of his first visit to Heppington, Smith had not knowingly examined any pagan Saxon finds, which are almost never found in central London. His first opportunity to do so came in January 1841, when he saw some of Douglas's finds in the Ashmolean Museum.\textsuperscript{462} Eighteen months later, his friend W.H. Rolfe would take him to see Douglas's sand-pit at Gilton,\textsuperscript{463} but by this stage Smith had already commenced his research on Saxon antiquities. His interest was aroused by a meeting of the Antiquaries, in February 1842, which heard a paper by Lord Albert Conyngham and his private secretary, J.Y. Akerman, about an earlier series of barrow excavations at "Breach Down" (Conyngham and Akerman 1844). They were the first barrows to be reported as Saxon since Douglas, on the basis of whose work Akerman proposed a date in the late 5th to early 6th centuries. This was subsequently confirmed by the Revd J.P. Bartlett, who opened four more tumuli, one of which contained some sceattas.

These were identified by Akerman (1843), and illustrated by Smith (1843a, 7 and Pl. VI).

It seems that Smith recalled seeing objects similar to those from Breach Down in Rolfe's collection (p. 150), and immediately requested them for exhibition. Thus a hamper of Anglo-Saxon antiquities from Gilton and other East Kent sites was delivered to Smith in March 1842, and displayed to the Antiquaries. Under dirt on a large brass vessel, Smith discovered three metal repair patches bearing figures. These he considered showed close affinity with the Breach Down finds:

"... thus the two discoveries will be mutually illustrative, and furnish a store of facts, from the general and distinctive features of which deductions may be drawn with greater certainty towards a classification of the remains ascribed to the northern tribes, who successively over-ran Britain after the withdrawal of the Roman forces. As these nations have a near relation one with the other, with similar habits and customs, the correct appropriation of their works of art ... can

\textsuperscript{462} CRS:J4, 25 Jan. 1841.
\textsuperscript{463} CRS:J5, 27 June 1842.
This passage embodies the 18th-century notion that each race had its characteristic artifacts and art styles - a view that held sway in the 1840s to the extent that many antiquarians expected that contemporaneous Roman and Romano-British artifacts would be very dissimilar. Even Worsaae supported the prevailing view that iron was introduced into Britain by the Romans (Worsaae 1846-7, 331), and Smith accepted this misconception and another: that Bronze Age weapons (then regarded as "Celtic" or "British") could have continued into the early Romano-British period (Smith 1854d, 81-82; Wright 1852, 74). (This was unfortunate given that Hodgson had already described the literary evidence that iron weapons were standard by Caesar's day; Hodgson 1816.) As the British and Roman populations interbred, it was held that their artifacts would tend to develop a hybrid character. This model remained popular until the 1880s, when the work of two Germans - the geographer Friedrich Ratzel and philologist Gustav Kossina - introduced to the archaeological community the concept of cultures and cultural areas (Trigger 1980, 24-31). Nevertheless, as we shall see, the racial model laid open rich avenues of research.

Back in 1842, the problem outlined by Smith - of establishing the ethnicity of the sepulchral remains of tribal groups during the Dark Ages - had already been discussed in Douglas's Nenia, which Smith had apparently reread while preparing his paper (Douglas 1793; Smith 1851b, 155-6). Douglas was unable to suggest how to approach the problem, but Smith recognised that the first step was to determine regional differences within burial groups of the same period. His idea may have been inspired by Burgeon (1839), who while residing in Turkey had noticed that ancient Greek coins were generally found close to the city.
where they had been struck. He inferred that a geographical study of British coin finds might indicate whereabouts they were made, and hence which kings and kingdoms may have authorised their production. As Smith was aware (Smith 1843a, 5; 1848e), Burgeon's challenge had been taken up by Akerman, who noted that Iron Age coins reading TIN and TIN.COM were especially common in Sussex and Hampshire, and those reading EPPI. COM. F. and EPPI. COM. F., in Kent (Akerman 1839; 1846b, 179-82).

In order to observe potential ethnic differences, Smith recognised that it was necessary to compile reliable data from which the characteristic artifacts of different population groups might be determined. He immediately began the task by defining two varieties of Saxon brooch, with a clarity not seen since the work of Douglas (Smith 1844a). During the following year, Smith met the Danish archaeologist, Thomsen, who would have encouraged this classificatory approach (Smith 1883, 151; cf. Klindt-Jensen 1975, 57). The same applies to Worsaae, who in 1846 was commissioned by the King of Denmark to travel around Holland, England, Ireland, and subsequently France, in search of evidence of Danish occupation. During his visits to Britain, in 1846 and 1847, Worsaae received every assistance from Smith, who even tried to obtain for him some Saxon artifacts as comparanda (Smith 1886, 151).

Smith's awareness of regional variation within particular classes of find had arisen during his tours of private collections in south-east England. It was inevitable that he should notice differences between the local antiquities and those in his museum, and since regional variation in church architecture was understood and readily apparent, it was natural that the differences should be explained in

similar terms. The variation in Roman pottery was particularly marked. At Silchester, a flagon and a mortarium stamped Q. VALERIVS. VERANIVS were "of distinct materials from those found in London. The clay is more compact and quite white". Probably, Smith had distinguished between Brockley Hill mortaria, which are common in London, and the scarcer Gillam form 238, from north-east Gaul or south-east England (Hartley 1977). That form 238 can occur in the same fabric as a variety of pulley-neck flagon from Brockley Hill is confirmed by Green (1980, 47-48).

Without more data, the extent to which pottery varieties might be linked with specific centres of manufacture was unclear. In the 1830s, the only widely known Romano-British kiln site was at Caistor, Northants, as excavated and published by E.T. Artis (1828). On visiting Smith's museum in 1838, Artis suggested that the "black kinds" of pottery came from Caistor. (From the description, he was perhaps not referring to what we call "Nene Valley colour-coated wares".) The following year, Smith made the first of many pot-hunting trips to the North Kent marshes (Pl. 15), obtaining samples from Otterham Creek of what he dubbed "Upchurch ware" (Smith 1842e; cf. Monaghan 1987). Exactly which forms and sub-varieties were made here Smith was never sure, and whilst regarding Upchurch as "the chief depôt for this peculiar ware", he embraced within the category what are now termed "London ware" (Smith 1854d, 20, Fig. 3; Swan 1975, Pl. 10), and "poppyhead" jars and beakers, including at least one Highgate product (Smith 1854d, Fig. 2; cf. Brown and Sheldon 1974, Fig. 5, No. 68). Not surprisingly, Smith eventually concluded that Upchurch ware was not made exclusively at Upchurch (Smith 1883, 215).

466 CRS:J2, 25 July 1837.
467 CRS:J3, 10 July 1838.
468 CRS:J3, 14 Oct. 1839. See also CRS:J4, 22 Mar. 1840 and 9 June 1841.
Although the possibility of determining the origin of pottery fabrics from kiln site finds had been recognised in the 17th century (p. 41), Smith deserves credit as the first to recognise and collect regional styles of Romano-British pottery. In 1850, he recognised as distinct types what we now term "rosette stamped Oxfordshire red ware" and "Argonne ware", dating the latter from its provenance "to the latest Roman period, or even the early Saxon time" (Smith 1850a, 73 and Pl. IV). Two years later, when preparing a small representative collection for Joseph Mayer, Smith included "samian imitations" from Colchester (i.e. Gallo-Belgic type platters, see Smith 1849b), "Norfolk mortaria", and what seem to have been medieval or early post-medieval wares from Holt Forest, Hampshire (Long 1840).\(^{469}\) By 1864, further Roman varieties had been identified, including the first examples from the New Forest kilns (Akerman 1853; Smith 1864c).

Whereas variation within a particular class of artifact was taken to indicate local workshop traditions, the recurrence on different sites of identical objects pointed to trade. When visiting France in 1839, Smith noted similarities between Roman glass vessels found in London and near Boulogne, and deduced that certain goods might have travelled long distances.\(^{470}\) On the basis of Pliny, the glass was probably made in Spain or Gaul (Smith 1850a, 76). In 1840, Artis gave him a cast taken in Paris from a samian mould bearing the name COBNERTVS, whereupon Smith immediately produced a smaller but otherwise identical vessel from Fenchurch Street (Smith 1847a, 161).\(^{471}\) His growing suspicion that samian was made on the continent, was soon confirmed by the discovery of samian moulds in Lezoux, and kilns elsewhere in France and at Heiligenberg and Rheinzabern in Germany (Smith 1844d, 116; 1851c, 45; cf. Le Maistre 1842; Brongniart 1844; Schweighauser 1844). Samian

\(^{469}\) LM, 30.131 No. 2, CRS to JM, 20 Aug. 1852.
\(^{470}\) CRS:J3, 5 Sep. 1839.
\(^{471}\) CRS:J4, 21 Feb. 1840.
was probably developed from Italian prototypes, although in Britain there was not one specimen like those recently published from Arezzo (Fabroni 1841; Smith 1844d; cf. Birch 1846). Certain varieties could have been made here, but whoever had made the decorated vessels had enjoyed access to the finest works of Roman art. This pointed to a continental source, as did the lack of Romano-British samian kilns and the fact that Romano-British pottery is generally unstamped. To resolve the matter would require:

"... examining the varieties found in Italy, in Spain, in Germany, in France, and even in Africa, for it is very probable that several countries may lay claim to the production" (Smith 1847a, 157).

In all such areas of research, progress depended upon the ability to compare specimens from different sites. This was best done in a collection of:

"... national antiquities and those of neighbouring countries which are either identical or which serve to illustrate and explain them. They should be arranged by a system of double classification, to show at a glance their epoch and parentage, and also the localities where they were discovered" (Smith 1852g, xiv).

To this end, Smith encouraged others to collect and study comparanda. On his visit to Cologne in 1850, he obtained for Lord Londesborough an important group of "Frankish" garnet-inlaid jewellery, evidently from a single burial, which Lord Londesborough doubtless wanted to place alongside his collection of Kentish Saxon remains (Kidd 1990). Smith also obtained comparanda for his own collection: a francisca from Londinières, a Frankish pot from Envermeu, pilgrim signs from the bed of the Somme, a series of prehistoric stone implements from Denmark, presented by the Danish King (Kidd 1978, 67; AI 1854, 179). He also asked Bateman to supply casts of antiquities for comparison. But Smith had neither the room nor money to develop an extensive collection along these lines. The only hope lay in the creation of public museums.

472 BMA, CRS to JBdeP, 11 Apr. 1850.
473 BAC III, CRS to TB, 3 July 1844.
474 NCRO, ZAN.M.20/4/31, CRS to JB, 30 Sep. 1848.
Museums as National Monuments

Smith's long-standing campaign for public museums of antiquities ran in parallel with his campaign to save field monuments. Both antiquities and structural remains might qualify as "national monuments", or:

"Records, which serve... to determine the nature and course of events which bear a direct chronological relation to the history of our country, and exemplify the progress of its civilization" (Smith 1845d, 26).

Smith's own collection amounted to a "national monument" in that it illustrated:

"... the social habits and customs, and ... the industrial life, of the inhabitants of London in past ages.... It reveals our forefathers in their every-day life ... and brings us better acquainted with those from whom we have sprung, or from whom we have inherited our institutions, laws, language, and national character" (Smith 1855-7a, 1-3).

In Britain as elsewhere in Europe, the rise of nationalist fervour following the Napoleonic wars had greatly improved the climate for museums. From 1823, when George IV had offered it the "King's Library", the British Museum had grown vastly in importance, its visitors rising from 68,101 in 1829 to 237,366 in 1834 (Anon. 1835). New premises were essential, and in 1846-7 the Museum reopened to the public in its present building (Miller 1974, 116-50).

Unfortunately, the BM was British only in the sense that it was largely created from seizures arising from British imperial adventures. As such it symbolised the ascendancy of the British Empire and its claim to be regarded as moral successor to the ancient classical empires. Since 1826, a single Antiquities Department, including ethnography, had been placed under the numismatist Edward Hawkins (Pl. 14). His staff consisted of three assistants, an under keeper, and two supernumeraries - all of them numismatists or biased towards the Mediterranean and Eastern civilisations (idem., 191-3; Kidd 1977, 125). The museum actively collected only
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works of artistic merit, with an almost exclusive emphasis upon classical and middle-eastern antiquities. It was generally unwilling to accept British antiquities, which received but one passing reference in the lengthy Parliamentary Select Committee Report on the museum of 1835-6 (Parliamentary Committee 1835-6, 417-8).

The BM's failure in this regard led others to think of meeting the need. In 1838, Smith and his circle attempted to revive a proposal made eleven years earlier by the Antiquaries' then Director, J.H. Markland, that the Society should develop its miscellaneous collections into a genuine museum (Evans 1956, 250). The idea had foundered through lack of space, so Smith helped organise a petition, urging the Council to ask the Government for an additional room at Somerset House; but the Government declined. In December 1844, it was also suggested that the newly formed BAA should establish a museum (Jerdan 1844), but the forthcoming split ensured that none of the national societies could engender a truly national institution (p. 195, ff.). The only hope lay with the government, and from April 1845 the press began to call for action ("E.H." 1845). It was against this background that Sir Thomas Wyse introduced his ill-fated bill to create two Royal Commissions, to draft proposals for a museum of national antiquities and for the conservation of national monuments (p. 196).

Among other reasons, Wyse wanted a museum to enable artists to produce better "historical works" (Hansard 1845, 1330-4). By contrast, Smith and most antiquarians based their arguments upon the need for to preserve, educate, and to support "the great institutions of the country, sacred and secular", respect for which:

"... must ... be increased in proportion to the advance of an intelligent appreciation of monuments, which are the tangible evidences of the gradual establishment of those institutions" (Way 1844; cf. Smith 1848b, viii).

475 CRS:J3, 22 Feb. 1838.
A museum was also desirable because when objects of similar age and origin were put together:

"... they exhibit with peculiar reality, the character of an age or race as it has unconsciously revealed itself in its art and handicraft" (Hawkins 1845).

The time was now ripe because:

"... the characteristic distinctions of every period are now in great measure understood, and Archaeology ... assumes the position of a defined science" (Way 1844).

By this was meant that arising from work by Douglas, Colt Hoare, Lysons, and so on, it was now frequently possible to distinguish "Celtic" or "British" (i.e. prehistoric) objects from "Roman" or "Romano-British", and Anglo-Saxon. Akerman's Archaeological Index was intended to prevent errors of classification according to this scheme (Akerman 1847). The same tripartite division is reflected in Wright's The Celt, the Roman, and The Saxon (1852). By the end of the decade, the artifacts of the Danes would also be identified and published by J.J.A. Worsaae (1849; 1852).

At the BAA's second congress of 1845, a more sophisticated argument for a national museum was introduced, when T.J. Pettigrew spoke of the need:

"... to form collections from various parts, to study the history of the several localities, and then generalise the observations and draw the historical deductions" (Pettigrew 1846, 3).

Pettigrew's knowledge of British antiquities was small, and his words so closely mirror Smith's of 1842, cited above, that there is little doubt these were Smith's views, not his own. It was this same problem which, in 1852, caused Ludwig Lindenschmit to create the Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum, in Mainz (Böhner 1969, XVII).

The Museum of the Corporation of London 1841-55

Since there was no progress towards a national museum of archaeology, it was worth seeing what might be achieved locally. Earlier in 1845, Smith had cited the difficulty of conducting regional comparative studies of Dark Age finds,
as evidence of the need for the Government to establish and endow a museum in every county (Smith 1844h). The possibility of so doing had recently been facilitated by William Ewart's new "Museums Act", which authorised municipal councils to levy a halfpenny rate for "museums of art and science" (8 & 9 Victoria c 43).

Apart from the barrows of Kent and Wessex, the principal source of finds of sufficient merit to qualify as "national" was the City of London, as demonstrated supremely by Smith's own collection. From 1839, Smith tried to encourage the Corporation's projected museum by making occasional donations, although the Royal Exchange affair of 1841 raised doubts about the Corporation's ability to create a museum of suitable quality. A writer to the Literary Gazette thought the only way forward might be to form a new society "for the preservation and collection of national antiquities", which would attract gifts from the City Corporation and collectors alike ("C.C." 1843). Smith nevertheless continued to harry the Corporation, using his influence with The Literary Gazette, which had strongly supported him during "the split", George Godwin the editor of The Builder - a friend of John Britton, and George Dasent, assistant editor to The Times, to whom Smith had been introduced by Worsaae (Smith 1886, 94 and 154).

Within the Corporation, Smith had an ally in Thomas Lott, a member of the Common Council who from 1844-5 sought to revive its resolution of 1826 to create a museum within the library (p. 86). According to Lott, at first "he was caricatured as if crazed" (Anon. 1845g). Moreover, on presenting his motion to the Common Council on 19 January 1845, the meeting had to be adjourned because there was no quorum, something The Builder called disgraceful, "when there were few other towns in England where some public repository of local antiquities cannot be found" (Anon. 1845h). This may have helped his cause, for on 13 February,
the Council passed the resolution, and when William Tite presented the finds from the Royal Exchange site in November, the Library Committee agreed to prepare a room for them and to publish a catalogue, which appeared two years later (Tite 1848).

Since he never knew what to do with duplicate finds, news about the museum was extremely welcome to Smith. He immediately donated some "middle-age antiquities", stating that:

"As I understand the Library Committee has at last resolved to wipe away from the City of London the reproach of having no museum for its antiquities, I present these remains for the embryo collection."

Smith's patronising tone was ill received, and his letter ordered to lie on the table. In 1847 and 1848, further gifts - including Roman ironwork, an amphora handle and post-medieval "clogs" - were rejected on advice from the librarian that they were "not adapted for the collection contemplated by the Corporation of the City of London". Perhaps he felt that Smith was dumping unwanted items on them.

Thus as Smith began to run out of space in his museum, he was obliged to send material to various society museums outside London, including Norwich, Liverpool, and Newcastle-upon-Tyne (HSLC 1850, 2, 183 and 212; 1851, 25). This at least might tend to encourage the establishment of comparative collections from different regions. Smith also sent antiquities to the London collector, H.S. Cuming,
to save them "from the fate which must befall the bulk". 485 The best he reserved for the Derbyshire collector Thomas Bateman, who had previously asked Smith to make purchases on his behalf. 486 Among the items sent to Bateman's museum at Youlgrave, were an amphora cremation burial from Bread Street Hill, 487 some seals, tokens and articles of cuir bouilli, 488 and gold coins from the Thames. 489 Sadly these were dispersed when part of Bateman's collection was sold in 1893 (SWH 1893, esp. Lots 264 and 421). Arising from his position within the BAA, Smith also became involved in finding suitable homes for other people's collections. 490

In refusing Smith's gifts, it may also be that the Library Committee had in mind Smith's criticisms of the Corporation arising from the Royal Exchange excavations (p. 106; Smith 1842c, 270). Certainly, Lambert Jones would not have forgotten them, nor had William Tite. On 22 November 1845, when the BM's latest plans for a collection of national antiquities were discussed at the Royal Institute of British Architects, Tite strenuously defended the Corporation, asserting that claims it did not care for antiquities were propagated primarily by Smith, who had obstructed attempts to create a museum by endeavouring to purchase everything that was brought to light. The Royal Exchange antiquities were safe, the only question being whether they should be placed in the City Library or the British Museum (Anon. 1845e). (In 1846, the former was agreed upon. 491)

As we have seen (p. 104), Smith responded by making a stout defence of his actions before a meeting of the BAA, claiming

485 Southwark Local Studies Library, Acc. No. 4565, TB to H.S. Cuming, 13 Nov. 1846; see also Cuming Museum, manuscript catalogue, 1848.
487 BAC III, CRS to TB, 31 July 1844.
488 BAC III, CRS to TB, 17 Jan. 1845.
489 BAC III, CRS to TB, 17 July 1848.
490 MP, H. Wakeman to JM, undated.
491 COLRO, Minutes of Joint Committee for Gresham Affairs, 27 Mar. 1846; COLRO:LCM, 18 Dec. 1845.
in reference to the BAA's recent schism, that Tite's attack was intended to "discredit the Archaeological operation through him, their secretary" (Anon. 1845d). This was ridiculous, and was firmly denied by Tite (1845a; 1845b). Smith also wrote to The Builder, pointing out that collecting was financially unprofitable, that "private museums must precede public ones", and that if the City Authorities truly cared for antiquities they would not be talking about one room, but "would have possessed a mansion solely devoted to them" (Smith 1845b). This was a salient point in that four years later, by its own admission, the library had still not managed to display all the Royal Exchange material, let alone any subsequent finds. According to Smith (1845b), the problem was not just one of display space, since:

"... the mere getting together ... of loads of antiquities, dissociated from those often minute but important circumstances, which serve to authenticate their parentage and aid their chronological arrangement, is an almost profitless labour".

In fairness, the Library Committee did urge the Commissioners of Sewers to take care when raising tessellated pavements and to record the location and depth of any finds, since the information might "lead to an interesting development of the Roman city". But their plea had little good effect.

The main problem was the lack of a knowledgeable and enthusiastic curator. W.T. Alchin, the librarian from 1845-65, was neither, and whilst rejecting Smith's donations, he gladly accepted geological specimens from Brazil and an Egyptian China Mummy (Sheppard 1991, 17). The same lack of discrimination was widespread throughout the country. According to one writer:

"We have only to set our foot on foreign ground, and enter the first museum in the first town we happen to light upon, to be struck with the respect paid to the antiquities of the locality. This holds good throughout the continent.... It is
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not so with us: our museums ... are mere collections of odds and ends ... stuffed birds and beasts, Chinese curiosities, Eastern antiques ... objects which amuse or surprise rather than instruct" (Anon. 1854e).

In 1849, it was claimed that scarcely one object found in the City since 1841 had been acquired (Smith 1849c), and a year later, that the museum contained "only one Roman inscription, and a fragment of Roman sculpture, both having been obtained by the interposition of Mr. Smith" (BAA 1850, 91). This "sculpture" was the deae matres statue from Hart Street, which having stood for years in an outhouse of the City Stone-yard, had recently been rescued through the influence of Thomas Lott (Smith 1848c, 138). The inscription was part of an important temple dedication from Nicholas Lane, which Smith had recently taken some trouble to deposit in the Guildhall. However, in 1859 when Smith returned to examine it, he found that it had mysteriously disappeared (Appendix 3, Site 70; Smith 1886, 198-9). By the same token, most of the Roman mouldings found in 1852-3 in the Tower Hill Bastion were dumped in a builder's yard (Appendix 3, Site 119; Anon. 1852b). It is hardly surprising that Smith and his friends should renew their criticisms of the Corporation, especially when Tite again tried to justify it in his catalogue of the Royal Exchange antiquities (Tite 1848, xlv; 1849; Anon. 1849a; Price 1849; Smith 1849c; 1849d). The criticisms may actually have had some effect, since in 1850, the library accepted a cabinet of London tokens and ordered that a catalogue of them be printed. Through the mediation of Thomas Lott, it even accepted the occasional gift from Smith.

The museum's development nevertheless continued to be strangled by the Corporation's unwillingness to make purchases (BAA 1850, 91). Since the Commissioners of Sewers rarely saved anything, the main opportunity to obtain City

495 COLRO:LCM, 7 Feb. and 6 Mar. 1848.
496 COLRO:LCM, Jan. and 8 Apl. 1850.
497 COLRO:LCM, 1 July 1850 and 7 July 1851.
antiquities came through offers of private collections acquired during the recent spate of City development. These collections had been purchased often at considerable expense, so it was unrealistic to expect them be given, even though - as in the case of Newman's collection - they were generally offered at modest prices.\textsuperscript{498} The unofficial upper limit for purchases of any kind was around £20.\textsuperscript{499} Thus during the late 1840s and 50s, amid continuing criticisms of the Corporation, every major collection of London antiquities apart from Smith's was dispersed by sale: Newman's in 1848, E.B. Price's in 1853,\textsuperscript{500} Chaffers' in 1855 (Anon. 1848c; 1853b; Smith 1859, ii).\textsuperscript{501} Again, Bateman secured some of the material.\textsuperscript{502}

There was therefore never more than an outside chance that the Corporation might purchase Smith's collection when he offered it for sale in January 1855.\textsuperscript{503} But at least Lambert Jones had retired, and on 12 March, following pressure from Thomas Lott and his friends,\textsuperscript{504} the Library sub-committee made an inspection of the collection.\textsuperscript{505} They then excused themselves from further action because of uncertainties arising from William Ewart's forthcoming bill.\textsuperscript{506} This proposed that municipal boroughs of more than 5000 persons should be authorised to levy an additional rate of up to one penny in the pound to establish public libraries and museums, provided that the proposals were approved at a public meeting. A fortnight after their visit, the committee persuaded Ewart to amend his draft, so that in the City the matter should be decided at a meeting of electors.

\textsuperscript{498} BAC III, CRS to TB, 25 Apl. 1848.
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by a two-thirds majority. That autumn, after Ewart's bill had become the Public Libraries Act 1855, the Court of Common Council voted unanimously to call just such a meeting, which took place at the Mansion House on 5 November. According to Smith, many of those who had voted for the meeting, now roused their constituents to vote overwhelmingly against the proposal (Smith 1855-7b). The Guildhall Library was so little used, it was claimed, that the Corporation could easily open it to the public at no charge to the tax-payer (Anon. 1855g). A similar meeting held in 1861 produced a similar result (Anon. 1861).

Thus the City went without a public library and museum, and as well as Smith's collection, lost the opportunity of acquiring another collection, valued at £800, which A.C. Kirkmann would have donated at the same time (Smith 1883, 235). Eventually, in July 1869, the Corporation underwent a change of heart when it agreed to construct a new library and museum to house the Bucklersbury Roman pavement found earlier that year (Sheppard 1991, 23). But not until 1882, when it purchased the Baily collection, did the museum acquire any respectability as a collection of local antiquities (Welch 1903, x-xi).

The British Museum, 1845-53

Having outlined the development of the Corporation's museum to 1856, we now turn to consider what was happening at national level. Influenced by his colleagues in the Archaeological Institute, by the autumn of 1845, Hawkins had at least accepted that the British Museum ought to collect British antiquities (Hawkins 1845). Progress was nonetheless impossible without support from the trustees, so in 1845, when Lord Prudhoe offered to donate the Stanwick hoard of bronzes to the Museum, he set a condition that room should be set aside for British material (Anon. 1845b). A similar ruse in 1839 had met with some success, and under

507 COLRO:LCM, 26 and 29 Mar., and 4 June 1855.
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pressure from the Institute, the trustees again agreed (Miller 1973, 210; Anon. 1845c). Hawkins immediately wrote to several railway chairmen to ask that, in view of the plans for a national collection, they would order the preservation of antiquities found during construction work. He received several satisfactory replies (Anon. 1845e).

When the BM reopened in 1846, the press expressed pleasure that a collection of architectural casts had been replaced by some Romano-British finds (Anon. 1846b). Otherwise Prudhoe's condition was ignored. So in 1848, the Institute resolved to repeat its request for an enlarged and scientifically arranged collection of "British and Medieval Antiquities". In 1849, a Times editorial deplored the lack of provincial museums, galleries and libraries, stating that apart from Smith "and some half-dozen other gentlemen, in this semi-barbarous metropolis" British antiquities were comparatively neglected. "If the State would find the building, we have little doubt that private generosity would soon fill it" (Anon. 1849c). In 1850, Lord Mahon again reminded the trustees that the promised room had yet to be provided. Their slow response came as no surprise to Smith, who was still urging the Antiquaries to form a museum.

The year 1850 also saw the publication of the report of a Parliamentary Commission which had spent the past two years studying the BM's function and organisation (Parliamentary Commission 1850). In giving evidence, Hawkins complained that members of the board of trustees had gone so far as to rearrange the galleries without consulting him, and that he needed their permission to make any changes requiring expense. It was also reported that the Museum had no "antiquary" on the staff to balance the natural scientists and literati, and that:

508 BM:CA, Minutes of Standing Committee of Trustees of BM XXV (1850-2), 9 Nov. 1850.
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"A great many of our collections are in a state of entire confusion... the British antiquities are wanting space - wanting new rooms; the other collections are too much crowded" (paras. 8131 and 8133).

With this Worsaae would have whole-heartedly agreed, for on hearing about the Commission, he had written to "a nobleman" urging that the BM should have five or ten apartments of antiquities from England, Scotland and Ireland (Smith 1850c). The Danish National Museum held no less than sixteen rooms of their national antiquities (Smith 1852b, 205). Hawkins nevertheless considered that the two rooms in preparation should suffice. That winter, just one room was opened for British antiquities, which months later was still "too insufficiently arranged to admit of classification and description" (Vaux 1851). But major advances were at hand with the appointment in 1851 of a new assistant to look after the British material - A.W. Franks (Kidd 1977, 126).

Franks (1826-97) had graduated from Cambridge in 1849 and the following year had become a life member of the Institute. Unlike the Museum's other curatorial staff, Franks was interested in medieval art, and in particular the artifacts of barbarian Europe (Wilson 1985a; D. Kidd, pers. comm.). He was a man for whom Smith came to develop a high regard (Smith 1891, 184).

Franks' first task was to expand the British collections into a national series comparable with the Danish National Museum. Franks recognised that the scientific value of antiquities depended upon the reliability of associated records, and that in this regard antiquities obtained from dealers were deficient. He therefore set out to encourage gifts from private collectors, and for three consecutive

510 BM:CA, Minutes of General Meeting of Trustees of BM VII (1844-52), 14 Dec. 1850.
511 The importance of the Danish model is suggested in many places, e.g. the report of the Parliamentary Commission (1850, 38-9), and Franks (1853), who also organised the British collection according to the Danish three-age system (Daniel 1975, 82).
years after his appointment, published notes on his progress in the Institute's *Archaeological Journal* (Franks 1852; 1853; 1854). In his article of 1853, despite numerous recent discoveries of Saxon grave goods by private collectors, Franks complained that:

"... additions to the Saxon antiquities have not been very numerous, and that branch of national archaeology is the most deficient in the whole collection".

This was paradoxical, in that following the European uprisings of 1848 there had arisen in Britain a widespread conception that the country's stability derived from its Anglo-Saxon roots (Levine 1986, 80; esp. Kemble 1849, v-viii). In Smith's words:

"... while it is the fashion ... to hear appeals made to the wisdom of our Saxon forefathers, to their laws and institutions, the foreigner asks in vain to be shown a relic of one of their monuments" (Smith 1851b, 157).

This being so, Franks would clearly have done his utmost to acquire a prize such as the Faussett collection.

**Faussett Refused, 1853-4**

Whereas following the Canterbury Congress the BAA had shown no interest in the Faussett collection, Smith had never forgotten an offer made to the Congress by Dr. Faussett to permit its publication. Therefore, following the success of his recent research on Saxon and Merovingian finds (Chapter 10), Smith wrote to Dr. Faussett, offering to publish the collection at his own expense. This was shortly before the latter's death in 1853. Dr. Faussett refused, probably because he was considering its disposal "consistent with the preservation of its integrity, and the interests of his family" (Smith 1856b, v). He nevertheless asked Smith's advice about this, and offered the collection through Smith to Lord Londesborough for £ 1,000, who seems to have declined.512

The principal beneficiary of Dr. Faussett's will was his eldest son, Bryan, who lived at Oxford "being in holy

---

512 DNM:CRS, CRS to JJAW, 3 Dec. 1853.
orders". Heppington was placed in trust for his benefit, but much of the rest of the estate, including the antiquities and manuscripts, was left to him directly. The executors were, nevertheless, empowered to sell or dispose of such property as was necessary to settle debts and charges, and it was they who decided the fate of the collection.

There were three executors: Dr. Faussett's widow, his second son, Godfrey, and his cousin William Bland of Hartlip. Smith had been friendly with Bland since 1840, and had published an account of a Roman villa found on his estate (p. 283). Therefore, all three executors would have been disposed to accept Smith's advice, which was that the collection should be valued and offered to the BM (Smith 1856b, v). A few days later, Heppington received a visit from Hawkins (Pl. 14), accompanied by Albert Way, who judged the collection to be "of the highest importance to the Museum". Hawkins immediately arranged for the manuscript volumes to be forwarded to London, and for a mutually acceptable dealer to value the collection (BM 1854, 1; Smith 1854b, 182). They agreed upon William Chaffers, a friend of Smith's, whose collection of London antiquaries has already been mentioned (p. 96). Again Smith's influence is evident.

Chaffers submitted his valuation on 20 September, having priced the collection at £ 665, excluding the notebooks. This the executors thought rather low, but by 30 September they had determined to proceed, and to include the manuscripts in the valuation price.

---

513 PRO, Prerogative Court of Canterbury, Quire 606, proved 9 Aug. 1853.
514 CRS:J3, 10 Feb. 1840.
515 Two copies of the valuation survive: BM:DWAA, Museum Archive, 2nd Series f. 1957; MP (Chaffers). Published (BM 1854, 1-3).
The BM trustees considered their offer on 8 October. Chaffers' valuation was tabled with Faussett's notebooks, and a report from Hawkins was read. It commended the collection as "probably the most instructive and interesting ever formed of such objects", emphasising the excellent documentation and that every item was "ticketed with the name of the place where it was found". The trustees nevertheless "declined to give so large a sum as there were no sufficient funds". The matter was back on the agenda for 12 November, when a letter was read from the Archaeological Institute's Central Committee. Clearly Franks had canvassed support. The letter stated that the Institute contemplated making valuable donations of British materials to the Museum, but looked for the formation of a national series to which the Faussett collection would be a valuable asset. The trustees' response was unaltered (BM 1854).

When it became known that the purchase might fall through, various private collectors expressed an interest. Once again, Bateman was eager to buy, so was Albert Way, but the principal contender was Joseph Mayer (1803-86), the Liverpool goldsmith, collector, philanthropist, and co-founder of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire.

Smith and Wright had become friendly with Mayer at the BAA's Chester congress of 1849 (Smith 1883, 64-65). By helping to finance the congress, Mayer had placed the BAA greatly in his debt, and in 1850, Smith showed his appreciation by sponsoring Mayer's election to the Antiquaries. He also arranged his entry into other societies. It may be that

517 BAC V, CRS to TB, 28 Nov. 1853.
518 BAC III, CRS to TB, 28 June 1849.
519 CRS:BAA6, JM to CRS, 18 Aug. 1849; SAL election records, 10 Jan. 1850. Mayer's other sponsors included WC.
520 Notably the Soc. Antiqs. de l'Ouest (MP, CRS to JM, 11 Nov. 1852; NLW:DMR, 5118D, M. Duprés to CRS, 24 May 1853), the RSNA (DNM:CRS, CRS to CCR, 24 Nov. 1855), and the Society of Antiquaries of Luxembourg (LCLRO, Acc. 1207, JM to CRS, 18 Feb. 1857).
Smith had ulterior motives, for on returning from a continental tour in 1850, he told Bateman that:

"You must give us some little notices of your more recent Saxon discoveries. I have some remarkable materials at hand for a paper making comparison between the continental and the English, but the expense is too much.... I wish I could find some liberal man of humble birth and humble pretentions who would take us by the hand firmly and freely. We would raise a statue of him in the temple of archaeology."521

Had Smith sensed that he had met such a man in Joseph Mayer? Certainly his attention bore fruit, in that Mayer made generous contributions towards Smith's excavations at Lympne in 1850 and at Pevensey in 1852 (Smith 1852c, 46; 1858a, 41).

Mayer came from a prosperous Newcastle-under-Lyme family. Having trained in his brother-in-law's jewelry shop, in 1844 Mayer established his own business in Lord Street, Liverpool, in part because he wanted to be a manufacturing jeweler, not just a middle man. Like Smith, Mayer remained a bachelor, and looked to his business to finance his collection, so the men found much in common.

Impressed by the BM's new Egyptian Gallery, in May 1852 Mayer opened his own "Egyptian Museum" in Colquitt Street, Liverpool, furnishing it with sale room purchases (Gibson 1988). That summer, Mayer asked Smith to supply him with exhibits and notes for a study collection of national antiquities, and Smith gladly complied (p. 226).522

Mayer was particularly interested in antique jewelry - to sell, for his collection, and as a source of design ideas (Gibson 1988). It was therefore natural that he should be interested in the Faussett collection, and when Smith visited him in September 1853,523 the men doubtless discussed what might happen if the BM was to refuse the collection.

521 BAC III, CRS to TB, 15 Sep. 1850.
522 LM, Acc. No. 30.131, item 2, CRS to JM, 26 Aug. 1852; MP, CRS to JM, 12 Dec. 1852.
523 JM:A, p. 57.
Some of the correspondence relating to this period is missing, but there are hints that Wright, Mayer and perhaps Smith met in Liverpool in October to discuss tactics: soon afterwards, Wright was planning a lecture on Saxon antiquities, and in early November, a second (?) "Faussett Club" dinner, this time in London, was being talked about.\textsuperscript{524} Mayer was probably unknown to the BM's officers, but tactfully placed them in his debt by giving the museum twenty-five Wedgwood medallions and a valuable 14th-century astrolabe (Franks 1854, 30).\textsuperscript{525} He also contacted Dr. Faussett's executors, who promised that he should have the first refusal.\textsuperscript{526} Doubtless Mayer's intention not to split the collection would have proven attractive to them.\textsuperscript{527} The motive behind these moves is revealed in a letter from Smith to Bateman. Mayer was considering a bold philanthropic gesture:

"... to buy the collection and after I, at his expense, had printed an account of it, to give it to the British Museum!!!\textsuperscript{528}

With this in prospect, Smith now became eager to see Bryan Faussett's notebooks, which he had never examined closely. They were still with Hawkins at the BM. Accordingly, at the end of November, Smith wrote to ask Godfrey Faussett if he might borrow them for a day or two.\textsuperscript{529} Permission was granted immediately. Nevertheless, when Smith applied to Hawkins, the latter refused to hand them over, and informed Mr. Faussett that he strongly objected that Smith should have them.\textsuperscript{530} Clearly Hawkins had not forgotten old scores arising from the split (p. 192). Since it was due to Smith that the collection was on offer to the Museum, the snub was particularly inappropriate. Mayer was disgusted, and

\textsuperscript{524} TW:L, TW to JM, 31 Oct. and 6 Nov. 1853.  
\textsuperscript{525} BM:DMLA, Acc. Nos. 1853.11-4.1 etc. The number indicates that they were accessioned in November, and must have been donated shortly before.  
\textsuperscript{526} BAC V, CRS to TB, 28 Nov. 1853.  
\textsuperscript{527} BM:DMLA, JM to AWF, 24 Nov. 1853.  
\textsuperscript{528} BAC V, CRS to TB, 26 Dec. 1853.  
\textsuperscript{529} BAC V, CRS to TB, 28 Nov. 1853.  
\textsuperscript{530} DNM:CRS, CRS to JJAW, 3 Dec. 1853.
immediately withdrew his plan of giving the collection to the BM.531

When the Archaeological Institute met on 2 December, they heard that a continental museum had registered its interest, and voted unanimously to petition the BM trustees (AI 1854, 52-3; Smith 1854b, 189-91). In November, Hawkins had exhibited Faussett's notebooks to the Society of Antiquaries (Evans 1956, 274), whose officers now wrote to advise the trustees that if they accepted the Faussett collection, W.M. Wylie, author of the Fairford Grave, would make a gift of his own collection (BM 1854, 7). The matter was considered anew on 10 December and 14 January, but the reply was the same, and the reason became clear. The trustees would not even try to raise the money. Finance was not the problem; the trustees did not want the antiquities - probably they did not want any British antiquities!

Any lingering doubts that lack of finance was an excuse were dispelled on 11 February 1854, when the Board considered estimates for the forthcoming financial year. The finance sub-committee had recommended that they should seek a purchase fund of £4,000 if the Faussett collection was to be bought, and £3,500 if not. The trustees requested £ 3,500 (idem., 9). In desperation, the Antiquaries and the Institute now wrote directly to the Lords of the Treasury (Anon. 1854c). This measure was unlikely to succeed, but in any case, Godfrey Faussett's patience was exhausted. On 18 February, he informed Mayer that he and Hawkins had agreed that if the Treasury had not responded by then, he would withdraw the offer.532 The following week, Mayer visited Heppington with Chaffers, bought the collection for £ 700. With characteristic generosity, Mayer paid the full cost of the valuation;533 the BM would have paid only one half.

531 DNM:CRS, CRS to JJAW, 1 Feb. 1854; BAC V, CRS to TB, 26 Dec. 1853.
532 MP, GF to JM, 18 Feb. 1854.
533 MP, WC to JM, 18 Feb. 1854; BM:DMLA, Correspondence Files, JM to AWF, 26 Feb. 1854.
This was not quite the end of the matter, for Mayer declined to buy the coins and seals, which were immediately sent to Sotheby's together with Faussett's papers. Smith was concerned to know if there was anything else relating to the Saxon antiquities and, indeed, the papers included important correspondence between Douglas and Godfrey Faussett. Fortunately, Chaffers managed to purchase this for Mayer. The coins were another question, and Smith was obliged to contact the purchasers directly. His efforts were rewarded by the discovery of six Saxon weights made from Roman coins, which had previously escaped attention (Smith 1856b, xliii).

News of Mayer's acquisition was greeted, by the societies and press alike, with praise for the purchaser and condemnation of the BM trustees. Smith wrote a tract on the subject, and included a list of the board members, partly to shame them and partly to demonstrate that they comprised the great and the good, most of whom had no specialist knowledge (Smith 1854b). On 1 June the outcry reached Parliament, and the trustees were ordered to supply the House of Commons with copies of all communications relating to the Faussett collection, which were published for public scrutiny (Hansard 1854a, 283; BM 1854). Smith was frustrated to find that the trustee's minutes did not record who had attended the crucial board meetings (Smith 1854c). However, by good fortune, a private letter survives, which points to the individuals concerned. It was written by William Vaux, one of Hawkins' assistants, to the archaeologist Henry Layard, who was concerned to know why his Assyrian antiquities were confined to the museum basement.

The problems created by what Smith called the "monstrous anomaly" of the board were truly as bad as they appeared (Smith 1854b, 186). Of the 47 trustees, 27 held post by

534 MP, GF to CRS, 2 Mar. 1854.
535 MP, WC to CRS, 2 Mar. 1854.
536 BL: DMS, Add. MS. 38984, ff. 374-8, W. Vaux to H. Layard, Apl. 1856.
reason of their position - including the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Speaker of the House of Commons and the First Lord of the Admiralty! Not surprisingly, few of these officials attended meetings, and the same applied to the nine family trustees. The remaining fifteen places were elected by the board - in practice the other elected members of the board - who were thereby able to introduce persons of their own taste and outlook. These elected members formed the majority at board meetings, although no more than seven or eight attended, and sometimes only four or five. In Vaux's words:

"Practically this is the greatest evil - it throws all the arrangements in the hands of two or three men, who if they stick together (as Hamilton, Dundas and the Duke of Somerset for instance) can carry or reject what they like".

What they liked were Greek antiquities. When the Faussett collection was finally rejected on 11 February, only five trustees were present. One is known to have been Viscount Mahon, President of the Society of Antiquaries, who supported the purchase (BM 1854, 9). Another was the Duke of Somerset, who was against it. Hamilton and Dundas were united in opposition, and would have made every effort to attend. Clearly, the gang of three had voted together.

The views of Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset (1804-85), were expressed in a Commons answer about the Faussett collection on 3 July. In his opinion, the job of the trustees was:

"... to consider how, with the limited funds available, they could best secure those antiquities, which, if they did not purchase, the country would not possess.

This was the case with regard to classical antiquities, although British antiquities would very likely find a place in some provincial museum" (Hansard 1854b, 1054-8; Smith 1854c, 268).

This last suggestion was impracticable. The municipal museum movement did not gather momentum until the last three decades of the 19th century (Lewis 1984, 32), and as late as 1870, when Smith advised William Gibbs about bequeathing his collection of Anglo-Saxon antiquities from Faversham, Kent, it proved impossible to find a suitable local museum. The
antiquities ended up in the V&A (Smith 1891, 52). By the mid 1850s, a number of respectable local museums had opened, as at Caerleon, Lincoln, Leicester, Colchester, York and Newcastle-upon-Tyne, but they had no money, and could hardly be expected to mount an appeal for antiquities found outside their locality (Anon. 1858b). Thus for the Faussett collection, the only realistic alternative to the BM was a private collection, with the attendant risk of dispersal when its owner died.

Lord Seymour's next comment was even more absurd: the Museum was always being offered expensive collections that were reputedly unique, for example a recent offer of some Pacific shells. Smith lost no time in printing a scathing reply, underlining the stupidity of comparing Faussett's antiquities with shells, "as if the one grew like the other, and was re-produced yearly" (Smith 1854c, 267).

The former M.P., Sir David Dundas (1799-1877), regarded by many as being "not quite, quite right", was no better informed than Lord Seymour. Vaux had actually heard him remark that he "did not think we wanted a heap of Saxon antiquities in the Museum!" The third member of the club, William Hamilton (1777-1859), at least had some claims as an antiquary. As Lord Elgin's secretary in Constantinople he had assisted in obtaining the Rosetta stone and Elgin marbles. A co-founder of the Royal Geographical Society (DNB) and former vice-president of the Antiquaries, Hamilton (although not there) had even been named as President of the Primeval Section at the BAA's Canterbury Congress. Nevertheless, in Hamilton's opinion museums should be "rather for the improvement of fine arts than merely as an historical collection of objects" (Parliamentary Commission 1850, para. 10564). In a period dominated by historicizing styles, the need to display well-designed historical objects had already been recognised by the government, and in 1852

537 BL:DMS, Add. MS. 52009, f. 66, A. Panizzi to Lord Holland.
had led to the creation of the "Museum of Ornamental Art" in Marlborough House (Wilson 1985b, 71). Unfortunately, Hamilton's definition of fine art was Greek art. Such was his bias against other civilisations, that he had vehemently opposed plans to display Layard's Nineveh sculptures. According to Vaux:

"Hamilton would not see with any but Greek eyes, they were not Greek. He wished them at the bottom of the sea...".

By the 1850s such views were preposterously conservative. In France, medieval art had been fashionable since the early 1830s. In Russia, Denmark, Germany, and elsewhere, museums of national art and antiquities had already opened or were about to open (Basin 1967, 218 ff.; Sklenár 1983, 78-82). This is not to say that Merovingian art was universally appreciated on the continent, since a tendency to view through "Greek eyes" naturally persisted. At first the German archaeologist, Ludwig Lindenschmit, was reluctant to accept that the Selzen graves belonged to early Germanic tribes, since the jewelry found among the grave goods did not match his grandiose preconceptions. Trained in the classical school, Lindenschmit could not appreciate the style of decoration, which seemed bewildering, fantastic and adventurous (Lindenschmit 1848, 23-4; Kühn 1976, 218). However, he and others were willing to respect their historical interest and to learn, whereas Hamilton was not. In Vaux's words:

"I say such prejudices are not only wrong but disgraceful and that a man who is so narrow minded, is not fit to be a trustee of any miscellaneous collection".

Matters were made worse because the trustees did not permit museum officers to attend their meetings. All communications had to be in writing, and there was no opportunity for discussion or questions. Because of this, the poor attendance, and the bias of Hamilton's clique, decisions were almost arbitrary. Faussett was refused, yet less than two years earlier, the trustees had agreed to spend £ 200 on Professor J.K. Bähr's collection of Latvian
grave goods. Ironically this was regarded as being especially important because it was well documented, with details of find spots (Franks 1852, 14).

Ultimately, the blame for the mismanagement lay with Parliament. The composition of the board had been recognised as problematic by the 1850 Parliamentary Commission, as was the board's say over acquisitions - which should have been the responsibility of curatorial staff. However, the Commission's recommendations in this area had been ignored. Smith (whose Liberal sympathies have been noted) saw this as further evidence of the need for parliamentary reform:

"When our Government shall be composed of statesmen instead of placemen ... then, and then only, may it be expected that our national antiquities will be cared for and protected" (Smith 1856b, vi).

In this, Smith was being over-optimistic, in that the extraordinary composition of the board remained unaltered until the British Museum Act 1963 - despite a long series of Parliamentary reforms between 1858 and 1949.538

Whether the trustees were embarrassed by their public denunciation is not known. In 1855, they attracted further criticism by refusing the important Fejérváry collection of classical and medieval ivories, which again was purchased by Mayer (Gibson 1988, 10-11; AI 1855, 401). In March the same year, their anti-British bias was again evident when they refused (initially at least) to purchase Smith's collection of London antiquities.539 In 1856, when Akerman offered the finds from his recent Anglo-Saxon cemetery excavations at Filkins and Broughton Poggs, Oxfordshire, at below the cost of the excavations, the trustees again declined, and again the finds were purchased by Mayer, who also paid all the expenses (Akerman 1859; White 1988a, 122).

539 BM:CA, Minutes of ... Trustees XXVI, 24 Mar. 1855.
The refusals engendered such feeling in antiquarian circles, that for a while it appeared as if the BM might never develop a national series. Wylie stuck to his word, withheld his collection, and eventually gave it to the Ashmolean Museum. Rolfe's museum was offered to and purchased by Mayer, on advice from Smith, who also arranged that Mayer should have the important Saxon horn mount made from a reused Gallo-Roman vessel, found at Strood, then in the collection of Humphrey Wickham (Smith 1851b, 158). Hillier sold his collection to Lord Londesborough, claiming that but for the BM's attitude, he would have placed it there (Anon. 1855h). There were renewed calls for a national archaeological museum separate from the BM, and perhaps outside the capital. In March 1854, an attempt was made to establish one in Regent's Park, with a capital of £200,000. The Crystal Palace was also suggested (Rhind 1855). Mayer was privately urged to work towards one in Liverpool, with the Faussett collection as its "grand neucleus". He responded in 1867 by donating his Egyptian museum to Liverpool Town Council, although the archaeological collections did not expand to become a national series.

The turning point for national antiquities came in the spring of 1856, when the press and national societies made it clear that by refusing Smith's collection, the BM's trustees risked a public outcry at least equivalent to that which attended the Faussett affair. Faced with this, the trustees backed down and made an offer of £2,000, which although well below an independent valuation, Smith eventually accepted, making a financial sacrifice to preserve the integrity and scientific value of his collection (Kidd 1977). Vaux saw the purchase as yet another instance of the trustees' incompetence, in that

540 MP, JC to JM, 17 Aug. 1857.
541 MP, CRS to JM, 2 July 1856.
542 DNM: CRS, CRS to JJAW, 19 Mar. 1854.
543 MP, FWF to JM, undated.
"everyone who has seen who was any judge at all said £ 1,500 was quite enough."544 This is doubly ironic when one considers that the same meeting which approved the offer to Smith also approved an annual pension of £ 1,200 to Sir Henry Ellis - who years earlier had opposed Smith's election to the Society of Antiquaries.545

Franks' pleasure at acquiring Smith's collection must have been short-lived, for just days later Anthony Panizzi, a man of Greek tastes, was appointed as Principal Librarian. Franks consequently had a difficult time at the Museum for several years to come (Wilson 1985a, 12-14). Even so, after Hamilton's death in 1859 the quality of decision-making seems to have improved, and following the 1860 Select Committee report on the Museum, neither the trustees nor Panizzi could fail to collect British antiquities (Parliamentary Committee 1860, vii-ix). Meanwhile, slowly but surely, Franks had been developing the British and medieval European collections into a major international resource. In 1866, having failed in his goal of purging the Museum of British material, Panizzi relented, and accepted its permanence by creating the Department of British and Medieval antiquities (Miller 1973, 299, 213 and 313).

The Publication of Inventorium Sepulchrale

An advantage of the Faussett collection going to Mayer, was that it led to the immediate publication of Inventorium Sepulchrale, Mayer being concerned to underline the philanthropic nature of his purchase (Smith 1856b, i). The prospectus was issued in April 1854.546 No such publication would have appeared if the collection had been purchased by the BM (Anon. 1856a-c; Wright 1856). Smith agreed to edit the work, and his illustrator friend, F.W. Fairholt, to

545 BM:CA, Minutes of ... Trustees XXVII, 8 Mar. 1856.
546 MP, CRS to JM, 6 Apl. 1854.
Meanwhile Thomas Wright drafted a "nice popular paper on Anglo-Saxon antiquities", which he read on 27 September before a meeting of the British Association and Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire. Mayer's new acquisition was exhibited at the same event which was reported in The Illustrated London News (Anon. 1854h; Wright 1855, 8).

The task of editing Inventorium greatly appealed to Smith, who was forever urging the publication of catalogues of collections, public and private. His aim was to make them better known, to ensure that they were properly assessed (which would tend to maintain the integrity of important collections), to facilitate research, and to ameliorate the potential loss of information through accidents or "the grave of science - a public auction" (Smith 1886, 223; 1891, 54). In 1851, when he began to think of retiring, Smith's first step was to catalogue his collection.

Inventorium was in proof form by December 1855, and was submitted to Akerman, Wright, and J.M. Kemble for comment. In general, Smith's editorial work was excellent. Apart from some additional footnotes, which corrected some mistaken terminology, Faussett's text was left virtually unaltered (Hawkes 1990, 7). So keen was Smith to preserve the work's integrity that he not only included, but actually illustrated, two post-medieval sword pommels and a knife handle, even though he believed they must have been placed in the graves by Faussett's friends as a joke (Smith 1856b, 29-30 and 82). His only substantial alteration was to place the Crundale antiquities last, since unlike the other finds, 

547 MP, CRS to JM, 6 Apl. 1854.
548 TW:L, f. 8, TW to JM, 28 Mar. 1854.
551 LCLRO, Ref. Hg 0695, proof edition of Inventorium Sepulchrale, dated 1855, and annotated by CRS, J.M. Kemble, JYA, TW and FWF.
552 There are some errors in the numbering of the artifacts, R. White, pers. comm.
these were Roman (which Faussett had not appreciated). A preface summarising the history of the collection was supported by an appendix containing transcripts of relevant correspondence (Smith and Mayer were both ardent collectors of autograph letters). An introduction, supplemented by a full bibliography, discussed Faussett's discoveries in the light of current knowledge; its value as a synthesis of recent discoveries was underlined by the cuts, which were borrowed from many recent works on Dark Age cemetery finds. Other aspects of the format show the influence of continental publications, particularly Bähr's Die Gräber der Liven (1850).

Fairholt's illustrations were unsurpassed in an English publication. Recent works, notably Akerman's Remains of Pagan Saxondom (1855) had demonstrated the potential of high quality tinted engravings in the illustration of Saxon jewelry, and Mayer provided no less than seven coloured plates (Pl. 16). They cost over ten shillings per set and Mayer became worried about rising costs. Smith therefore reassured him that the work would bring:

"... great returns in honourable fame.... There are chances, my dear Sir, which occur only once in an age; and the Faussett collection was a chance of chances. In a month or so you will see the effect."

Even so, Mayer was concerned that his beneficence might go unnoticed and despite Smith's reservations, when

---

553 Both the Inventorium and Bähr (1850) use quarto paper. Both have an introduction which summarises the circumstances of discovery, followed by a separate discussion of each class of find, and then the ethnological origins of the antiquities. Both provide tables, of coins only in Bähr and of all the finds in Inventorium. Both locate the plates at the end and use indexes to link items shown on the plates with individual graves. Some of these features are found also in Lindenschnmit (1848).

554 MP, AWF to JM, 22 Apr. 1856. If he had seen anything of equivalent quality in a continental publication, it cannot have been in the field of dark-age studies.

555 MP, Invoice by T. Brooker, Christmas 1856.

556 MP, CRS to JM, 20 Feb. 1856.

557 MP, CRS to JM, 4 Apr. 1856.
Inventorium finally appeared in April 1856,\textsuperscript{558} Mayer's portrait was bound in every copy. This was not inappropriate for whereas in normal circumstances the volume would have sold for three guineas, Mayer had set the price at two (Smith 1883, 69).

Although not widely reviewed, Inventorium was greatly acclaimed (Anon. 1856a-c; Wright 1856). In congratulating Mayer, Franks wrote that:

"The publication ... is the only thing which in any measure reconciles me to the loss of the collection to the National Museum".\textsuperscript{559}

It provided Mayer with the recognition he desired, and led to membership and high office in some prestigious societies.\textsuperscript{560} He was delighted,\textsuperscript{561} and towards the close of 1856 commissioned two marble portrait medallions of Smith, keeping one, and presenting the other to Smith with a cast of his own portrait and a bust.\textsuperscript{562} Smith later donated his medallion to the Society of Antiquaries (Anon. 1890e).\textsuperscript{563} Mayer also paid Smith 200 guineas (Smith 1883, 69), a sum so large that he may have sought to compensate Smith for the loss he had incurred by selling his own collection to the BM. He subsequently helped finance a trip to the Loire,\textsuperscript{564} and to fund some of Smith's minor publications (Smith 1862–3; 1874).\textsuperscript{565}

The influence which Inventorium may have had on Anglo-Saxon cemetery studies is difficult to determine. Probably it did

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{558} It had not appeared by 15 Apl. (see EML, EM to CRS, 15 Apl. 1856), but had been published by 22 Apl. (MP, AWF to JM, 22 Apl. 1856).
\item \textsuperscript{559} MP, AWF to JM, 22 Apl. 1856.
\item \textsuperscript{560} A copy was sent to the Soc. Antiqs. de France just before his election (TW:L, f. 257, TW to JM, 16 June 1858). He was elected to the RSNA on 15 Dec. 1855 (RP:II, CCR to JM, 16 Apl. 1856), and in 1858 to the Council of the Ethnological Society (TW:L, TW to JM, 1 July 1858).
\item \textsuperscript{561} LCLRO, Acc. No. 1207, JM to CRS, 18 Sep. 1854.
\item \textsuperscript{562} MP, G. Fontana to CRS, 3 Feb. 1857.
\item \textsuperscript{563} Now in their museum, Cat. No. 896.
\item \textsuperscript{564} DNM:CRS, CRS to JJAW, 19 Mar. 1854.
\item \textsuperscript{565} RP:II, JM to CRS, 10 Oct. 1869.
\end{itemize}
no more than to reinforce the best contemporary practices of observation and documentation. Whilst Faussett's standard of excavation and recording had not been surpassed in 1856, it had been equalled, if with no great consistency, by Akerman and others. Moreover, the dated inventory of graves' method of presentation, favoured by Faussett, had already almost superseded the less satisfactory general discussion and excavation diary formats. The importance of the Inventorium, both then and now, lay primarily in the information that it contained. Smith's "Introduction", although now long obsolete, was also acclaimed as a notable achievement:

"For the first time he has enabled us to classify the somewhat chaotic mass of Saxon antiquities discovered at home and abroad; and by the careful comparison of their peculiarities, and the thoughtful testing of the historic record, made one illustrate the other so completely, that we may safely refer certain ornaments to certain tribes, who had settled in various parts of England" (Anon. 1856c).

Clearly, Smith had gone a long way towards achieving the goal he had set in his paper of 1842 mentioned above. The means by which he accomplished this will be discussed in the following chapter.
Having considered how Dark Age studies and the Faussett affair influenced the development of the national collection, we now turn to consider Smith's contribution to Anglo-Saxon archaeology as a subject. In so doing, we will pay particular attention to Smith's edition of *Inventorium Sepulchrale* which to this day remains a corner-stone of Anglo-Saxon cemetery studies (Faussett 1856).

**Excavation and Interpretation**

Smith's edition of *Inventorium Sepulchrale* appeared in 1856, two thirds of the way through the second period of Saxon cemetery exploration, which began in 1841, and tailed off sharply in the early 1860s. Although some important excavations were still to be published in 1856, the most significant reports of this period - by Wylie (1852) and Neville (1852) - had appeared, and Smith had already drawn his principal conclusions. Most of these conclusions feature in his "Introduction" to *Inventorium*.

The contemporary vogue for excavating Saxon graves had been initiated by a series of finds made from 1825-8 by Revd W. Vallance at Sittingbourne, Kent, and eventually published in Smith's *Collectanea* (Vallance and Smith 1844; Smith 1883, 150). The curious grave goods attracted the attention of Lord Albert Conyngham (later Londesborough), who from 1841 with his personal secretary, J.Y. Akerman, commenced a series of excavations around Canterbury at Bridge, Wingham and "Breach Down" (Wright 1861, 117). Arising from these and subsequent excavations, Akerman became the foremost excavator of Saxon cemeteries of his day (Francis 1984).

Smith's own involvement in Saxon cemetery excavations was restricted to Kent. In July 1844, just before the Canterbury Congress, he assisted Wright, Sir Henry Dryden and Lord Albert Conyngham in barrow diggings on Lord...
Albert's estate at Bridge (BAA 1844a, 253-5). Then in July 1846 and May 1847, he and Fairholt assisted W.H. Rolfe's rescue excavation of a Saxon cemetery at Ozingell. Since the graves were unmarked, they developed a system of digging trenches down to the natural chalk to reveal the grave fills (Smith 1853b, 1). In 1858, Smith explored the cemetery at Wye, together with Revd L.B. Larking, founder of the Kent Archaeological Society (Smith 1858d). Soon afterwards, Lord Albert offered to pay for Smith to excavate the Bifrons and Bekesbourne cemeteries, but the plans were terminated by Lord Albert's death in 1859 (Smith 1883, 168). Therefore, contrary to expectations, Smith did not use his retirement to "turn grave digger general of the County of Kent". Compared with Akerman, Smith's contribution to Saxon cemetery excavation was small. Arising from his efforts to publish and interpret the grave goods found by others, it was nevertheless Smith, and not Akerman, who was responsible for most of the accompanying conceptual strides.

That so many of Smith's deductions remain valid is due to the care with which he recorded data, his wide reading and clarity of thought, and his cautious approach to interpretation. Whereas earlier writers on sepulchral remains - Douglas (1793), Colt Hoare (1812-21) and Bloxham (1834) - had centred their efforts on classifying entire burials, grave goods included, according to broad characteristics, Smith and his contemporaries concentrated on the description and classification of the artifacts. Individual burials remained important, not only as evidence of funeral rites, but because they provided a context for the finds. Cemetery lay-outs were generally not studied, despite signs of interest by Douglas (1793, Pls. XXVII-XXVIV, etc.), Dryden (1852) and Troyon (1841).

The validity of Smith's work rested upon the principle of dating by association with objects of known date, first
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propounded by Douglas. In 1843 he published an article that gently corrected some errors in a book on sepulchral remains by Bloxham (1834; Smith 1843b). The most important amendment concerned a coiled (?) Saxon pot from Churchover, Warwickshire (Pl. 17a). (Although Smith called it "turned", it was probably coiled, pers. comm., Dr. R. White.) The author considered that it was probably Roman (Bloxham 1834, 34), but Smith disagreed on the basis of associated weapons and shield bosses (Smith 1843b, 41). To support his interpretation, Smith illustrated a stamped hand-made globular urn from another mixed cemetery recently identified at Marston St. Lawrence, Northamptonshire (Pl. 17b; ibid., 44; both vessels are reproduced in Smith 1856b, xv).\footnote{CRS:N1, p. 68.} Whilst Douglas had suggested in a footnote that urns of this variety were Saxon (Douglas 1793, 131, fn.), his idea seems to have been overlooked, and Smith here became the first to illustrate correctly identified hand-made Saxon urns. Four years later, a JBAA article on finds from Kingston-upon-Soar, Derbyshire, extended the range of published forms was extended to include what are now called bossed urns, biconical urns and Buckelurne (Henslow 1847). The writer maintained that these belonged to "Ancient Britains", but Smith knew better, and a corrective note was inserted by Wright (1847, 58). This was confirmed at the BAA's Warwick conference of 1847, when Milner and others exhibited as Saxon some similar urns (Smith 1883, 51). Such errors of basic identification became less frequent after the publication that year of Akerman's Index (Akerman 1847). The Kingston urns were eventually republished with a correct identification by Smith (1852b, 228-34). When Kemble later published his important article on mortuary urns recently found in Lower Saxony, their identification rested upon their similarity to these and other Saxon urns from the Midlands, and it was the striking English parallels which convinced some of Kemble's German colleagues that his urns were Saxon, not Slavonic, which had been the prevailing wisdom (Kemble 1855a).
Having ascertained the means of dating Saxon burials, Smith set about to identify and describe the varieties of objects which they contained. His early classificatory work on brooches has already been mentioned (p. 224), and his "Introduction" to Faussett's *Inventorium* is noteworthy for its tripartite classification of Kentish circular brooches, based on construction (Smith 1856b, xx-xxiv). This has served as the basis of more recent classifications by Leeds (1936, 115-24) and Avent (1975, 1), although Smith's first and third classes are transposed in their schemes.

Smith's limited experience of excavation taught him that: "It is important to note the position of things in situ to determine their use" (Smith 1847c, 237). This remark arose from the excavations from 1846-7 at Ozingell (Osengal), Kent, by Rolfe, assisted amongst others, by Smith, Wright and by Fairholt, who was responsible for preparing the illustrations. Here, in a grave, an object interpreted by Douglas as a bow brace was found, hollow side up, immediately beneath the umbo of a shield. Clearly this was the shield's handle (Smith 1853b, 3, 11 and Pl. II, Nos. 5-6). To record the fact, Smith asked Fairholt to make a drawing to show the skeleton and grave goods in situ. This was later turned into the first accurate illustration of its kind in an English publication (Pl. 18; Smith 1854e, 216). As in Bryan Faussett's day, graves were generally opened and destroyed without being illustrated. The only exceptions had been a misleadingly inaccurate drawing by Douglas (1793, Pl. I) and a sketchy cross-section and plan of two barrows at Bridge by Wright (BAA 1845, 253-5).

In 1851, Smith published two puzzling objects, hoping that similar items might be recovered in situ in a grave (Smith 1851b, 165). Within a few months, his network of

correspondents had sent in their observations, and Smith was able to pronounce them to be "pendant girdle-ornaments, somewhat analogous to the modern châtelaine" - another interpretation that has stood the test of time (Meaney 1981, 247-8). All were incomplete but in much the same way that he had earlier worked out the design of Iron Age coins by comparing several incomplete examples, Smith was now able to compile a picture of the entire artifact by combining evidence from several finds in different degrees of completeness (Pl. 19; Smith 1852b, 234-5). The same inductive methods were used to research Saxon shields, on which subject Smith corresponded at length with Goddard Johnson and Worsaae.570

Other writers did not compare and weigh evidence with the same care. In 1850 an inhumation was found at Little Wilbraham in which:

"... partly upon the occipital portion of the cranium, and the circular vertebrae, was placed a curious and apparently unique object ... a headpiece or kind of crown" (Deck 1851).

The accompanying illustration depicts a wooden bucket with bronze hoops, decorated with vandykes. The same mistake had been made previously in France and Germany (Oberlin 1773, 159 and Tab. XVI; Houben and Fiedler 1839, 67 and Tab. XLVIII). Until Smith had convinced him otherwise, even Cochet adopted this interpretation for a bucket hoop from Dieppe (Smith 1851b, 160-1, 169 and Pl. XLV; 1875, 466-7; Cochet 1854, 310-6; 1857, 279-98).

When interpreting objects, Smith also took account of the sex of the burial. In 1864, he discussed some unusual "sword-like implements" found in graves at Sarre, Ozingell and Chessell Down, which we now know as iron weaving batons. Whereas most others would have regarded them as weapons, Smith recognised that female graves only ever contained "personal ornaments, or implements and utensils which, for
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domestic uses, had been specially associated with them when living". He therefore contented himself by presenting the implements and some perforated spoons without suggesting a possible use (Smith 1864a, 147-152).

Smith's caution in making interpretations actually led him into error in his refusal to accept the amuletic usage of certain grave goods. In this he was overreacting to Douglas, who saw amulets and magical practices everywhere, supposing that glass tumblers had held *aqua magica* and that iron shears and mirrors had been used in divination (Douglas 1793, 44-46, 22, and 80-81 respectively; Meaney 1981, 269-71). In discussing crystal balls, Douglas had discoursed at enormous length on the use of gems in divination, ranging from Zoroaster and the *Druidical speculum* to the "celebrated vision and mysterious operations of Dr. Dee and Mr. Kelly" (Douglas 1793, 14-19). Smith may perhaps be forgiven for suggesting that they were merely ornaments for attachment to the dress (Smith 1864a, 150). However, even where an amuletic use was well-established, as in the contemporary Neapolitan use of cowry shells, Smith would not accept it for the Anglo-Saxons (Smith 1856b, 68). His prejudice led also to the incorrect identification of certain objects; for example model weapons were interpreted as "tooth, ear and nail picks" (Smith 1856b, xxviii; cf. Meaney 1981, 149). Nevertheless, in seeking to redress this imbalance, Audrey Meaney has commented that:

"Roach Smith's views ... have had a profound effect upon Anglo-Saxon archaeology virtually up to the present day. Not that this was altogether a bad thing ... a sceptical attitude in scholarship is always to be preferred to a too ready credulity" (Meaney 1981, 271).

Despite his scepticism about amulets, Smith wrote to great effect on the significance of the boar on the helmet from Benty Grange, Derbyshire, citing historical sources (Smith 1852b, 238-42). The use of literary evidence in the interpretation and naming of Saxon artifacts had been demonstrated by Douglas (1793), and became a feature of
antiquarian study during the mid 19th century. It was greatly assisted by the publication of Anglo-Saxon and Merovingian texts in modern translation, notably Gregory of Tours' *History of the Franks* (Guizot 1823), and *Beowulf* (Kemble 1835-7). As well as *Beowulf*, J.M. Kemble also published the *Codex Diplomaticus* (1839-48) and his history of *The Saxons in England* (1849), which with Benjamin Thorpe's *History of England under the Saxon Kings* (1845) effectively overtook Sharon Turner's *History of the Anglo-Saxons ...* (1793-1805) - the only previous work on the subject. Unlike Turner, both Kemble and Thorpe were trained in Germanic philology and together transformed Anglo-Saxon studies in England, providing an historical framework within which artifact studies could proceed (White 1971, 586).

In 1847, Smith arranged a scientific examination of wood adhering to weapons from the mixed cemetery at Northfleet, Kent. The shaft of the spear proved to be ash, which was seen as a confirmation of *Beowulf*, where the spear-shaft was termed *aesc*, meaning ash (Smith 1847c, 239). Although not in the same scholastic league as Kemble's *Beowulf*, a discussion of continental Dark Age sources by Rigollot (1850) was also influential. It was Rigollot's comments upon Agathios' *angan* that led to Wylie's successful search for the weapon in France (Wylie 1853a). Wylie's paper on this subject attracted attention on both sides of the channel, and became a celebrated instance of the use of historical sources in naming archaeological artifacts (Akerman and Lindenschmit 1855; Wylie 1855; Smith 1860a, 131).

It was literary sources also which first made it clear that cremation was the traditional rite of Germanic peoples, and, by inference, that where inhumation was practised, it probably represented a subsequent development. Mixed cemeteries could be explained in terms of length of use. Smith nevertheless expressed puzzlement as to why in Kent, where it was affirmed the first Saxons settled, cremation is an exception to the practice of inhumation (Smith 1856b, xv-
Further difficulties arose when Neville found Saxon cremation urns buried above Saxon inhumations at Little Wilbraham, Cambridgeshire. Smith made an ingenious attempt to reconcile the discovery with conventional wisdom by suggesting that the urns, having been exhumed when the graves were dug, were carefully replaced after they had been infilled (Smith 1855a, 146; 1886, 51). Even today, it is doubtful that this problem may be satisfactorily resolved, but Akerman and Neville were perhaps nearer the truth in suggesting that the two rites could have been in contemporaneous use (Akerman 1855, xvi; Neville 1852, 11).

Having studied the written sources, the historian Kemble concluded that urn-burials were always pagan, and that inhumations were always Christian (Kemble 1855b). Smith was unconvinced, but having submitted the proofs of *Inventorium* to Kemble, was obliged to include his views in the Introduction. Wylie subsequently suggested that the rite probably changed to inhumation as a result of contact with Christian customs, and was not necessarily used solely by Christians (Wylie 1857). Smith ultimately accepted the force of Wylie's argument, influenced perhaps by an account by Revd S.E. Finch, which he published in *Collectanea Antiqua*, of a mixed cemetery at Kempston, Beds., which lent support to this view (Smith and Finch 1868; Smith 1871a, x). Some years earlier, Smith had explained cruciform brooches in terms of contacts with Christians (Smith 1850a, 89). This was unfortunate because, in their earliest form, cruciform brooches are now known to have lacked the cross bar, and are thought to have been inspired by Roman bow brooches (Aberg 1926, 28-56).

**Saxons and Romans**

The possibility of interaction between early Saxons and Roman civilisation fascinated both Smith and Wright. There
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was documentary evidence for the presence of Germanic troops in late Roman Britain, and Wright noted that Saxon burials had been found adjacent to Roman cemeteries at Canterbury, Strood and Colchester (Wright 1847, 51). Smith pointed to the burial of money and Roman objects with the dead as evidence of the adoption of Roman habits, from which he questioned whether the Anglo-Saxon invasions had indeed obliterated Roman civilisation (Smith 1850a, 159). As further evidence of cross-cultural contacts, Smith drew attention to the form of Frankish urns, and the Romanizing style of a spoon from Southampton, Teutonic coins, and certain varieties of brooch (Keele and Smith 1855, 62; Smith 1850a, 88 and 216-20; 1851a, 149). Whilst Roman influence upon Anglo-Saxon objects is undeniable, artifact studies now suggest that the cross-fertilisation was less direct than Smith imagined, and with the exception of disk brooches, that it took place mainly on the continent before the period of Saxon settlement (e.g. Ager 1985; Dickinson 1979; White 1988b, 43-45). Moreover, some supposed instances of continuity between Roman and Saxon artifacts and burial customs suggested by Smith are now known to be spurious (White 1988b). The Roman "chatelaine brooch" is entirely unrelated to the Saxon chatelaine pendant (Smith 1880c, Pl. XX, No. 1; cf. Hattatt 1987, 194-6), and the notion that 4th-century developed "cross-bow" brooches represent "the transition link from the late Roman to the early Saxon cruciform ... fibulae" has long since been disproved (Smith 1850a, 81-82, Fig. 3; cf. Aberg 1926, 28-56).

Smith's search for evidence of continuity received false encouragement from a hand-made biconical Saxon urn in the Faussett collection, with an incised Latin inscription (Smith 1858b). Whilst recognising that the urn was an East Anglian type (he later found evidence that it came from North Elmham, Norfolk), Smith understandably failed to realise that the inscription followed an early Roman formula, and must therefore have been a forgery (Haverfield 1901, 312). Having first pronounced it Saxon (Smith 1855a),
Smith then questioned whether it might not be late Roman (Smith 1856b, xvi). This drew strong opposition from Wylie, who noted its similarity to an urn from Cestersover, found with a sword and spear, commenting that even if Smith would insist it was Roman "it is impossible to found a theory on a solitary example".\textsuperscript{572}

Smith was on equally weak ground in attempting to trace links between Saxon and Roman art, as in his remark that Saxon interlaced patterns were "unquestionably borrowed" from the guilloche designs on Roman pavements (Smith 1850b, 56). Like his contemporaries (p. 249), Smith also tended to view Saxon art through classical eyes, describing it as: "degraded, but not without a degree of elegance, except in the attempts to draw the human form" (Smith 1886, 121). Saxon pottery at least was superior to what followed, in that:

"... the Roman influence may be traced; but in the Norman and English productions, harmony of design and beauty of form give way to a total change in conception and in workmanship, as universally bad and degraded as the productions of preceding ages were correct and tasteful" (Smith 1850a, 62).

It was a moot point "whether a corresponding degradation of mind did not accompany the debasement of art". By the 1880s, Smith felt free to express what he had probably thought for years - that the degradation was due to those great destroyers of Roman art:

"... the Christians who, having no confidence in themselves and weak in their religious belief, destroyed every reminder of the old superstition ... being very ignorant people" (Smith 1891, 179; also 1886, 85).

The process was best observed in coins:

"Place the Roman alongside of the Saxon and Norman, the Irish, the Danish, and those of other nations: we see evidence of the rise of Christianity and of the downfall of art" (Smith 1886, 37; also 1878a, 2).

\textbf{Tribal Characteristics}
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Perhaps Smith's greatest contribution to Saxon cemetery studies lies in his recognition of the regional differences in Saxon brooches and other grave goods. As early as 1844, Smith had identified as a class what are now termed Anglian cruciform brooches, giving their distribution as East Anglia and the Midlands (BAA 1845, 246). Otherwise, most of the known Saxon material had come from Kent, and hopes of distinguishing regional tribal characteristics depended upon new discoveries outside the county. The only other substantial groups of finds were from the Isle of Wight, and had aroused a comment from Smith about their close affinity to the Kentish finds (Smith 1846a, 461). In 1847, however, a substantial Saxon cemetery was excavated at Fairford in Gloucestershire, and Wright immediately noticed that the two shield bosses were of a form not hitherto found in Kent (Wright 1847, 52). Three years later, in 1850, the Marston St. Lawrence finds were exhibited to the Society of Antiquaries, and Smith commented that unlike the Kentish burials, these did not include swords, and the brooches were of different forms (Smith in Dryden 1852). On museum visits he had found parallels to the concave (saucer) brooches in the Upper Thames Valley (although their distribution is now known to be wider). Other (small long) brooches were similar to examples from Warwickshire, Leicestershire, Northamptonshire and Suffolk. The large (great square headed) fibula was of a class found also on the continent (it originated in Scandinavia, and is found in Frisia, Herpes, and elsewhere: Aberg 1926, 61-89). In 1860 he noted the distinctive character of Kentish buckles (Smith 1864a, 143). Smith likened these regional variations to English dialects, suggesting that both indicated a decent from tribes of common origin, language and customs. He was particularly struck by similarities between the provincial dialects of Kent and the Isle of Wight, which as an Isle of Wight man living in Kent he was well qualified to comment upon (Smith 1871a, vi-vii; Smith and Smith 1881-2).
In 1849 and 1850, Smith linked these regional differences in Saxon artifact types to Bede's account of the territories settled by Jutes, Angles and Saxons (Smith 1849e, 116; 1850a, 88-9). This seeming confirmation of Bede appeared just months after Kemble's highly acclaimed history of the Anglo-Saxons, which followed Sharon Turner in casting serious doubts on Bede's reliability (Kemble 1849, e.g. 1-3). Smith's observations, although of far-reaching importance, were made almost in passing. It was left to Wright, always the more fluent writer, to explain in detail the distinctive features in the artifacts of the three tribal groups; based on information compiled by Smith (Wright 1852, 399-431; 1855). The similarity between the Kentish and Isle-of-Wight artifacts strongly suggested that Bede had authority, written or traditional, for his assertion that the populations in these places sprang from common stock (Smith 1883, 228). As a result of this, and a paper on early Welsh and English histories by Edwin Guest (1849), it became almost treasonable to impugn Bede for the next fifty years (White 1971, 587-8).

In 1854, Wright made an original and important contribution to this topic by charting the first archaeological distribution map of the British isles, thereby pointing the way for more detailed studies by Leeds (1913). His map shows the 81 Saxon cemeteries then known in relation to Roman roads, rivers, and Roman towns (Wright 1855; republished by Smith 1856b). Wright believed, perhaps correctly, that the clusters of cemeteries indicated the areas that had been occupied by the different tribal groups. He hoped too that the map would give rise to the discovery of further Saxon cemeteries, especially along the Welsh borders, since this might help to indicate the extent of Anglo-Saxon penetration.573

Smith was obviously pleased to find apparent correlations between archaeological and historical sources, but sounded a note of caution in his "Introduction":

"It is not a slight analogy in some instances only that will establish this theory; it must spring from the remains themselves, and be palpable and convincing, or it must be rejected" (Smith 1856b, xii).

To Smith archaeology was no longer subservient to history. In this and in other aspects of methodology, his approach had acquired a consistency and coherence which distinguished him from many of his contemporaries. Akerman for example, had no hesitation in freely mixing current conceptions and "facts". As a result, his conclusions are more often seen to be erroneous, and even at the time of writing were sometimes at variance one with another (Francis 1984, 19).

Continental Developments

Smith's comparative work on Dark Age antiquities was by no means confined to England. His early research coincided with the first sizeable excavations of Germanic Dark Age cemeteries in Germany, France and Switzerland (e.g. Wilhelmi 1838; Troyon 1841; Cochet 1854; Sklenár 1983, 71) and Smith's importance rests to no small extent on his achievements in placing Anglo-Saxon remains in their European setting.

Smith became aware of close parallels between English and continental discoveries almost from the beginning of his Anglo-Saxon research. On his third visit to France in 1843, Smith called on M. Feret of Dieppe, who showed him Merovingian artifacts recently found at Ste-Marguerite (Seine-Maritime). These were later published by Wylie, together with Feret's opinion that they were Saxon (Wylie 1853b). This interpretation partly rested on the similarity the pottery to "Saxon" material (from Kent?), and of the buckles to finds from Strood. Since Smith recorded Feret's discoveries as Saxon in his journal, it is probable that
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this interpretation originated with his visit. Unfortunately, Wylie did not illustrate the pottery, so its identification cannot be verified.

The potential value of studying continental parallels to Saxon materials was underlined at the Canterbury congress of 1844. During a discussion of the Bourne Park finds, someone commented that an unidentified Danish gentleman (i.e. Thomsen) had, from their similarity to relics in Copenhagen museum, suggested that various Saxon remains in Canterbury museum had belonged to Germanic invaders from Jutland. Bede's remarks about the Jutish origins of the Kentish settlers were footnoted in the proceedings (Dunkin 1845a, 187-9). Worsaae's visits of 1846-7 might have encouraged further thoughts on this subject (Wilkins 1961), but it was not until 1850 that Smith fully recognised the potential.

In that year he made an antiquarian excursion to North Germany, where he was particularly struck by the "Frankish" grave finds in Wiesbaden Museum (Smith 1851a, 129-31; 1851c). Firstly, they were arranged in burial groups (Smith 1868b, vii). He had not seen this method of display before, which thereafter he strongly advocated; as incidentally did Petrie (Evans 1956, 373; see Smith 1868e, 286). Secondly, the finds were described in detail in a publication, in which each grave was carefully described and illustrated. This was the Lindenschmit brothers' *Germanischen Todtenlager von Selzen* (1848), which laid the corner-stone for the interpretation of German Dark Age materials (Böhner 1969). Smith purchased a copy himself and on returning to England recommended it excitedly to others.

Similarities between the Selzen and English discoveries were immediately apparent. Not only did it appear that:
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"... the same customs prevailed in both counties; but we are still more forcibly struck by the close analogy in the forms and workmanship of the various objects" (Smith 1851c, 48).

Smith was particularly struck by the claw-beakers. He had previously engraved one in Canterbury museum for his Richborough volume, but eventually excluded it as he was uncertain of its date. The parallels from Selzen now removed all doubt as to its antiquity and origin (Smith 1852b, 220). Other similarities were "very striking, but at the same time there seem to be some peculiarities in each" (Smith 1851b, 160).

Smith's growing conviction that English and continental materials should be studied together received a boost during the following year. Not only did the Great Exhibition bring many continental archaeologists to London - including Troyon of Lausanne and Rigollot of Amiens (Smith 1886, 223) - but Smith paid a further visit to France, where Cochet brought him up to date with recent Frankish cemetery excavations near Dieppe - at Londinières, Douvrend and Envermeu. In the spring of 1852 he published his notes on Selzen and Dieppe in the Collectanea, aiming to demonstrate the relationship between English and Frankish remains (Smith 1852b). To this end, he used a novel technique of juxtaposing illustrations of parallels. Four plates of German and English remains demonstrated the close similarity of what are now termed radiate brooches, iron knives, glass claw beakers, and ceramic jugs, biconical bowls, and bottles (Pl. 19). Having discovered an angon in a grave in Strood, Smith later suggested that its owner might have been a Frank, and sent the skull to "my friend Davies the craniologist" to see if he could prove the point (Smith 1852b).
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Frankish settlement in Kent during the 6th century is now widely accepted (Hawkes 1982, 72). Elsewhere, Smith remarked on some of the differences between English and continental finds, for example the comparative rarity in England of franciscas or throwing axes (Smith 1851c), and the superiority of Kentish composite brooches over their continental counterparts, which led Smith to suggest that they were probably made in this country (Smith 1856b, xxiii).

Further research was necessary to confirm such points, especially "on an extended scale in the countries north of the Rhine" (Smith 1852b, 204). Within France, Cochet was well acquainted with discoveries in neighbouring countries, and compared them with local finds in his Bulletin Monumental. But as we have seen, apart from Smith, few English archaeologists had established useful contacts with continental antiquaries (p. 207); Worsaae alone was widely known. Nevertheless, by the time Inventorium had been published in 1856, this had begun to change. Whether by design or opportunity, Smith's plea for excavations north of the Rhine had been answered by Kemble, who had published an article on mortuary urns, some excavated by himself, from Stade and Lüneburg, in Lower Saxony (Kemble 1855a). These urns were of immense importance, for they provided unequivocal evidence for the region of departure of Saxon migrants who occupied the Midlands and East Anglia.

Not every parallel between continental and Saxon antiquities was so easily explained. In 1856, the British Museum obtained some artifacts found while excavating in the catacombs of Kerch, in the Crimea. They included radiated brooches which had previously been found only in Saxon and Frankish graves. McPherson concluded from this that the brooches must be Teutonic - possibly vestiges of some of the Varangian body-guards of the Byzantine Emperors (McPherson
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1857, 104-5). Smith dismissed this on the grounds that the Varangian guard was not formed until the 10th century, whereas the brooches had been found with late Roman glass and pottery. If the brooches were indeed Teutonic, they probably belonged to German auxiliaries - but the absence of weapons in the graves suggested that they were Roman (Smith 1860b). If so, it might be that Saxon and Frankish radiated brooches had developed from Roman prototypes (Smith 1857a). The likelihood of this has since been discussed by Salin (1904, 19-40). In suggesting a non-Teutonic origin, Smith was apparently unaware that the Crimea was settled by the Goths during the 3rd century AD, as was pointed out to him in 1869 (Smith 1923).578 Smith's ignorance on this point is a reflection of the patchy availability of the literary sources.

Smith's Influence

Probably the clearest evidence of Smith's influence upon his contemporaries may be seen in the activities of W.M. Wylie, whom he regarded as "one of the soundest antiquaries, and to me a constant colleague and friend" (Smith 1886, 119). The men first met in 1851 when Wylie sent Smith some of the Fairford brooches for comment (Smith 1852d). Wylie's first publication, The Fairford Graves, bears evidence of Smith's advice in matters of interpretation. Immediately after its appearance in 1852, again doubtless following Smith's counsel, Wylie traced his footsteps to Dieppe, where he met Ferét and assisted the Abbé Cochet's excavations (Wylie 1853a; 1853b; Webster 1978). Referring to Wylie and Smith, Cochet later remarked that English help was the most important outside influence on his study (Kidd 1978, 63). Wylie's interest in funereal remains subsequently took him to Germany, Italy and back to France in 1855. The results of these excursions were published in Archaeologia. In so doing, Wylie achieved no more than Smith, albeit in novel areas of research. Where he exceeded Smith was in

attracting articles on Dark Age remains for *Archaeologia* from eminent continental archaeologists. These included Ludwig Lindenschmit, Menzel and Cochet. Several became FSAs. Together with Akerman's papers on Saxon cemetery excavations, the *Archaeologias* for 1855-60 contain no less than nine papers on continental Dark Age antiquities, six on Saxon, and three on medieval French burials by Cochet. The latter were of interest because they demonstrated the continuation of pagan burial superstitions well into the Christian era. Smith soon followed suit by publishing in his *Collectanea* an article on Frankish remains by Moutié (1857), whom he had met on a visit to France in 1854 (Smith 1855c). This international approach bore fruit in 1863, with the publication of Kemble's *Horae Ferales* (1863). With Franks' copiously illustrated discussion of artifact types, this became in effect the first European-wide survey of prehistoric and Dark Age burial customs and antiquities.

In 1864, Smith published a further well-illustrated article about the Saxon antiquities obtained by William Gibbs from the King's Field, Faversham, Kent - the richness of which denoted royal burials (Smith 1864a). Soon afterwards, the collection passed to the Victoria and Albert Museum, who paid Smith £ 34-4s to produce a catalogue (Smith 1871a). Both publications were packed with valuable information which considered the finds in the light of other recent discoveries. But apart from the draftsmen, no new classes of artifact were identified, and Smith's conceptual framework was unaltered. Thus the publication of *Horae Ferales* in 1863 marks the point at which the baton of progress passed from Smith to others.

Although the *Horae Ferales* extended beyond even Smith's horizons, it necessarily relied upon foundations that he had lain with respect to the Anglo-Saxon materials. The careful identification and publication of artifacts, which he had done so much to encourage, were an essential precursor of

---

579 CW:I, CRS to C. Warne, 14 May 1871.
more detailed studies of the geography of cultural movement during the early years of the 20th century, amongst others, by Baldwin Brown (1915) and Aberg (1926). Smith's fundamentally important work on the classification and regional distribution of brooch types and other finds, with his recognition of the links between such regional differences and Bede's account of the Anglo-Saxon migrations, stands among the most significant achievements of Victorian archaeology. It was probably this which gave rise to Cochet's remark that:

"Il est une justice que j'aime à rendre à M. Roach Smith, c'est que seul, et presque avec l'unique secours de son intelligence, il a parfaitement deviné l'archéologie saxonne" (Cochet 1857, 264).

The potential that this approach revealed pointed the way for all further artifact distribution studies, most notably those of Leeds (1913), whose paper on the distribution of Anglo-Saxon saucer brooches was the first after Wright's to be illustrated by a distribution map. But it was perhaps in his international approach to the subject that Smith's greatest influence on his contemporaries may be seen. Through just one article of cardinal significance, Smith had demonstrated in a lucid and novel manner that the solution to certain archaeological problems lay beyond the confines of this island (Smith 1852b).

In England, as on the continent, the interest in Teutonic remains had arisen from a patriotic search for the roots of nationhood (Levine 1986, 79-82, 98; Sklenár 1983, 62-7; cf. Smith 1856b, x). It is paradoxical that the problems that emerged from this nationalistic aim were the first to excite cross-channel co-operation between antiquarians, in what came to be perceived as a mutual archaeological problem.
CHAPTER 11: Conclusions

Having now completed our discussion of the three topics selected for in-depth coverage, our concluding chapter provides a résumé of Smith's achievements in these areas and endeavours to set them in context. It begins by appraising Smith's contribution to the archaeology of Roman London and Anglo-Saxon England within the framework of his academic career as a whole, and of contemporary developments in British and European archaeology. It then reviews Smith's attempts to update the organisation and institutions of British archaeology in the light of parallel social and intellectual trends. The reader may wish to refer to Appendix 4, which lists key events in Smith's life and academic career against wider developments at home and abroad.

Smith's archaeological career summarised

Smith's archaeological career falls broadly into five periods:

1834-1843, during which he made the majority of his London site observations, acquired the bulk of his Museum of London Antiquities, made extensive antiquarian excursions throughout south-east England and northern France, and began his work on Roman coin assemblages.

1843-1848, during which Smith commenced his Collectanea Antiqua, and became co-founder and secretary of the British Archaeological Association.

1848-1861, during which Smith made the first systematic study of the Saxon shore forts, continued his research on Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon artifacts, and published his most important works: Collectanea Antiqua Vols. 1-5 (1848-61), The Antiquities of Richborough, Reculver and Lymne (1850a), and his edition of Faussett's Inventorium Sepulchrale (1856b).

1861-1880, when Smith redirected much of his energy into Shakespearean readings and horticulture.
1880-1990, in which Smith devoting his declining years to
the production of his three-volume Retrospections.

This thesis has explored three themes associated with
Smith's first three periods (1834-61), and this résumé of
his contribution to archaeology is also restricted to these
years. From around 1861, Smith was archaeologically less
active and his work was less original. This was partly
because retiring from London had placed him in isolation
from the main-stream of British archaeology. Smith's low
income restricted his ability to travel, and he took up
new hobbies, so that friends were exasperated to receive
letters about gardening instead of antiquities. Even his
Collectanea Antiqua became diluted with articles on the
history of horticulture, although it did contain some useful
new papers on favourite themes, like Anglo-Saxon cemeteries,
the antiquities of Roman Gaul, and the coins of Carausius
and Allectus (Appendix 1a).

The effect of Smith's isolation was exacerbated by powerful
new trends in British archaeology, which arose from the
discoveries in Kent's Cavern and a growing acceptance of
Boucher de Perthes' Palaeolithic finds from the Somme
gravels. In 1859 an examination of these helped persuade
John Prestwich, John Evans, and through them Sir Charles
Lyell and the British Association, of the great antiquity of
man (Daniel 1962, 36-38). This new perspective on
humanity's past shifted the centre of antiquarian excitement
away from Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon antiquities to the
classification of much more ancient objects according to
Thomsen's "three-age system" (cf. Sklenár 1983, 104). We
may note that arising from visits to de Perthes' museum in
1842, and again in 1843 and 1853, Smith was the first
Englishman to examine and accept the authenticity of
"Abbevillian" flints (Smith 1853-4, 130). But he chose

580 LOA 229/40, CRS to JOH, 22 July 1876.
581 MP, JC to JM, 11 May and 24 June 1861.
582 CRS:J5, 28 Sep. 1842.
583 CRS:J5, 2 Sep. 1843.
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not to report them because the Antiquaries refused to accept de Perthes' ideas (Smith 1886, 134-9). His instinct was also to accept the three-age system (Smith 1850c, 162), but again he seems to have kept his opinions to himself because of his friend Wright's intense opposition to Worsaae's ideas (Wilkins 1961, 217-8).

The year 1859 also saw the publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species*, followed in 1863 by Lyell's *Antiquity of Man*, which applied Darwin's ideas to human and technological evolution and demonstrated the value of stratigraphy in gaining an understanding of man's early history. These works gave scope for new methods of archaeological excavation, dating and classification, as exemplified by the model excavations of Pitt-Rivers, and his studies of technological development through systematic typologies (Thompson 1977).

The older racial approach to classification, whilst not abandoned, began to be influenced by Anthropology and Ethnology, the rising importance of which were marked by the formation of the Ethnological Society in 1843, the Anthropological Society in 1863, and by the first Congrès International d'Anthropologie et d'Archéologie Préhistoriques in 1860. Thus, the world of the Celts, Romans, Saxons and Vikings began to be integrated into a far broader canvas, which encompassed multitudes of prehistoric peoples extending back into a hitherto unimaginably long prehistoric past, and outwards to "primitive" races throughout the world, whose lives might provide insights into the beliefs and practices of early tribesmen (Eggan 1968; Thompson 1977; Chapman 1989). Kossina's work from the early 1870s was a natural consequence of these trends, and led to the replacement of classification by race with classification by culture (Trigger 1989, 161-7).

Archaeology as the "unwritten ... history of the people"
Faced with developments of this magnitude, Smith's work soon appeared old fashioned and its previous significance was forgotten. This was unfortunate, for during the 1840s and 50s, Smith had led the field in many areas of study. His site observations in the City of London mark an important phase in the evolution of rescue archaeology. The artifacts he obtained from building sites became the foundation of the national archaeological collection. His investigations of the Saxon shore forts pointed the way for the excavation of other green-field Roman sites. He inaugurated the study of Roman coin hoards from a statistical point of view, and his international comparative studies of provincial Roman and Anglo-Saxon antiquities were of international significance.

In all these fields, Smith's importance stemmed not just from his scholarship, astute interpretations and unprecedented access to archaeological data, but from his perception of archaeological remains "as exponents of that great unwritten history - the history of the people - which is not to be obtained from other sources" (Walford 1866). In Smith's words: "The real value of antiquities should be determined by the extent to which they are capable of being applied towards illustrating history" (Smith 1856b, ix), and especially "the institutions, the habits, the customs, and the arts of our forefathers" (Smith 1855e, 46). According to Walford, it was this emphasis in Smith's archaeological work that made him "one of the foremost among those few of the present day who understand the science in its best and widest sense".

As described in Chapter 2, the emphasis which Smith placed upon commonplace antiquities was a consequence of wider social and intellectual trends. Whereas the information value of small-scale site observation and potsherds had been recognised by the mid 17th century, these early signs of interest were soon eclipsed by a tendency to regard classical architecture as of pre-eminent importance, and aesthetically pleasing antiquities as more significant than
utilitarian ones. During the 1820s, however, the romantic image of English rural life, and the ideas of popular sovereignty and the equality of man engendered by the French revolution encouraged historians and antiquarians to study the history of ordinary people. Thus, when the building of roads, railways and associated urban development produced a wealth of Roman and medieval antiquities, there was no shortage of antiquarians willing to buy them (Chapter 4).

This same generation of antiquarians inaugurated a tradition of recording and publishing site observations as an adjunct to their collecting activities. It was nevertheless left mainly to Smith to instigate the systematic study of minor antiquities, to explain their value to the educated public, and to force the authorities - local and national - to recognise their significance. Without overlooking the contribution of writers such as John Sydenham, Smith effectively inaugurated the study of everyday life in Roman Britain, as epitomised this century in the writings of Joan Liversidge (esp. 1968). This inevitably brought him into conflict with the trustees of the British Museum and other proponents of the quest for "taste", which in 1851 persisted to the extent that J.A. Repton could complain of:

"... Mr. Lyson's miserable papers on old nails, broken tiles and bad drawings for the Archaeologia, not being good enough for his own private works".584

London Collections and Site Observations, 1834-54

As described in Chapter 5, Smith's observation and recording work on London building sites stands out from that of his forebears and contemporaries on three counts:

- the extent of his observations
- his attempt to use them to understand the development, character and layout of the Roman city, and
- his astute judgement in matters of interpretation, which in London remained unsurpassed until the work of Dr.

584 MOLL, Reg. No. 77.109/6, Smith's own copy of Illustrations, J.A. Repton to CRS, 4 Aug. 1851.
Phillip Norman and F.W. Reader in the early 20th century. Despite producing three impressive monographs (Price 1870; 1873; 1880), Smith's successor in the City, J.E. Price, was prone to uncritical speculation, drawing strictures from Smith and his colleagues.585

Because of the range and quality of his acquisitions and the care with which he verified and recorded their provenance, Smith's museum at least equates in importance with the other 19th-century London collections combined. But due to the volume of subsequent finds it no longer appears unique (p. 131), and the circumstances under which he worked generally prevented Smith from relating his finds to the strata in which they were preserved. Smith's records (like those of his contemporaries) are brief and generally unsupported by adequate location records or sketch plans. Smith also played no part in the most impressive Roman discoveries of the Victorian era - the Billingsgate baths, the Bucklersbury pavement, the Camomile Street bastion and the forum - all of which were found after the Corporation had debarred him from making observations (Merrifield 1965, Sites 353, 194, B10 and 211-32). In terms of our present knowledge of Roman London, Smith's contribution appears relatively modest.

Smith's understandable difficulty in interpreting his observations appears to have given rise to doubts concerning their value, which may explain why a relatively high proportion were never published. Setting aside his observations of the course of the Walbrook and the Roman riverside wall - Smith's principal discoveries were that Roman London and Southwark were probably linked by a bridge, that the City had been subject to urban expansion, and that in places, substantial Roman masonry had survived. The implication of this last discovery for other Romano-British towns was not always appreciated; before finding the Roman

585 AL, Miscellaneous Correspondence - London, CRS to JEP, 3 Oct. 1880; MP, JGW to CRS, 10 Nov. 1880.
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theatre in 1847, Lowe believed that the only structural remains at Verulamium were the walls (Wright 1865, 68).

Despite its shortcomings, Smith's work in London deserves recognition as the first sustained campaign of urban site observation in Britain, and as well as influencing contemporary Londoners such as E.B. Price, can only have encouraged systematic site observation in other English cities, for example Chester (Watkin 1886).

Archaeological Excavation, 1843-58

Chapter 10 has outlined Smith's involvement in the excavation of Anglo-Saxon cemeteries, although we have otherwise not referred to Smith's activities as an archaeological excavator. That Smith excavated at all is a tribute to his determination, given his relative poverty and the demands of business, which generally prevented him from spending more than an occasional weekend on site. He consequently tended either to assist in campaigns conducted by his friends, or to work alongside someone with fewer commitments. Smith was also obliged to refuse many invitations to excavate, as in 1851, when Lord Londesborough pressed him to survey and excavate the tumuli on his Yorkshire estate,586 and 1853, when the Duke of Norfolk invited him to excavate at Melandra Castle.587 The only excavations which Smith directed alone were in 1841 on the site of the French Protestant Church, London (p. 106), and in 1844, of two Isle of Wight barrows,588 and the Roman villa at Bighton, Hants., which he investigated on behalf of the BAA Committee (Smith 1844e).

Smith's work as an excavator must be viewed against the rising popularity of the technique from the mid 1820s as a

586 BAC III, CRS to TB, 13 Apr. 1851.
587 BAC V, CRS to TB, 4 Sep. 1853; also KBC, CRS to JJAW, 6 May 1852; LOA 49/58, CRS to JOH, 11 Nov. 1854; and DNM:CRS, CRS to JJAW, 21 Mar. 1853.
588 AJD:BAA1, CRS to AJD, 20 Oct. 1844.
means of revealing treasure, fine architecture, or the remains of Roman military might. By contrast, Smith excavated in order to elucidate the life-style and customs of former times. This is exemplified by his report on William Bland's excavation of the Hartlip Roman villa in September 1845 and November 1848, with which Smith had assisted (Anon. 1845j; Smith 1849a). Along with a less detailed paper by Albert Way (1849), it stands among the first accounts of a villa without mosaics. With its comprehensive descriptions, plans and illustrations, and close attention to small-finds, Smith's report evidently helped to overthrow a tendency established by Lyson's later works to focus upon mosaics rather than the villas that contained them (e.g. Sibthorpe 1831), for which it was justly commended.

The establishment of the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle-upon-Tyne in 1813, and the Revd John Hodgson's excavations at Housesteads in 1822, mark the rise of a North of England tradition of excavation and exploration, which evolved almost independently from that in the South (p. 61, ff.). After around 1843, when John Clayton commenced excavating at Chesters and elsewhere, the work began to acquire the nature of a sustained long-term campaign, whose progress was chronicled by the Presbyterian minister and schoolmaster, John Collingwood Bruce (1851; 1853, 1867; 1875). Smith first corresponded with Bruce in 1849, a year after the latter had begun his research (Bruce 1905, 110). He was unable to participate in the famous first wall pilgrimage held that year, but was present when Bruce lectured at the BAA Chester congress. He subsequently visited the wall twice in 1851 (Smith 1851d; 1883, 184), returning in 1853, 1854, 1871, 1877 and 1889, and writing...

589 LOA 33/31, CRS to JOH, 19 Nov. 1848.
590 SM:CRS, BP to CRS, 29 Sep. 1849.
591 SAL: BAA6, JCB to CRS, 11 June 1849.
592 BAC III, CRS to TB, 26 Apl. 1851.
593 MOLL:B, list of sketches by Smith; BAC III, CRS to TB, 26 Apl. 1851.
several articles to publicise Bruce's research and publications (Smith 1854f; 1857d; 1871c; 1879a, 117; 1883, 184).

Apart from some exploratory trenches around the Great Foundation at Richborough (Cunliffe 1968, 43-4), the Roman military sites in the South of England had received relatively little attention, and from 1843 Smith's work in encouraging, organising and publishing the first excavations of the Saxon shore forts represents the earliest systematic attempt to investigate and explain them as a class of monument. Smith thereby encouraged subsequent investigations by J.O. Parker, who made the first excavations at Bradwell-on-Sea in 1865 (Lewin 1867; Smith 1865a), and by George Dowker who excavated at Richborough in 1865 and 1887, and at Reculver in 1877 (Dowker 1872; 1889; 1878).

Smith's interest in the Saxon shore forts dates from his first major antiquarian excursion to Richborough and Reculver in 1836 (p. 150). From 1843 he acted as advisor to W.H. Rolfe when the latter re-excavated the Great Foundation at Richborough (Anon. 1843c), and proceeded to explore the line of the walls (Smith 1850a, 37-48). In October 1849, Smith noticed some mortar in a nearby field which he correctly supposed belonged to the amphitheatre illustrated by Stukeley (1724, opposite 125; Anon. 1849e). Labourers were directed to dig, and Rolfe subsequently traced its plan, had it surveyed, and identified some dating evidence: a coin of Constantine associated with an inhumation above the ruined west entrance (Smith 1850a, 165-9). Since the amphitheatre has never been re-excavated, Smith's report provides important constructional details, for example of an

594 AL, Smith's bound volume of his Saxon shore fort publications, entitled, "Richborough, Lymne. Pevensey. Reculver" with manuscript additions, WHR to CRS, 21 Sep. 1843; RP:2, CRS to WHR (unspecified), 5 Nov. and 27 Dec. 1843.
595 MP, CRS to WHR, 4 May 1849.
arch attached to the north entrance that presumably gave access to a chamber below the seating. Smith nevertheless failed to realise that the greater part of the seating was supported by an earthen bank, which is understandable given that this was the first Roman amphitheatre to have been excavated in Britain (*idem.*, 161-2).

Smith next turned his attention to Lympne and Pevensey, where from 1850-52 he co-directed the first excavations on these sites (Smith 1852a; 1852c; 1858a; Lower 1853). At Pevensey, he was assisted by the schoolmaster/antiquary, M.A. Lower, and at Lympne, by James Elliott, surveyor and engineer of the Romney Marsh sea wall. The latter's technical skills were to prove invaluable in explaining the dramatic topographical changes at Lympne since Roman times, including the destruction of the walls through landslips (Smith 1883, 205). In December 1852 and April 1853, Smith dug trial trenches at Bramber Castle, which based on what is now known to be spurious place-name evidence (Rivet and Smith 1979, 442), he believed was the site of *Portus Ardaoni*, although he abandoned the search when it proved unproductive (Wright 1865, 265).596

One of Smith's aims in excavating these sites was to obtain collections of antiquities akin to his London collection and that obtained at Richborough by W.H. Rolfe (Smith 1852a, 3; 1852c, 31; 1858a, i). In this, Smith was to be sorely disappointed, but he achieved his primary goal - of locating the walls, gates and related features - and capped his success by having them professionally surveyed (Pl. 21). Smith's reconstruction of the plan of Lympne may be mistaken, but this is understandable given the extraordinary extent of the landslips, and the lack of information about comparable sites (Cunliffe 1980). His most important observation at Lympne was that the East gate had incorporated reused stonework, including an altar to a

---

596 DNM:CRS, CRS to JJAW, 3 Jan. and 21 Mar. 1853; BAC III, CRS to TB, 3 Apl. 1853.
praefectus classis britannicae, which indicated that there had been a station of the fleet prior to the present fort (Pl. 20; Smith 1852c, 24-25; BM Acc. No. 56.7-1.5026; Collingwood and Wright 1965, No. 66). The patterns of coin loss showed that Lympne was occupied from the mid 3rd century (Smith 1852c, 32), and Pevensey "after the reigns of Carausius and Allectus, and probably not until many years subsequent" (Smith 1858a, 26).

Since his role in these excavations was to initiate the projects, advise and to produce the reports, Smith did little to advance techniques of excavation and recording. These saw but slow progress until the first published illustrations relating Palaeolithic finds to geological sections (Perthes 1847, e.g. 253-4; Lyell 1863), which in the mid 1860s encouraged Revd J.G. Joyce to draw the first true archaeological sections at Silchester (Boon 1957, 35-37). Smith nevertheless used the rudimentary understanding of stratigraphy he had acquired in London when he and Lower observed a thick build-up of earth within the walls of Pevensey, and resolved to sink some exploratory trenches. These revealed that "at some remote period" when the facing stones of the walls were still in place - probably during the erection of the Norman castle - the ground surface had been covered with five to eight feet of clay, which itself was overlain by a foot or two of natural accumulation (Smith 1858a, 18). Since the trenches revealed no stonework, the internal buildings must have been "slight and temporary" (Lower 1853, 276). Smith's excavation methods were of course incapable of revealing timber structures, although at Lympne, apart from the principia(?) and baths revealed by Smith, subsequent work has confirmed his conclusion that few internal features have survived (Cunliffe 1980, 256).

In respect of his strategic use of trenches to reveal the sites' layout, his attention to phasing and basic

597 LP, CRS/33, CRS to MAL, 17 Feb. 1851; CRS/34, CRS to MAL, 4 Aug. 1852; DNM:CRS, CRS to JJAW, 22 Aug. 1852.
chronology, and his desire to elucidate the inhabitants' life-style, Smith's campaigns at Lympne and Pevensey must have carried some influence. If his approach now appears unremarkable, it is worth pondering the implications of John Clayton's remark, on hearing a paper on Wright's excavations at Wroxeter, that:

"The absence of altars and inscribed stones ... struck me as a remarkable feature in that excavation still continues."\(^{598}\)

Even Clayton's aims and methods surpassed those adopted at Ribchester, which drew widespread criticism at a time before it was generally recognised that archaeological excavation also involves archaeological destruction (Anon. 1850c). One may be thankful that Smith's letter "advising excavation of all the stations of the wall" was not acted upon (Smith 1860e). Among those probably inspired by Smith was Thomas Wright, whose Wroxeter excavations Smith evidently regarded as the realisation of what he might have achieved at London were the site not built over, and at Lympne and Pevensey, had the intramural areas been more productive (Smith 1862b; 1868a; Wright 1872).\(^{599}\) The Wroxeter excavations encouraged those at Silchester by Revd J.G. Joyce (1866; cf. Smith 1891, 20), which in turn pointed the way for the Society of Antiquaries' influential research excavations at the beginning of this century.

The publications that arose from Smith's shore fort studies were produced with exemplary speed (Smith 1850a; 1852c; 1858a), and with his *Illustrations of Roman London* (1859) made an important contribution to a spate of volumes on the regions of Roman Britain that appeared during the 1840s and 50s. These included Stuart's *Caledonia Romana* (1845), *The Roman Wall* by Bruce (1851), and Wilson's *Pre-historic Annals of Scotland* (1851). The most significant was arguably Wright's best-selling *The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon* (1852) - a brilliant, popular summary of the contemporary state of knowledge which, sadly, it has become fashionable


\(^{599}\) LOA 78/42, TW to JOH, 29 Sep. 1862.
to denigrate or to overlook. As was recognised (Anon. 1851a), these works were important for revealing the character of Roman-Britain south of Hadrian's Wall, and in demonstrating that archaeology and not history held the key to future advances. To discuss them further must remain the obvious next task in compiling a general history of Romano-British studies during the 19th century.

While stressing the value of excavating and making site observations, the practical difficulties involved, and the intellectual difficulty of trying to interpret fragmentary structural elements encouraged Smith to emphasise the value of loose finds, which in his Richborough and London volumes are allotted more space than the structural and historical evidence combined. Precedents may be found in Lee's *Delineations of Roman Antiquities found at Caerleon* (1845), H.E. Smith's *Reliquiae Insurianae* (1852) and *Illustrations of the Remains of Roman Art in Cirencester...* by Buckmann and Newmarch (1850) - the model for Smith's *Illustrations*. These writers may themselves have been influenced by the early parts of Smith's *Collectanea* (e.g. H.E. Smith 1852, 51-52).

Among the volumes influenced directly by Smith is Scarth's *Aquae Solis* (1864, vii), and that Roman site syntheses might have developed along different lines is demonstrated by Stuart's *Caledonia Romana* (1845) and Charles Wellbeloved's outstanding *Eburacum* (1842). Here the emphasis is upon the description and interpretation of structural remains within a historical framework derived from classical sources, in a manner reminiscent of Horsley and 18th-century local histories. Small-finds are included, but mainly those bearing inscriptions.

**Numismatics and small-find studies, 1836-61**

This thesis has explored in depth just one aspect of Smith's work on small-finds, namely his contribution to the study of
Anglo-Saxon grave goods (Chapter 10), and it remains to consider his wider contribution in this area.

From 1836-61, Smith's pioneering work in collecting, sketching, classifying and publishing Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon antiquities ranks in importance with later work by John Evans on Iron Age coins, William Chaffers on English pottery, and St. John Hope on English churches. His simple well-illustrated publications of finds from British and continental sites represent the first systematic attempt to explain their significance and to integrate them within a scientific framework. It was for this that Joseph Clarke dubbed him "the British Montfaucon", an honour previously awarded to Faussett (cf. Douglas 1793, 37), although Smith's work owes more to another Frenchman - the comte de Caylus (p. 51).

When Smith took up his interest in antiquities, there was within Britain a well-established tradition in the study of Roman coins, inscriptions, mosaics and sculpture, and medieval seals. Aided by his sound knowledge of Latin, French, and continental antiquarian literature, Smith quickly became a recognised expert, and from 1856 was the principal adviser in such matters to John Collingwood Bruce (1857; 1875). Smith's principal contribution to numismatics was in pioneering the comprehensive reporting of Roman hoards and site assemblages from a statistical viewpoint, as described in Chapters 6 and 7 - a significant advance in an age when coins were valued principally for rarity of type (Smith 1879a, 129-30). Smith's competence in coin identification was such that we may also venture to reinterpret his coin...
lists in the light of subsequent finds. Their potential in this regard is illustrated in Chapter 6, which argues that Smith's account of the Roman coins from London Bridge appears to offer fresh insights into the development of Roman London.

Smith published many new coin types, notably of Carausius and Allectus, and of the British Iron Age, for which he was commended by no less than John Evans (1864, 15). He was the first to attempt to classify late medieval leaden tokens, and to date them from their similarity to official silver coinage (Smith 1845a; 1854d; cf. Rigold 1978; 1982, respectively). But despite some interesting observations on Roman mint marks and die types (e.g. Smith 1869), Smith's methodology in these areas was unremarkable, and from 1862-3 he unwisely channelled his energies into Stevenson's Dictionary of Roman Coins (Stevenson, Smith and Madden, 1889). By the time of its appearance, this had been largely superseded by Cohen (1857; 1859-68; see Babelon 1901, 270). 603

Smith published many other varieties of artifact that had not previously attracted attention, either because they had not been found - as was the case for Roman leaden seals prior to the discovery of large quantities at Brough-under-Stainmore (Smith 1854a; 1878-9) - or because no one had thought them sufficiently interesting. For instance, Smith was among the first to request and to publish specialist reports on animal remains (Smith 1850a, 105-10; cf. Gage 1834). His interest in certain antiquities was encouraged by continental publications, which supplied new insights into the sorts of information that might be gained from them - for example the use of Roman tile stamps to demonstrate military movements (Wiener 1830). 604

_____________________
603 MP, JC to JM, 20 Dec. 1863.
604 CRS:J4, p. 245.
Smith's interest in social history and the "progress of civilisation" caused him to place a particular emphasis upon the study of materials, manufacture and trade, and the beliefs, habits and pastimes of the working population (Smith 1845d, 26). The trend away from a purely art historical approach is evident in Smith's attention to technical aspects of pottery manufacture, and the pigments and mortar used for Roman wall-painting (e.g. Smith 1859, 82). His work in distinguishing 621 distinct varieties won particular praise from Daniel Wilson (1863, 75), and stemmed from a recognition that the distribution of similar types might elucidate Roman trade, and that potters' names might indicate various nationalities among the Roman population (Smith 1854d, 41-47). Arising from a visit to the Igel monument and Porta Nigra Museum in 1850, Smith became the first Englishman to show an interest in Roman provincial sepulchral monuments depicting trades and scenes of daily life (Pl. 23; Smith 1851a; 1853-4; 1860c; 1862c; 1880f). Despite their inferior workmanship, Smith regarded them as much more valuable than the:

"... elaborately executed marble sarcophagi of the south of France, which ... [represent] wealth but not a sentiment of affection" (Smith 1860d, 162).

Smith's interest in beliefs and customs led him to revive Horsley's interest in inscriptions relating to provincial Roman cults (Smith and Wright 1846; Smith 1847b; 1855d, 44; 1859-60, 122; cf. Wright 1852; Wylie 1881). He was also the first Englishman to collect and publish medieval pilgrim signs and ampullae, and to follow Rigollot (1837) in attempting to link them with particular saints and shrines by their inscriptions and iconography (Smith 1844g; 1850d, etc.).

Setting aside objets d'art and inscribed objects like seals, medieval small-finds had been largely ignored in Britain, but Smith likened his interest in them with the vogue for
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publishing "stories, traditions, and songs which were current among the middle and lower orders" which were now recognised to contain "important information on the political and social condition of the population ... supplying omissions of the historian" (Smith 1844i, 115; e.g. Wright 1839; 1846b). Together with his colleagues F.W. Fairholt, J.G. Waller, and J.R. Planché, who specialised in art history and costume, and Wright, who specialised in medieval literature, Smith helped lay the foundations for the study of medieval social history.

Many elements of Smith's approach to the study of Anglo-Saxon antiquities, as described in Chapter 10, may be observed in his study of "Celtic" (i.e. prehistoric), Roman and medieval artifacts. He was strongly positivist, in that he began by gathering facts as a basis for interpretation, instead of devising theories, then seeking supporting evidence. Smith thereby pointed the way for his contemporaries, many of whom were wont to indulge in a priori deduction and to mix fact with conception. This was recognised in a contemporary comment that:

"Mr. Roach Smith does not come forward as an author, with views and theories and generalizations of history or antiquities to lay before us. He is rather a collector and cataloguer - one who registers the facts of archaeology ..." (Anon. 1860b).

The emphasis in Smith's writings is upon "good evidence" (Smith 1851a, 150), meaning full descriptions of authenticated primary data, and the rigorous elimination of spurious finds and unreliable information. Smith thereby did much to raise critical standards, so that by the 1850s, archaeology had become a qualitatively discipline to that which had prevailed in the 1820s (cf. Malina and Vasícek 1990, 36).

Like his contemporaries, Smith took advantage of the newly published historical texts to interpret archaeological finds. He nevertheless preferred to rely upon classification and comparison, recognising the danger of too
firmly linking archaeological observations with potentially inaccurate or biased literary evidence (Smith 1854d, 66-7). Doubtless his friends Wright and Halliwell, and contacts with other leading historians helped shape his outlook in this regard. Smith's *Collectanea Antiqua* reflects his position as perhaps the first antiquarian to whom archaeology was no longer subservient to history, as illustrated by his comment that:

"... we study history by the aid of a new light; and by the slow but sure process of comparison, are often enabled to test the authenticity of ancient writers"

(Smith 1849a, 2).

The birth of this "new light" in the work of Winckelmann has been described in Chapter 2. Like his English peers, Smith was probably unaware of its origins, and would have derived his understanding of "comparative archaeology" through the work of Douglas and Colt Hoare (p. 60), through recent studies of Gothic architecture (p. 166), and in particular through numismatics (p. 224).

Like Cochet and Akerman, the thrust of Smith's artifact studies was to classify objects according to functional type, and the tripartite racial divisions of "Celtic" (i.e. prehistoric), Roman, and Saxon or Frankish. This relied upon an understanding of the closed burial group (of which increasing numbers were available) and of the principle of dating by association with objects of known date, as propounded by Douglas two generations earlier (p. 60). With the conspicuous exceptions of the Billy and Charley forgeries (p. 77), Smith's work in this area was mostly accurate, and along with Akerman's *Index* (1849) did much to eliminate errors. The importance of their work may be judged by the fact that even experienced excavators like Bateman had previously been apt to confuse Saxon burials with Roman (Bateman 1848; cf. Bateman 1861; Marsden 1974. 39-40).
Given the extent of this task, Smith paid less attention to stylistic differences, which he explained in terms of workshop practice or the mixing of different racial groups. Like his contemporaries, he failed to grasp the potential of typology (cf. France-Lanord 1978, 40), although he did like to comment upon typicality and possessed a coin-collector's eye for scarcity value. His Catalogue presents eighteen distinct samian forms with comments on relative rarity (Smith 1854d, 24-40) and follows Hamilton (1791-5) and Wellbeloved (1842, Pl. XVI) in illustrating them in profile rather than perspective. Smith thereby helped pave the way for the first genuine pottery form type series, by Cuming (1891). Except in the case of medieval antiquities, which might be dated from manuscript illustrations or church brasses, Smith did not attempt to relate stylistic, technological or typological differences to date, and we may smile at his puzzlement that no samian was found at the Bramdean villa, now known to be of 4th-century construction (Rainey 1973, 28-9). The potential of samian as dating evidence did not emerge until the turn of the century when the combined labours of continental workers produce a partly dated form series (Dragendorff 1895; Déchelette 1904). Probably, Smith did not expect artifact change during periods when there was no major invasion nor change in the population's racial composition.

In common with his contemporaries, Smith faced insurmountable problems in attempting to classify Iron Age artifacts. Despite the prompt publication of the Hallstatt cemetery (Gaisberger 1848), the characteristics of Iron Age antiquities were not made known in Britain until the mid 1860s (Kemble 1863, 190-6; Davis and Thurnam 1865), and the date of La Tène art, as defined by the 1858 excavations on Lake Neuchâtel, was not established until the 1861-5 excavations at Alesia and Mont Réa in Burgundy (Daniel 1975, 110). It is therefore to Smith's credit that, before this information was available, he was able to make sensible
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comments about those Iron Age finds which came to his notice. A sword from the Thames, of Piggott (1950) Group II, he judged to be "analogous in workmanship, and therefore evidently of the same period" as swords in the Stanwick (Yorks.) and Polden Hill hoards (Smith 1853c; cf. Smith 1855b, 153-4). While ascribing them to the Roman period, Smith recognised that the swords might be of non-Roman origin, pointing to supposedly Germanic characteristics, and their "manifest departure from the general purity of taste" of undoubted Roman works (Smith 1853c, 69).

Another apposite parallel was drawn between a "Roman" burial at Mount Bures, Essex, containing a fire-dog, amphorae and what we now recognise as Gallo-Belgic type pottery, and another burial at Stanford, Beds. (Smith 1849b). Both are now seen to belong to a small group of rich late Iron Age burials of North-Gallic culture (Collis 1977, 5-6 and 12). It is a measure of the advanced nature of Smith's remarks that they should irritate certain Colchester antiquarians. In explaining this to Smith, William Wire commented that:

"Had you have stated ... that the ninth legion was routed and the infantry slain by Bodicea; that the common soldiers' bodies were gathered and burnt on the Druidical altars; that the remains were afterwards collected and ... that lofty Mount at Bures erected over them; ... that the ox head irons were the trestles of the ninth legion camp tables and ... the iron bar was the staff of their standard [and if you had] left over of consideration a similar discovery being made at Stanford ... then you would not have given offence".607

Smith's Excursions

Chapters 9 and 10 have described Smith's important work on regional variation, which paved the way for all subsequent distribution studies. Such studies had previously been impossible due largely to the paucity of collections and publications (Malina and Vasicek 1990, 29), but the expanding road and rail systems transformed this situation by providing new opportunities for travel and a great
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increase in the number of archaeological finds (Chapter 7). Thus, by 1842, Smith had examined more British antiquities than anyone to date, and was uniquely placed to compare objects from different localities. His observation that variations in brooches and other grave goods might reflect the areas settled by the different ethnic groups described in Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* stands high among the achievements of 19th-century archaeology, alongside Lisch's recognition in 1847 that engraved wavy lines were characteristic of Slav pottery in north-east Germany (Sklenár 1983, 95).

Smith's earliest excursions, which pre-date the railways, were inspired by Stukeley's *Itinerarium Curiosum*, and it may be argued that Smith was the last great worker in the Camden "topographer-antiquary" tradition. As the transport revolution proceeded and antiquarian knowledge grew, the opportunities for novel observations and discoveries became fewer, and the publications resulting from antiquarian excursions - while containing original matter - increasingly acquired the character of travelogues, as illustrated by Wright's *Wanderings of an Antiquary* (1854). Historic sites on the continent nevertheless remained largely unknown in England, not least because of the scarcity of foreign literature, hence Smith's remark that:

"Tourists should not hesitate ... in making public the observations they may have made on remarkable objects of antiquity" (Smith 1851c, 43).

We have described in Chapter 7 how Smith's visits to Northern France of 1839 and 1842, although primarily holidays, gave rise to a conviction that British and foreign antiquities should be studied together and hence of the need for contacts between English and continental antiquarians. Smith's next visit of 1843 was partly motivated by a desire to make comparisons between English and French antiquities, as evidenced by two short articles (Smith 1843e; 1843f). Despite their modest nature, these are perhaps sufficient to
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undermine a claim that by visiting England in 1846, Worsaae became the first person to travel to other countries and regions to make a comparative study of archaeological evidence (Müller 1884–9, 148). In any case, Smith's continental visits were themselves preceded by those of an earlier generation of English antiquarians intent on tracing the development of Gothic style (p. 166).

Smith sought to study continental antiquities in part to throw light upon their Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon counterparts, and his importance partly rests on his achievements in this regard. In some cases, Roman lead coffins for instance, the close continental parallels were able to elucidate a class of object rarely encountered in England (Smith 1853a; also 1846d). In others, significant differences emerged between English artifacts and their continental counterparts, which in the case of Kentish composite brooches, indicated that they were made in this country (p. 272).

Smith also studied continental antiquities for their intrinsic interest, and made some useful contributions, for instance, by explaining the significance of the presentation sword found near Mainz, bearing on its sheath a silver plate embossed with an image of Tiberias (Smith 1851c; 1857c; his views on the iconography have recently been challenged by Walker and Burnett 1981). Whereas German antiquarians had argued about its significance and a dealer had pronounced it "made up",609 Smith's articles about the find led to a general acceptance of its authenticity, and ultimately to its purchase by the British Museum.610

Although Worsaae's visits to the British Isles are better known, taken together Smith's visits to the continent were almost as extensive and in some respects equally
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significant. Following his early visits to France, Smith visited the Rhine in 1846, making a return visit in 1850, followed by another to Normandy in 1851. The importance of these excursions to Anglo-Saxon studies is described in Chapter 10. Further visits took Smith to northern France in 1853, in 1854 to the Loire valley, and in 1858 and 1876, to Bordeaux and the south of France (Smith 1853-4; 1857d; 1891, 28 etc.; 1878b). In 1867 Smith visited the Paris region, and in 1871 he accompanied a neighbour on a brief, unprofitable trip to Rome and Pompeii (Smith 1867b; 1891, 65-8). In the course of these excursions, Smith inspected most of the principal upstanding Roman monuments of France and Germany (further details are provided in Appendix 4).

In an effort to encourage English antiquarians to take an interest in continental antiquities (Smith 1853-4, 79), Smith made notes and sketches everywhere he went, and subsequently worked them up into articles for the Gentleman's Magazine and Collectanea Antiqua. Although he gleaned much of his material from French antiquarian literature, Smith sometimes published new discoveries ahead of his French colleagues, for example Cochet's Merovingian cemetery excavations (Smith 1852b, 205-12, cf. Cochet 1854, 181-244, etc.). Unfortunately, Smith frequently felt the need of a good illustrator (Smith 1880e), and his artistic limitations were magnified when his sketches were engraved by persons who had not seen the original monuments. The human figures which W.H. Brooke added to Smith's view of the Lillebonne theatre are hopelessly out of scale, and in relation to the ruins would have stood 35 feet high (Smith 1853-4, Pl. XVII; see Pl. 22)!

Smith's visits to France in 1853 and 1854 arose from his research on the Saxon shore forts, in connection with which he wished to examine the Roman castelli at Larçay, near
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Tours, and at Jublains (which he correctly dated on numismatic evidence to the period of the Gallic Empire: Smith 1854e; 1854h; 1853-4; cf. Grenier 1931, 454-64). Both sites presented similarities to the Saxon shore forts in that they had bastions, and their walls incorporated stonework from earlier buildings. Smith was nevertheless mistaken in concluding that Larçay was defended on one side by a cliff, and compounded his error by pointing to an analogous situation at Burgh Castle, Richborough and Lympne, which are now known to have been walled on all sides (Smith 1855c, 10; 1883, 197).

A similar consideration induced Smith to revisit France in 1858, in order to examine the Roman walls of Dax (Landes). Recently identified as among the most complete in France, the walls, with their gates and forty bastions were being levelled for town improvements - to the consternation of the French antiquarian community (Smith 1857b, 219). Smith had rallied to their cause by writing to the press and to the French ambassador (Anon. 1857b; Drouyn 1857; Smith 1858c; Smith 1861c, 240), but he received the same reply as his French counterparts: that the walls were reconstructed in medieval times. The presumption was that Roman walls were worth saving whereas medieval walls were not (Smith 1857b, 218-9). Since the walls were clearly Roman, Smith determined to examine them in order to lend weight to his protests. Earlier that year, a congress of the Société française pour la Conservation des Monuments historiques had petitioned Emperor Napoléon III (Gourraigne 1858), and on returning home, Smith addressed a further appeal to the Emperor via the Abbé Cochet. To everyone's amazement, this had the desired effect (Smith 1861c, 240; 1891, 50). Unfortunately, following the Emperor's defeat at the end of the Franco-Prussian war, the demolition recommenced (Smith 1871b), and despite Smith's best endeavours, nothing could
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be done. Today just one short stretch of wall and six bastions remain (Grenier 1931).

Disputes over the date of walls were a feature of 19th-century archaeology (e.g. Miket 1984). This was because in the absence of mortar and bonding courses, it was exceedingly difficult to date Roman stonework without making excavations. In 1851, Smith thought he had identified a Roman bridge and road, on a visit to Lord Londesborough's estate at Grimston, Yorks. (SAL 1851, 187). This was hotly contested by local antiquarians who reported that the parents of local people had remembered it being built, and produced documentary evidence that the bridge was named after a cobbler who had lived nearby ("B.B.T." 1851; 1852; "Ebor and F.S.A." 1852; Smith 1852f). Smith was nevertheless correct in believing that the walls of Chester were largely Roman, a view first propounded by him at the BAA congress of 1849 (Anon. 1849d). Smith's opinion stood unchallenged until 1883, when a fierce dispute erupted following claims that the walls above ground were medieval (Shrubsole 1883; Watkin 1886, 95 ff.). Space prevents a discussion of the arguments and counter-arguments, which were partly settled by excavation, but it is interesting that Smith was able to support his arguments using continental analogies: the absence of bonding courses at Arles, and a Roman tombstone from Bordeaux, similar to one from the wall of Chester which had been claimed as medieval (Watkin 1887; Smith 1887).

These were analogies which no other English archaeologist could have proffered, for whereas Smith's work in tracing continental parallels to Dark Age antiquities was taken up by Wylie, Kemble and others, in the field of Romano-British archaeology, apart from Smith's travelling companions and John Collingwood Bruce (who did not publish his observations), no one seems to have followed Smith's example (cf. Bruce 1905, 310-7). The implications of Smith's work -

616 BAC III, CRS to TB, 15 Sep. 1851.
that Romano-British culture was best understood in the light of the archaeology of Roman Gaul and the other Roman provinces, rather than by analogy with ancient literature and the upstanding ruins of Greece and Italy - was nevertheless to become increasingly important, and in 1948 was enshrined in the appointment of Dr. Mortimer Wheeler as the Institute of Archaeology's first Professor of the Archaeology of the Roman Provinces (Potter 1987, 76).

The Institutions of British Archaeology

Another effect of Smith's early excursions was to convince him of the need for a new approach to archaeological organisation and legislation in Britain (Chapter 7). In the late 1830s, there was no ancient monuments legislation, no government money for rescue work, the British Museum had no interest in British antiquities, and local museums, while increasing in number, had no money for purchases and lacked adequate curation. Meanwhile, historic buildings were falling into ruin, and increasing numbers of antiquities were being brought to light and dispersed or destroyed without record.

The situation was markedly different in Northern France, an area already well furnished with antiquarian museums, which had recently moved ahead of the rest of Europe in terms of archaeological organisation. The year 1834 had seen the formation of the Société Française pour la Conservation des Monuments historiques to promote conservation and provide funds for research and excavation, and of a new government body - the Commission des Monuments Historiques. A privately funded archaeological journal had appeared - the Bulletin Monumental, and local Commissions were established to disperse grants and advise on the preservation and conservation of historic monuments. In 1837 a Comité des Arts et Monuments was established to compile an inventory of them.
Smith was understandably impressed, and during the 1840s strove tirelessly to create a similar institutional framework for Britain, as described in Chapter 8. The British Archaeological Association and Archaeological Institute, which were modelled on the Société Française... are the most tangible results, although Smith failed to achieve his principal goals - to obtain local and central government funding for archaeology and a Royal Commission on historical monuments. In such matters, Smith was ahead of his time, although it might be argued that in trying to replicate the French approach within Britain, Smith failed to take account of the different cultural and political factors at work in the two countries. Perhaps it was this that lay behind Hawkins' remark that Smith was "impracticable" (Smith 1883, 120).

Pocock (1961-2) has argued that a society tends to generate a view of its past which will ensure the continuity of its current structure - a tendency that may be observed in the different attitudes to the past in France and Britain. In France, state support for archaeology came about under Louis Philippe, who gained the throne in 1830 after the middle classes had deposed his predecessor for trying to introduce an Ultra-royalist programme. Louis Philippe's policy was to harmonise past and present by wedding the monarchy to the French revolution. Threatened by internal insurrection and by instability in neighbouring countries which encouraged French expansionism, it was politic to engender a respect for the past as a guarantee of security (Léon 1951, 114). Similar factors operated during the Second Empire (1852-70), when Emperor Napoleon III encouraged a popular revival of interest in the archetype of Roman Emperors - Julius Caesar - for example by sponsoring excavations at Alésia and Bibracte.

An altogether different climate prevailed in Britain, which had escaped revolution and where, despite the increasing democratisation implied by the Corn Law Repeal Act, 1846,
and Reform Acts of 1832 and 1867, ownership of the land and the control of Parliament remained in aristocratic hands (Berman 1975, 33). The aristocracy also owned many of the country's ancient monuments, and dominated the Society of Antiquaries, which enabled them to exercise control over Britain's heritage and history. For progress in archaeology, as in other areas, it was necessary for traditional institutions and authorities to reform or be undermined, and Smith was destined to be a prime mover in this area. The parallels between his antiquarian endeavours and the wider process of social reform were apparent even then, as seen in Benjamin Thorpe's description of Smith as "the O'Connell of archaeology" (O'Connell being a radical leader of the 1830s). 617

In the prevailing social climate, Smith's calls for government funding for archaeology and the protection of ancient monuments stood little chance of success. His campaign to induce the Corporation of London to assist antiquarian endeavours, while justified on archaeological grounds, overlooked the fact that the Corporation was apparently the first local authority to make provision for archaeological finds in a building contract, and that serious difficulties would have ensued had it tried to introduce similar measures for private developments. This was recognised by The Athenaeum, which questioned:

"...how far it was possible for a public body to keep the necessary watch over workmen, ..., and how far, if they had been able to do so, it would have been charged against them that they interfered with private enterprise" (Anon. 1855c).

The main stumbling block was not however the principal of laissez-faire, for the government was ready to take action to deal with pauperism, public health, and other social problems (Lubenow 1971, 9). It was primarily the interests of landowners and the sanctity of private property - issues of particular sensitivity following the revolutions in Europe which raised irrational fears over the confiscation
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of private property (Houghton 1957, 55). Even the very weak proposals of 1871 were defeated in Parliament several times before being enshrined in the Ancient Monuments Act 1882. Prior to the Second Reform Act 1867, such legislation would have been out of the question, given that many regarded any form of state intervention as despotic, corrupting and unconstitutional, and preferred limited, local self-government to "government by commissions" (Murray 1989, 66; Lubenow 1971, 183-4). The failure of the first historical commissions did not help (p. 171), and there was little point in appointing a new commission to compile lists of monuments in the absence of legislation to ensure their preservation. As Smith recognised, the only chance of averting destruction lay in mobilising public opinion, the importance of which was increasing. The press was receptive to the cause, but the Society of Antiquaries was poorly placed to meet the challenge. Dominated by the aristocracy and upper classes, it had consistently failed to speak out on conservation matters, and even in the 1870s was less than whole-hearted in its support for the legislation mentioned above (Evans 1956, 366).

As we have seen in Chapter 8, the BAA also failed to lobby the government for a Royal commission, but it was at least partly successful in raising public awareness of the issues involved. The BAA was no mere pressure group, however, but rather a new society with distinct modus operandi and a journal with a particular emphasis in the kinds of material it published. As discussed in Chapter 1, according to Kuhn (1962, 19), a new group forms when a number of individuals receive a paradigm, and may be identified by a new society and/or specialist journal and "the claim for a special place in the curriculum". It is therefore appropriate to examine to what extent whether the BAA was the result of new paradigms, or indeed, revolutionary change.

The BAA arose partly in response to the new democratic spirit, which widened the scope of archaeology by endowing
greater significance to commonplace antiquities, and extended to the masses the right to comment on matters of general concern (Houghton 1957, 95). Together with the rising scale of archaeological destruction, this created conditions whereby the middle classes might make a vital contribution to the discipline by collecting finds and making observations. The interpretation of the data could be left to a central body of experts - implying a greater separation between the processes of observation and interpretation. A central body was also needed to disseminate the wealth of new data required to advance the cause of comparative archaeology and the newly perceived need to understand the particular in the light of the general - approaches pioneered by Smith. The Society of Antiquaries could not fulfil this role because its officers and fellows were appointed partly on grounds of rank. Also, its cumbersome publications were unsuited to carry the weight of new data, and lacked sufficient editorial control, so that outmoded opinions were perpetuated, while persons who had important matter to submit but lacked literary skills were unable to contribute. We must therefore conclude that the formation of the BAA was indeed a result of underlying paradigm change.

Whatever their failings, the BAA and Archaeological Institute succeeded as publishing bodies, as a means of popularising archaeology and, like the Numismatic Society and the British Association for the Advancement of Science, in attracting support from a broader social spectrum. But the bitter rift between the two societies also did immense damage to archaeology. Whilst the BAA was not alone in suffering schism (which also affected the Ethnological and Numismatic Societies: BAAS 1931, 89; Carson 1986, 22), it is worth pondering a contemporary comment that:

"There must surely be some inherent venom concocted by antiquities .... Naturalists, geologists, astronomers, geographers, chemists, philologists, have each their one Society, and can work together in it harmoniously; but antiquaries must have three, and then contrive to squabble in ai!" (Anon. 1854f).
Two explanations are offered, both of which stem from the involvement in antiquarianism of the aristocracy and clergy. One is that these groups were interested in the past precisely because their social influence was declining (Houghton 1957, 96), and that this made them especially anxious to preserve their position within the antiquarian societies. The second is that due to their involvement, the societies offered unusual opportunities for social mixing, and made them breeding grounds for sycophancy. Both factors would have served to undermine Smith and Wright's radical ideals. The events which led to the schism suggest that Way and the staff of the BM (who were generally graduates and by definition socially privileged) were unhappy that the newly popular movement should be dominated by persons whose claim to recognition rested upon success in research and publication, without regard to social rank. The same factors affected BM appointments, as illustrated by what happened when Akerman (a secretary) sought the position of Assistant, but was opposed by the officers who were "very jealous of him". The Institute's concern to protect its central committee from outsiders is reflected in its first set of rules, which incorporated the Antiquaries practice of posting a "house list" of approved nominees, making it difficult for ordinary members to gain a position on the committee without the old committee's support (AI 1845).

The involvement of the aristocracy and the clergy ruled out any chance that the BAA or Institute would advance the professionalisation of archaeology which Smith had hoped for. The British Association also failed in this regard, and for the same reason, namely that the amateur tradition strove to perpetuate itself, and instinctively conspired to prevent anyone from making financial gain within its normal areas of involvement (Berman 1975, 34-37). This is reflected in the parsimonious offer made for Smith's collection, and the jibes that Smith and Wright were
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"mountebanks" and "traders" (Cunningham 1845). By analogy with the development of history as a university subject, we may speculate that the lack of professionalisation probably discouraged the teaching of archaeology in the universities (which in any case regarded archaeology as the study of Greek and Roman antiquities based on classical literature). From 1851 until the 1880s, the Disney Chair of Archaeology at Cambridge was the only position of its kind in the country (Levine 1986, 32).

The spread of the democratic spirit and the same paradigms that led to the creation of the BAA and Archaeological Institute also led to calls for a museum of national antiquities. There has been a tendency to link the development of the British national collection with the spread of the three-age system (Wilkins 1961; Daniel 1975, 79-85). Doubtless this played a part, but as described in Chapter 9, the scientific justification for a national collection was the ability to distinguish between objects of "Celtic", "Romano-British", and Anglo-Saxon origin, and the possibility of distinguishing regional differences between objects of similar date - areas in which Smith played a vital role. It not advances in prehistory, but the furore which Smith orchestrated over the Faussett collection of Anglo-Saxon antiquities and his own Museum of London Antiquities, which helped change attitudes. Thus, in Britain as in the rest of Europe, the national collection stemmed from a heightened appreciation of native antiquities (cf. Bazin 1967, 218 ff.; Sklenár 1983, 78-82). Again, this was accomplished only by weakening aristocratic control of the relevant institution, in this instance through subjecting the British Museum's trustees to public criticism and parliamentary scrutiny, which ultimately forced them to note the wishes of the antiquarian community.

Concluding remarks
The 19th century was a period of continuous and rapid change, in which every year saw an important discovery or intellectual advance. From 1835 to 1861, Smith was at the centre of developments, and to no small extent, his importance stemmed from his extraordinary ability and energy in identifying, utilising and propagating new discoveries, contemporary best practice, and the latest lines of approach.

Despite first appearances, Smith's work was not strikingly original. Even his most innovative ideas have precedents, if not in Britain then on the continent. His penchant for publishing small artifacts was inspired by Caylus' work of a century before; his excursions were inspired by Stukeley and later by Worsaae; his statistical approach to the study of Roman coins was adapted from work on Anglo-Saxon coinage; his artifact distribution studies were inspired by developments in numismatics; his London site observations continued the work of A.J. Kempe and others; his ideas on archaeological organisation were lifted straight from the French institutional framework. His publications were likewise modelled on other works: Roman London on the Cirencester volume by Buckmann and Newmarch (1850), Notes on the Antiquities of Trèves &c (1851a) on a work by Wyttenbach (1839), his introduction to Inventorium Sepulchrale on a publication by Bähr (1850; p. 254).

Given his remarkable qualities, one feels that in some respects Smith never quite reached his potential. Much more might have been achieved had the BAA not indulged in squabbling, had Smith been less encumbered with business, and had the Corporation and the Treasury heeded his requests for financial and practical aid. Smith might also have gained more organisational influence had he possessed more subtlety and social polish, and more academic influence if instead of publishing other people's research in small-circulation journals of passing significance, he had directed his energy into the production of quality mass-
circulation volumes. It is sad that the appearance of Wright's *The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon* should have caused Smith to abandon his projected history of Roman Britain.\textsuperscript{619} It is nevertheless understandable, for Smith lacked the easy command of language that made Wright's books so popular, and may well have found it difficult to structure so ambition a work. His literary style is best suited to shorter technical works where it appears incisive, rather than harsh, formal and rigid.

Notwithstanding these reservations, for his unparalleled knowledge of British archaeology, for his wide reading, perceptive insight, outstanding scholarship, and for his extraordinary energy and tenacity, Smith undoubted stands among the leading European antiquarians of his day. Within Britain, he did more than anyone to foster comparative archaeology, and he ranks with Cochet and Worsaae in demonstrating the importance of an international approach to the study of small artifacts. A "society in himself" (Anon. 1860b), Smith's refreshing enthusiasm inspired a generation of English antiquarians, winning him a commendation as the "principal labourer" in the revival of British archaeology (Anon. 1868a).

Smith's greatness stems not just from his scientific achievements, however, but from his admirable personal merits, which in turn partly arose from his appreciation of archaeology as a humanity focused upon the condition of man and fleeting human institutions. In Smith's words:

"It is impossible to be continually a witness to the decay of the works of man ... without reflecting with feelings of humility on our own transitory state; such reflections lower human pride, check jealousies, and generate charity, toleration, and benevolence. If archaeology does not lead to our improvement, then it cannot be said to be properly studied or understood" (Smith 1855e, 47).

A strong motivation and personal philosophy are essential to any archaeologist, and Smith was neither the first nor the
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last to find that archaeology demands special sacrifices and rarely offers commensurate rewards. His despair at the self-inflicted wounds created by jealousies and lack of vision within the antiquarian community sounds resonant overtones at a time when the organisation of archaeology and rescue work in London are again matters of contention. It has been observed that to look into the Victorian mind is to see some primary sources of the modern mind (Houghton 1957, xiv), and the contemporary archaeologist will find it easy to identify with Smith's struggles against the Corporation, his experience of class distinction within the Society of Antiquaries and BAA, and his frustration at the lack of governmental and public support for archaeology - hence Stuart Rigold's description of him as a "young father-figure of archaeology for everyman" (Rigold 1980, 100). Through his genuine love of archaeology and concern for its progress, his desire to encourage fellow workers and educate the masses, and his stoic response to difficulties of every kind, the story of Smith's life and work speaks to our own age and beyond.
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APPENDIX 1: The Works of C.R. Smith

This bibliography has been compiled using the following sources:

- Obituaries (see Pt. E) and other articles about Smith.
- Cross-references in articles by Smith and other writers.
- Offprints and newspaper clippings contained in a variety of manuscript collections, notably the author's bound copies of his *Collectanea Antiqua*, and his scrapbooks relating to the first six congresses of The British Archaeological Association, all in the Library of the Society of Antiquaries.
- Published indexes of publications by Allibone (1870, 2131-2), Bonser (1964; 1957), Gomme (1907), and Palmer (1868-1891).
- Published indexes of national and local archaeological journals and a page-by-page search of the following journals:

  Animal World
  The Antiquary
  Archaeologia
  Archaeologia Aeliana
  Archaeologia Cantiana
  The Archaeological Journal
  The Archaeologist & Journal of Antiquarian Science
  The Athenaeum
  The Builder
  Bulletin Monumental
  Chambers's Journal
  Edinburgh Review
  The Gentleman's Magazine
  The Illustrated London News
  Journal of the British Archaeological Association
  Long Ago
Notes and Queries
The Numismatic Chronicle
The Numismatic Journal
Proceedings of the Dorset Natural History and
Antiquarian Field Club
Proceedings of the Numismatic Society
Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of London
Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Publications of the Antiquarian Etching Club
Quarterly Review
The Reliquary
Revue Archéologique
Revue de la Numismatique Belge
Revue Numismatique
The Saturday Review
Sharpe's London Magazine
The Student and Intellectual Observer ...
Surrey Archaeological Collections
Sussex Archaeological Collections
Transactions of the Essex Archaeological Society
Transactions of the Historical Society of Lancashire
and Cheshire
Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological
Society
Walford's Antiquarian

Conventions

- Titles of papers which do not follow the accepted modern formula have been adapted, and in some cases have been expanded to indicate the subject more clearly.
- All alterations and expansions are shown by the use of square brackets.
- The capitalisations have been standardised.
- Unless otherwise stated, it may be assumed that the books and pamphlets were published in London or Westminster. The place of publication of journals is not given.
Note on the Collectanea Antiqua

Smith's Collectanea Antiqua took the form of a privately produced journal, each volume containing a series of articles and papers, not all by Smith himself. To take account of this, each completed volume of the Collectanea is listed among Smith's books and pamphlets, while each individual paper by Smith is separately listed among his papers.

The Collectanea were issued in parts at irregular intervals, as and when sufficient material became available; Volumes 1 and 2 were issued in fourteen and nine parts respectively. The later volumes were produced in four parts each. It seems to have been Smith's early intention to produce a new part of the Collectanea every quarter, apparently in line with the JBAA.1

Because of the speed with which antiquarian knowledge grew during the period with which we are concerned, it has been important to establish exact publication dates for the various parts of the Collectanea. The complete volumes are usually dated to the year stated on their title pages (as cited in the list of books below). However, the title pages were evidently issued with the final part of each volume, together with the preface, so cannot be used to date the earlier parts.2 Each individual part of Volumes IV-VII was supplied in a temporary brown paper cover, bearing the date of issue, although these covers rarely survive.3 The only means of dating the parts of the earlier volumes has been

---

1 Stated to have been a quarterly publication by Anon. (1844a). The words "PUBLISHED QUARTERLY" are printed on the temporary brown paper cover of CA I, No. XI (1847), preserved in CRS:KP.

2 See RRL, copy of CA VII, Pt. IV, wherein preface and index are bound within the printers' temporary brown covers.

3 The original brown paper covers for the various parts of Vols. III-VI are bound at the end of NLW:DMR, F.W. Bourdillon's copies of CA.
from letters of receipt, and reviews in newspapers and journals.

The problem of ascribing individual papers to their original part within each volume has been even more difficult to establish, since nowhere is there a contents list for each individual part. The information has had to be derived from a careful examination of reviews and a number of incomplete volumes of the Collectanea, which serve to indicate the range of page numbers of each part. In some copies of Vol. I of Collectanea, the paper colour and quality varies, which together with Smith's habit of appending notes to the end of each part during proof reading, has helped to establish the end of each section. The actual and "official" year of publication of each individual paper is provided using the formula: "[year of issue] for [official year of publication]".
Part A: Books and Pamphlets

(This list excludes offprints or reprints of papers and articles originally published in journals).


1850: The Antiquities of Richborough, Reculver, and Lymne, in Kent (printed for the subscribers). [8vo., pp. viii+268, PIs. 10]


1852: Collectanea Antiqua, Etchings and Notices of Ancient Remains, illustrative of the Habits, Customs, and History of Past Ages II. [8vo., pp. ix+278, PIs. LVIII]


1854: Collectanea Antiqua ... III. [8vo., pp. xv+248+Appendix 14+index iv, PIs. XXXVII]


1857: Collectanea Antiqua ... IV (printed for the subscribers). [8vo., pp. viii+223+Appendix 60, Pls. XLVI]

1858: Report on Excavations made upon the Site of the Roman Castrum at Pevensey in Sussex, in 1852, under the Direction of M.A. Lower and C.R. Smith (printed for the subscribers to the excavations and not published). [8vo., pp. 44, Pls. XIII]


1861: Collectanea Antiqua ... V (printed for the subscribers only). [8vo., pp. 298; Pl. XXIX; reprinted in part with dedication from Smith to Lord and Lady Londesborough, as: Fairholt, F.W. 1858: Notes of a Journey through the South of France to Rome .... [8vo, pp. 106.]


1868: Collectanea Antiqua ... VI. [8vo., pp. viii+334, Pls. LII]

1868-9: Remarks on Shakespeare, His Birthplace, Etc.
Suggested by a Visit to Stratford-Upon-Avon, in the
Autumn of 1868 (privately printed). [8vo., pp. 30]

1870: The Rural Life of Shakespeare, as Illustrated by his
Works (1870). [8vo., pp. 44; first published as
"Shakespeare's rural life" MKJ 4 and 25 Oct. (1869);
also published as 1870: Shakespeare's Rural Life; an
Essay Read, In Part, Before the Society, at Chillington
House, Maidstone, September 21st, 1869 (printed for the
Maidstone and Mid-Kent Natural History Society; 2nd
edition 1874 (see below); extensively plagiarised in:
Walter, Major J. 1874: Shakespeare's Home and Rural
Life, 117 ff.)

1871: A Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon and Other Antiquities
discovered at Faversham, in Kent, and Bequeathed by
William Gibbs Esq., of that Town, to the South
Kensington Museum (Science and Art Department of the
Committee of Council on Education, South Kensington

1874: Shakespeare's Rural Life; an Essay read, in part,
before the society, at Chillington House, Maidstone,
September 21st, 1869 2nd edition (printed for the
Maidstone and Mid-Kent Natural History Society). [Also
published for the subscribers, with a dedication to
Joseph Mayer; 8vo, pp. iv+65.]

1877: Remarks on Shakespeare, His Birthplace, Etc.
Suggested by a Visit to Stratford-Upon-Avon, in the
Autumn of 1868 2nd edition (privately printed). [8vo.,
pp. 32]

1879: Address delivered at a Special General Meeting of the
Strood Institute Elocution Class, on February 4th, 1879
(printed for the members only). [8vo., pp. 16]
1880: Collectanea Antiqua... VII (privately printed).
   [8vo., pp. vii+271, Pls. XXIV]

1882: Notes on Clausentum; now Bittern Manor House
   (Southampton). [8vo., pp. 4; reproduced in "The
   British Archaeological Association. Meeting at
   Southampton. Afternoon Party at Bitterne Manor House"
   Hants. Advertiser County Newspaper (Aug. 30).]

1883: Retrospections, Social and Archaeological I (printed
   for the subscribers). [8vo., pp. 329; extract
   published as: -- 1882: "Site of Roman Potteries on
   the Banks of the Medway" in "The Antiquary's Note-Book"
   Antiquary VI (1882) 176; and under the same title in B
   XXXXIII, No. 2068 (23 Sep.) 394.]

1883: Address to the Elocution Class of the Strood
   Institute, August 30th, 1883 (privately printed,
   Strood). [8vo., pp. 8]

1884: The Floods of the Medway at Strood (privately
   printed). [8vo., pp. 7; described as "the portion of
   an advanced chapter in Retrospections, Social and
   Archaeological" but not incorporated in this form.]

1886: Retrospections, Social and Archaeological II (printed
   for the subscribers). [8vo., pp. vi+312, Pls. 6]

   To the electors and non-electors of Strood and
   Rochester (privately printed, Strood). [8vo., pp. 8]

Stevenson, S.W., Smith, C.R. and Madden, F.W. 1889: A
   Dictionary of Roman Coins, Republican and Imperial.
   [8vo., pp. viii+929]

4 Rare. A copy may be found in CRS:KP.
Part B: Papers and Articles

1836: ["Unpublished penny of Eadred"] GM, Sep., 266.


1837: "Observations on the Roman remains found in various parts of London in the years 1834, 1835, 1836, communicated in a letter to A.J. Kempe Esq., F.S.A." A XXVII, 140-52. [Offprints circulated]

"Coin of Carausius" GM, Mar., 267.

"Roman sepulchral stone found in London" GM, Oct., 361-2.

1838: "The denarii found near Maidenhead" GM, Jan., 80.

"Roman antiquities found near Winchester" GM, Oct., 371-2.

1839: "On two small brass coins of the second Constantius, with the letters 'PLON' in the exergue" NC I, 217-8.

1840: "On some Roman bronzes discovered in the bed of the Thames, in January 1837; in a letter to Nicholas Carlisle, Esq. K.H., F.R.S., Secretary" A XXVIII, 38-46 and Pls. IV-VIII.


"Discovery of Roman coins at Pevensey Castle, Sussex" in "Miscellanies" NC III, 65-7.

"Discovery of Roman coins [in Charnwood Forest, Leicestershire]" in "Miscellanies" NC III, 67-68.

"List of Roman coins recently found near Strood, in Kent" NC II, 112-24 and 255.

"... on a series of Roman coins, recently discovered near Strood in Kent [in a letter to Mr Hobler]" PNS 1839-40, 317-25.


"On the Roman coins discovered in the bed of the Thames, near London Bridge, from 1834 to 1841" NC IV, 147-68 and 187-94.

1842: "On an ancient enamelled ouche, in gold [in a letter to John Gage Rokewood, Esq., F.R.S., Director]" A XXIX, 70-5 and Pl. X.

"Observations on Roman remains recently found in London: in a letter to John Gage Rokewood, Esq. F.R.S. Director" A XXIX, 145-66 and Pls. XVII-XVIII.

"Notices of recent discoveries of Roman antiquities at Strood, Bapchild, Oare, and Upchurch, in Kent, with remarks on the site of the Durolevum of Antoninus, in a letter addressed to Sir Henry Ellis K.H., F.R.S., Secretary" A XXIX, 217-26 and Pls. XXII.

"Remarks on an unpublished inscription to the Emperor Tetricus, found at Bittern, near Southampton: in a
letter to Sir Henry Ellis, K.H., F.R.S., Secretary" A XXIX, 257-61.

"Observations on further Roman remains discovered in London. In a letter to Sir Henry Ellis, K.H., F.R.S., Secretary" A XXIX, 267-74.

"Ancient copper bowls found in Lothbury" in "Appendix" A XXIX, 367-8 and Pl. XXXIX.

"Ancient bone skate found in Moorfields" in "Appendix" A XXIX, 397-9.

"Tessellated pavements found in Threadneedle Street [in two letters addressed to John Gage Rokewood, Esq., Director]" in "Appendix" A XXIX, 400-4.

"Society of Antiquaries" in AJAS 5, Jan., 215-21.5


"Society of Antiquaries" in AJAS 8, Apl., 87.

"Society of Antiquaries" in AJAS 9, May, 140-1.


"Roman coins found at Ancaster" in "Miscellanea" NC V, 157.

5 Smith agreed to a request from JOH that he should provide notes on SAL meetings for AJAS: LOA 13/34, CRS to JOH, 16 Apl. 1842.

"Bronze fibulae and pottery, found at Etaples, Pas de Calais" CA I, Pt. I, 3-4 and Pls. III-IV.

"Coins found in Kent" CA I, Pt. I, 5-8 and Pls. V-VI.

"Gold British, or Gaulic coins, found at Bognor and Alfriston in Sussex" CA I, Pt. I, 9-12 and PI. VII.

"Gallo-Roman votive altar, now a baptismal font in the church of Halinghen, Pas de Calais" CA I, Pt. II, 13-16 and PI. VIII.

"Roman sepulchral remains found at Strood in Kent" CA I, Pt. II, 17-32 and Pls. IX-XIII.

"Warwickshire antiquities in the collection of Matthew Holbeche Bloxham, Esq., Rugby" CA I, Pt. III, 33-48 and Pls. XIV-XIX.

"Coins found in Kent" CA I, Pt. IV, 63-4 and Pls. XXII-XXIII.

1844: "Account of some antiquities found in the neighbourhood of Sandwich, in the County of Kent [in a letter to Sir Henry Ellis, K.H., F.R.S., Secretary]" A XXX, 132-6 and Pl. XI.

---

6 The contents of Vol. I, Pt. I are summarised in Smith (1883) 150. On the evidence of a review of Pt. V (Anon 1844a), and slight changes in paper quality and colour in the writer's own copy of CA I, it seems likely that each of the first four numbers comprised sixteen pages. However, this pattern cannot apply to the whole volume, or Pt. VI would not begin on p. 81.

7 Stated to be from Pt. II in BAC V, CRS to TB, 1 Sep. 1856.

8 Part number and date of publication given in Anon. (1845i) 208.
"Bronze forceps found in the bed of the Thames [in a letter to Hudson Gurney, Esq., V.P.]" in "Appendix" A XXX, 548-50 and Pl. XXIV.

"On some Anglo-Saxon stycas discovered at York" NC VII, 99-104.


"[A Saxon sceatta showing Roman influence]" AJ I, 385-6.


1844 (for 1848): "Roman pavement discovered at Basildon, Berks" CA I, Pt. V, 65-8 and Pl. XXIV.

"Caves in which Romano-british remains have been discovered, near Settle, in Yorkshire" CA I, Pt. V, 69-72 and Pls. XXV-XXX.

"Religious signs or tokens of the Middle Ages" CA I, Pt. VI, 81-91 and Pls. XXXI-XXXIII.

"Roman remains discovered on the South Downs, near Lancing, Sussex" CA I, Pt. VI, 92-4 and Pls. XXXIV-XXXV.

9 Publication data and contents of this part given by Anon (1844a).

10 A copy of CA I, No. VI, in its original brown paper cover, was examined by the writer in July 1988, at the premises of Deighton, Bell & Co. (Booksellers), 13 Trinity Street, Cambridge.
"Gaulish coins found in Brittany" CA I, Pt. VII, 107-9 and Pl. XXXIX.

"Roman remains at Springhead, Southfleets, Kent" CA I, Pt. VII, 110-2 and Pls. XL-XLI.

"Cover of a leaden box or cup found in the bed of the Thames" CA I, Pt. VIII, 115-22 and Pl. XLIII.

"Roman sepulchral interment discovered at Avisford, Sussex" CA I, Pt. VIII, 123-4 and Pl. XLIV.

Vallance, Revd W. with additional notes by Smith, C.R. 1844 (for 1848): "Anglo-Saxon antiquities discovered at Sittingbourne, Kent, from 1825 to 1828" CA I, Pt. VII, 97-106 and Pls. XXXVI-XXXVIII.

1845: "Merovingian coins, &c., discovered at St. Martin's, near Canterbury" NC VII, 187-91.

"... the objects and operations of the Association" in Dunkin, A.J. (Ed.) A Report of the Proceedings of the British Archaeological Association, at the First General Meeting, held at Canterbury ... September, 1844 (printed for the subscribers) 25-35.

... in Wrench, Revd F. 1845: A Brief Account of the Parish of Stowting, in the County of Kent, and of the Antiquities Lately Discovered There (J.R. Smith) 7-9.

11 Having established the page numbers of Pt. VI, we now encounter the problem of how to divide pp. 128-44 into Pts. VII-X. The simplest explanation is that the volume labelled "Vol. VI" actually comprised Parts VI-IX, each of which was sixteen pages long like Pts. I-V. In support of this, Pt. VII must have been distributed by July 1845 as it is mentioned in a contemporary letter in CRS:BAA2", BP to CRS, 18 July 1845.
1845 (for 1846): "On Roman potters' kilns and pottery, discovered, by Mr. E.T. Artis, in the County of Northampton" JBA A I, No. 1, 1-9.

"On pilgrim's signs and leaden tokens" JBA A I, No. 3, 200-12.


"Notice of a leaden coffin, of early fabric, discovered at Bow, as communicated in a Letter ... to Nicholas Carlisle, Esq., K.H., F.S.A., Secretary" A XXXI, 308-11.

"On some Anglo-Saxon remains, discovered at Stowting, in the county of Kent: in a letter ... to Sir Henry Ellis, K.H., F.R.S., Secretary" A XXXI, 398-403.

"Roman remains at Brecquereque, near Boulogne-sur-Mer" in "Appendix" A XXXI, 460-1.


"Notes on a bronze head of Hadrian, etc." JBA A I, No. 4, 286-91 and frontispiece.

"Account of the churches of Winchester at the period of the restoration" in BAA (1846b), 105-15.

"On the Roman remains at Bittern, near Southampton" in BAA (1846b), 161-70 and PIs. 4-6.

"Notes on Roman tessellated pavements at West Dean, Wilts" in BAA (1846b) 239-45 and Pl. 8.
1846 (for 1847): "Notes on Roman Remains at Colchester"
JBAA II, No. 1, 29-45.

"On Roman pottery discovered on the banks of the Medway, near Upchurch, Kent" JBAA II, No. 2, 133-40.

"On a hoard of stycas discovered at York, and sent by Mr. William Hargrove to the recent congress at Gloucester" JBAA II, No. 3, 230-3.

-- and Wright, T.: "On certain mythic personages, mentioned on Roman altars found in England and on the Rhine" JBAA II, No. 3, 239-55 and Figs. I-II.

1847: "On the British coins found in 1845 at Chesterford [in a letter to Captain W.H. Smyth, F.R.S., Director]"
A XXII, 255-6.

"Ancient figure of God the Father found in the Thames" in "Appendix" A XXXII, 409-10.

"Notes on some leaden coffins discovered at Colchester"
JBAA II, No. 4, 297-303.

"List of the Roman coins discovered at Springhead,... Kent, in the possession of Mr. Silvester ..." in Dunkin (1848) 148.

1847 (for 1848): "Roman monuments discovered in London" CA I, Pt. X, 12 131-44 and Pls. XLV-XLVIII B.

"Potters marks discovered in London" CA I, Pt. XI, 13 148-66 and Pls. L-LI.

12 Pt. X was donated to the NS in Dec. 1847 (NS 1848, 5).
13 The page numbers of this part are provided by CRS:KP, CA I in original brown covers.
"On an inscription to Bellona, discovered near Old Carlisle, Cumberland" JBAA III, No. 1, 42-6.

"Roman remains discovered on Hod Hill, near Blandford, Dorset" JBAA III, No. 2, 94-9.

"Discovery of Anglo-Saxon remains at Northfleet, Kent" JBAA III, No. 3, 235-40. [reprinted in Dunkin (1848) 149-54.]


"Romano Gaulish remains discovered near Boulogne-Sur-Mer" CA I, Pt. XII, 170-5 and Pl. LIV.

"British and Gaulish coins found In Kent" CA I, Pt. XII, 176-8 and Pl. LV.

"British coins" CA I, Pt. XIII, 179-82 and Pl. LVI.

"Notes on some articles of antiquity in the collection of Mr. John Huxtable" in BAA (1848) 99-101 and Pls. 7-8.

"Roman inscriptions discovered at York" in BAA (1848), 149-51.

1848 (for 1849): "On the red glazed pottery of the Romans, found in this country and on the continent" JBAA IV, No. 1, 1-20.

---

14 The last page of Pt. XI is indicated by a note added at proof stage to the bottom of p. 166. Pt. XII was presented to the NS in Nov. 1848 (NS 1849, 2).

15 The similar nature of this and the preceding paper suggest that they belong to different parts, otherwise they would probably have been published under one heading.

"Roman remains found at Mount Bures near Colchester" CA II, Pt. I, 25-36 and Pls. X-XII.

1850: "Another type of Vericus" NC XIII, 134.

"New type of Carausius" in "Miscellanea" NC XIII, 140.


1850 (for 1852): "Roman urns, vases, etc. found at Colchester" CA II, Pt. II, 37-40 and Pls. XIII-XV.


"Pilgrims' signs" CA II, Pts. II-III, 43-50 and Pls. XVI-XVIII.

"Cover of a reliquary" CA II, Pt. III, 50 and Pl. XIX.

"Roman tessellated pavements" CA II, Pt. III, 51-64 and Pls. XX-XXIII.


16 This part was presented to the NS in Nov. 1849 (NS 1850, 2).
17 This part is dated from BAC III, CRS to TB, 9 Apl. 1850.
19 Stated to belong to this part in a review (Anon. 1850a).
"Notes of a tour along the Roman Wall" GM, Oct., 383-8; Nov., 503-7.

1851 (for 1852): "Notes on some of the antiquities of Trèves, Mayence, and other places on the Moselle and Rhine" CA II, Pts. III-IV, 65-152 and Pls. XXIV-XXXV. [reprinted with new preface, as 1851: Notes on the Antiquities of Trèves, Mayence, Wiesbaden, Niederbieber, Bonn and Cologne. [8vo, pp. viii+88, Pls. XIV]

"New and unpublished type of the coins of Carausius" CA II, Pt. VI, 153-4.

"Anglo-Saxon remains found in Kent, Suffolk, and Leicestershire" CA II, Pt. VI, 155-70 and Pls. XXXVI-XLIV.


"Remarks on recent researches at Caerleon, Cirencester, on the Roman Wall, and in Scotland" JBAA VII, No. 1, 61-8.

1852: "Notes on Saxon sepulchral remains found at Fairford, Gloucestershire ... in a Letter addressed to J.Y. Akerman, Esq. Resident Secretary" A XXXIV, 77-82 and Pl. X.

---

20 This part presented to HSLC in May 1851 (HSLC 1852a, 103).
21 Stated to have been published in this part in KAO:JRJW, 22 Aug. 1851. The part was not circulated until Nov. (HSLC 1852b, 1).
22 This article falls either within Pt. VI or Pt. VII, both of which were published in 1851. Vol. VII is stated to have been published in Nov. or Dec. (BAC III, CRS to TB, 14 Jan. 1852).
"Anglo-Saxon and Frankish remains" CA II, Pts. VIII-IX,23 203-48 and Pls. XLIX-XVIII.

"The national monuments" CA II, Pt. IX, 248.

"Antiquarian excavations on the site of the Roman station at Lymne, in Kent" CA II, Appendix 1-14.


"Discovery of Roman coins between Rochester and Maidstone" NC XV, 59.

"British silver coins recently found at Weston in Norfolk [in a letter to Lord Londesborough]" NC XV, 98-102.


"On the large iron nails frequently found in Roman graves" CA III, Pt. I, 19-28.

"Roman sculptures found at Wroxeter" CA III, Pt. I, 29-32 and PIs. VII-VIII.

"Roman ornaments found near Dorchester, Dorset" CA III, Pt. I, 33-6 and Pl. IX.

1853: "Roman coins struck in the mint of London" in "Miscellanea" NC XV, 60-64.

"Inedited Roman coins" NC XV, 74-9.

23 The final part of Vol. II is stated to depict girdle ornaments (Anon. 1852a). Pts VIII-IX were presented to the NS in Apl. 1852 (NS 1852).

24 This part was donated to the NS in Feb. 1853 (NS 1853, 9-10).
"Roman sepulchral remains discovered near the Minories, London" CA III, Pt. II, 45-62 and Pls. XIII-XIV.

"Brass trumpet found at Romney, Kent" CA III, Pt. II, 63-66 and Pl. XV.

"Sword and scabbard, found in the Thames" CA III, Pt. II, 67-72 and Pl. XVI.

1853-4: "Notes on some of the antiquities of France" CA III, Pts. II-III, 73-130 and Pls. XVII-XXIX.

1854: "The Roman castra at Risingham and High Rochester" CA III, Pt. III, 153-78 and Pl. XXX.


"Inscribed Romano-Gaulish vase, in the Louvre; and inscribed fragment of Roman pottery found at Leicester" CA III, Pt. IV, 193-6 and Pl. XXXI.

"Roman leaden seals" CA III, Pt. IV, 197-8 and Pl. XXXII.

"Researches and discoveries" CA III, Pt. IV, 199-220, 251-8, 271-2 and Pls. XXXIII-XXXVI.


25 This part was donated to the HSLC in Dec. 1853 (HSLC 1854, 18). Its contents are given by Anon. (1854a), but a conflicting account of the contents is given in a prospectus for this volume (Norwich Castle Museum: GJ, "Letters Vol. 3"). This dates to Sep. 1853, so the prospectus may include papers which were subsequently held over for Pt. III.

26 The contents of Pt. III are given by Anon. (1854b), and see also Anon. (1855a).
"The national antiquities" CA III, Pt. IV, 266-9.

"The brass trumpet found at Romney" CA III, Pt. IV, 270-1 and Pl. XV.

"Antiquarian researches in France" in "Correspondence of Sylvanus Urban" GM, Dec., 578-82.


"The site of Anderida" in "Correspondence of Sylvanus Urban" GM, Aug., 159-61.

"Discovery of a Merovingian cemetery" GM, XLIV, 617-18.27

"On a Roman Sepulchral inscription on an Anglo-Saxon urn in the Faussett collection .... In a letter addressed to Thomas Wright, F.S.A.' Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science 25, 145-6.

1855 (for 1857): "Notes on some of the antiquities of France: the result of an excursion in July and August 1854" CA IV, Pt. I,28 1-40 and Pls. I-XIII. [reprinted, with dedication to Joseph Mayer, as - 1855: Notes on Some of the Antiquities of France, Made During a Fortnight's Excursion in the Summer of 1854.]

"Altar inscribed to the dea matres, found at Winchester" CA IV, Pts. I-II,29 41-56 and Pl. XIV.

"Roman steel-yard weight found at Nursling, Hants" CA IV, Pt. II, 57-58 and Pl. XV.

27 Stated to be Smith's work in Kuist (1982) 144.
28 The contents of this part are given by Anon. (1855a).
29 That this article was spread across Pts. I and II is indicated by Anon. (1855b).
"Roman Vase found at Oundle, in Northamptonshire" CA IV, Pt. II, 63-64 and Pl. XVII.

"Medieval seals set with ancient gems" CA IV, Pt. II, 65-79 and Pls. XVIII-XX.

"Romano-British pottery" CA IV, Pt. II, 80-94 and Pls. XXI-XXIV.

"Roman antiquities found at Ixworth, Suffolk, and in its neibourhood" CA IV, Pt. II, 95-96 and Pl. XXV.


"Public dinner given to Mr. C. Roach Smith, at Newport, Isle of Wight, on Tuesday, August 28th, and conversazione at Ryde, Isle of Wight, on Wednesday, August 29th, 1855" CA IV, Pt. II, Appendix, 33-60.

"Medieval brooches" CA IV, Pt. III, 108-12 and Pl. XXVIII.

"Coins of Carausius and Allectus" CA IV, Pt. III, 125-8 and Pl. XXX.

"Notes on a week's tour in the autumn of 1854" CA IV, Pt. III, 129-54 and Pls. XXXI-XXXVI.

"Saxon remains, found near Ixworth, in Suffolk" CA IV, Pt. III, 162-4 and Pl. XXXVIII.

"Pilgrims' signs" CA IV, Pt. III, 165-72 and Pl. XXXIX.

30 The contents of this part are given by Anon. (1855b).
31 The contents of this part are given by Anon. (1857a).


1856: "On some late discoveries in Roman London. In a letter ... to the Rev. Thomas Hugo" TLAMAS I, Pt. 1, 31-4.

1857: "Roman remains found at Petham, Kent" CA IV, Pt. IV, 173-5 and Pl. XL.

"Roman sword found near Mayence" CA IV, Pt. IV, 197-203 and Pl. XLVI.

"Researches and discoveries" CA IV, Pt. IV, 204-20.

"Museum of London Antiquities (continuation from p. 32)" CA IV, Appendix, 62-70.

"Refusal of the City of London to have a public library and museum" CA IV, Appendix, 71-5.

1858 (for 1861): "Inscribed funereal urn in the museum of Joseph Mayer, Esq." CA V, Pt. II, 115-21 and Pl. X.

"Roman coins found at Nunburnholme, in Yorkshire" CA V, Pt. II, 122-8.

1858: "On Anglo-Saxon remains recently discovered at Faversham, at Wye, and at Westwell, in Kent. In a Letter ... to the Honorary Secretary" AC I, 42-48.

---

32 BM:DWAA, Museum Corresp., 2nd Series, Vol. 12, No. 5421, CRS to EH, 13 June 1857, in which Smith discusses the wording of the note on p. 61.

"On the so-called Anglo-Saxon antiquities discovered near Kertch, in the Crimea" THSLC 10, 59-60 and Pl. II.

1859: "Note on some Roman coins discovered in a hypocaust at Wroxeter" NC XX (1859) 79-83.


1860: "On Anglo-Saxon remains discovered recently in various places in Kent. In a letter ... to the Honorary Secretary" AC III, 35-46 and Pls. I-V.


"Fibulae discovered in the Crimea" CA V, Pt. III, 140-5 and Pl. XIV.

"Roman monuments at Lincoln" CA V, Pt. III, 146-8 and Pl. XV.

"Roman remains at Ancaster, Lincolnshire" CA V, Pt. III, 149-51 and Pl. XVI.

"Coins of Carausius" CA V, Pt. III, 152-6, 241-4, Pls. XVII and XXVII.

"Monument of the daughter of a Romano-Gaulish potter" CA V, Pt. III, 157-60 and Pl. XVIII.

"Roman monuments illustrative of social and industrial life" CA V, Pt. III, 160-73 and Pl. XIX.

33 The contents of this part are given by Anon. (1860a).
1861: "Lyminge, in Kent" CA V, Pt. IV, 185-200.

"Marotte, or fool's bauble" CA V, Pt. IV, 201-6 and Pl. XXII.

"The Roman column at Cussy, in the Cote D'Or" CA V, Pt. IV, 207-18 and Pl. XXIII.

"Autun" CA V, Pt. IV, 219-26 and Pl. XXIV.

"Dax (Dep. Des Landes)" CA V, Pt. IV, 226-40 and Pls. XXV-XXVI.

"Rare and unpublished British and Roman coins" CA V, Pt. IV, 245-6 and Pl. XXVIII.

"Ampullae, in lead" CA V, Pt. IV, 247-8 and Pl. XXIX.

"Mutilation and destruction of church monuments" CA V, Pt. IV, 248-52.

"The leaden images, Etc., found at Shadwell" CA V, Pt. IV, 252-60.


1862: "The excavations at Wroxeter" in "Correspondence of Sylvanus Urban" GM, Nov., 598-601.

1862 (for 1868): "Roman remains discovered on Hod Hill, Dorsetshire" CA VI, Pt. I, 1-17 and Pls. I-III.

34 The contents of this part are given by Jewitt (1861).
"Roman monuments illustrative of social and industrial life" CA VI, Pt. I, 18-27 and Pls. IV-VI.

"Chester: its Roman remains" CA VI, Pt. I, 28-47 and Pls. VII-XII.

"Romano-Gaulish fictilia" CA VI, Pt. I, 48-75 and Pl. XIII.


1862-3: ["Note on a gold Iron Age coin inscribed CVNO and CAMV., from Cudham"] in "Miscellanea" AC V, 331.

"Note on the Roman milestone recently discovered at Buxton" in R III, 210.

"On the scarcity of home-grown fruits in Great Britain; with remedial suggestions ... in a letter to Joseph Mayer ..." THSLC XV, 129-40. [reprinted - 1863: (Liverpool); 1868: 2nd edition (J.R. Smith)]


"Roman leaden seals found at Brough Upon Stanmore" CA VI, Pt. II, 117-20 and Pl. XVI.

35 The contents of this part are given in a review (Anon. 1862).
"The Roman villa at Carisbrooke, in the Isle of Wight" CA VI, Pt. II, 121-9 and PIs. XVII-XIX.

"Coins of Carausius" CA VI, Pt. II, 130-5 and PIs. XX-XXI.

"Anglo-Saxon remains recently discovered in Kent, in Cambridgeshire, and in some other counties" CA VI, Pt. II, 136-72 and PIs. XXII-XXXIV.

"Remains of Roman potteries on the banks of the Medway and the Nen; and in London" CA VI, Pt. II, 173-99 and PIs. XXXV-XXXVIII.

Smith, C.R. and Fairholt, F.W. 1864 (for 1868): "Babylon in Egypt" CA VI, Pt. II, 110-6 and PIs. XIV-XV.


"Antiquarian researches" in "Correspondence of Sylvanus Urban" GM, Dec., 758-61.

"Penny of Ceolwulf, from Bedfordshire" NC New Series V, 168.

1866: "Notes of the month" in "Antiquarian intelligence and proceedings of learned societies" GM, Jan., 37-43.

"Notes of the month" in "Antiquarian intelligence and proceedings of learned societies" GM, Feb., 201-7.

36 The contents of this part are given in a review (Anon. 1865).
"Notes of the month" in "Antiquarian intelligence and proceedings of learned societies" GM, Mar., 330-3.

"Notes of the month" in "Antiquarian intelligence and proceedings of learned societies" GM, Apl., 491-5.

"Notes of the month" in "Antiquarian intelligence and proceedings of learned societies" GM, May, 652-6.

"F.W. Fairholt, Esq., F.S.A." in "Obituary" GM, June, 913-4.37

"Notes of the month" in "Antiquarian intelligence and proceedings of learned societies" GM, June, 814-8.

"Notes of the month" in "Antiquarian intelligence and proceedings of learned societies" GM, July, 42-6.

"Notes of the month" in "Antiquarian intelligence and proceedings of learned societies" GM, Aug., 168-73.

"Notes of the month" in "Antiquarian intelligence and proceedings of learned societies" GM, Sep., 333-8.


"Notes of the month" in "Antiquarian intelligence and proceedings of learned societies" GM, Nov., 607-11.

"Notes of the month" in "Antiquarian intelligence and proceedings of learned societies" GM, Dec., 756-61.


"Antiquarian notes" GM, Feb., 223-8.

37 Stated to be Smith's work in LOA 112/54, CRS to JOH, 12 May 1866.
"Antiquarian notes" GM, Mar., 357-62.

"Antiquarian notes" GM, Apl., 506-11.

"Antiquarian notes" GM, May, 649-54.

"Antiquarian notes" GM, June, 791-5.

"Antiquarian notes" GM, July, 82-9.


"Antiquarian notes" GM, Sep., 364-71.


"Antiquarian notes" GM, Dec., 788-95.

1868: "Medieval seal set with an ancient gem" CA VI, Pts. III-IV, \(^{38}\) 200.

"The columns of Reculver church" CA VI, Pts. III-IV, 222-7 and Pl. XLV.

"Architectural details, of the Roman epoch, in France" CA VI, Pts. III-IV, 240-3 and PIs. XLVIII-L.

"Researches and discoveries" CA VI, Pts. III-IV, 243-69, 274-96 and PIs. LI-LII.

"The archaeology of horticulture [Pt. 3]" CA VI, Pts. III-IV, 269-74.

---

\(^{38}\) These parts were published together in a thin brown cover.

"Antiquarian notes" GM, Jan., 82-90.


"Antiquarian notes" GM, Mar., 366-72.

"Antiquarian notes" GM, Apl., 520-5.

"Antiquarian notes" GM, May, 664-6.

"Antiquarian notes" GM, June, 763-5.


Smith, C.R. and Pollexfen, Revd J.H. 1868: "Roman fictilia discovered at Colchester" CA VI, Pts. III-IV, 228-39 and Pl. XLVI.

1869: "Roman coins found on Salisbury Plain" NC New Series 9, 47-53.

"Find of coins at Poole" NC New Series 9, 283-5.


"Saxon sepulchral monument in the church at Whitchurch, Hants." B XXIX, No. 1501, 11 Nov., 884.

"The Roman Wall" B XXIX, No. 1504, 2 Dec., 940-1.


1873: "[Note on a gold torque found at Clapham]" in "Proceedings at meetings of the Royal Archaeological Institute" AJ XXX, 97-98.

"Antiquarian researches [on a recent visit to Leicester and Sheffield]" B XXXI, No. 1606, 15 Nov., 903-4. [also published in French translation as - de Puységur, Mme la comtesse de (translator) 1874: "Recherches d'antiquites" Bulletin Monumental 5th Series 2, 64-9.]

1874: "Gold torques and armillae discovered in Kent" AC IX, 1-11 and Pls. A-B.


"Find of [Roman] coins [in a hoard at Haven Street]" in "Miscellanea" NC New Series XIV, 352.


1876: "On a Roman villa near Maidstone" AC X, 163-72 and Pl. opp. 164.

"[Notes on Sorbiodunum in a letter to Mr Burtt]" in "Proceedings at meetings of the Royal Archaeological Institute" AJ XXXIII, 295-6.

"The Roman road from London to Chichester" JBAA XXXII, No. 4, 481-9.

1877: "On Mr. Teanby's collection of Romano-British, and Romano-Gaulish, pottery at Gravesend" AC XI, 113-20 and Pl. opp. 117.
"The British oppidum at Cobham" AC XI, 121-2.

"Footprints of the Romans in Kent [Part 1]" MKJ 5 Mar.

"Footprints of the Romans in Kent [Part 2]" MKJ 12 Mar.

supplement.


1877-8: "Unpublished lines on Artis's bust of John Clare the poet" in R XVIII, 240.

Dowker, G. and Smith, C.R. 1878: "Roman remains at Preston near Wingham" AC XII, 47-8 and Pl. opp. 47.


"Notes on some of the antiquities of France. Suggested by recent excursions" CA VII, Pt. I, 15-65 and Pls. VII-XIII.


1878-79 (for 1880): "Roman leaden seals" CA VII, Pts. I-II, 66-70 and Pls. XIV-XV.

39 Date and page numbers for this part obtained from a copy in its temporary brown paper covers, on sale in the Museum Bookshop, Great Russell Street, London, Aug. 1985.

"Discovery of altars, coins, etc., near the site of Procolititia, on the line of the Roman Wall" NC New Series XIX, 85-91.

1879 (for 1880): "British Oppida and Roman Castra" CA VII, Pt. II,40 71-114.

"The Roman Wall. Procolititia" CA VII, Pt. II, 115-35 and Pl. XVI.

"Pilgrims' signs" CA VII, Pt. II, 136-51 and Pl. XVII.

1879 and 1880, respectively: "The Saxon shore" CA VII, Pts. II-III,41 152-69.


"Newenden not Anderida" AC XIII, 488-91.

"British moated oppidum near Staplehurst" AC XIII, 492-3.


"Roman leaden coffins and ossuaria" CA VII, Pt. III, 170-201 and Pls. XIX-XIXA.
"Roman ornaments discovered at Canterbury" CA VII, Pt. III, 202-8 and Pls. XX-XXI. [reproduced in part in Anon. 1880: "Roman Canterbury" B XXXVIII, No. 1948, 5 June, 453.]


"Coins of Carausius and Allectus" CA VII, Pt. IV, 223-8 and Pl. XXII.

"Roman monuments illustrative of social and industrial life" CA VII, Pt. IV, 229-36 and Pl. XXIV.

"Roman villa at Morton, Isle of Wight" CA VII, Pt. IV, 236-40. [published in advance under the same title in B XXXIX, No. 1952, 3 July, 26.]


"Biographical notices [of Wright, T., Akerman, J.Y. and Planché, J.R.]" CA VII, Pt. IV, 244-62.

"Numerical view of the coins [from Coventina's Fountain]" AA 2nd Series VIII, 43-9.


42 Established from dated copy of this part in its original temporary brown covers (RRL).
"Discovery, near Liege, of a "TABULA HONESTA E
MISSIONIS" relating to Britain" in "Proceedings of the
Association" JBAA XXXVII, No. 1, 93-5.

"Note on some discoveries of Roman coins in Gaul and
Britain" NC 3rd Series I, 24-31. [summarised in
"Discoveries of Roman coins in Gaul and Britain" in
"The antiquary's notebook" Antiquary IV, 219-20;
published in French translation in Le Mans and Paris.]

Smith, the late Major Henry, R.M., and Smith, C.R. 1881 (for
1881-2): "XXIII. Isle of Wight words" in "Ser. C.
original glossaries" Glossaries of Words Used in the
Isle of Wight, North Lincoln, Radnor, west Worcester,
Cumberland, and Oxford, with a List of Devonshire Plant
Names English Dialect Soc. 12, ix-xii and 1-64.

Calvert, T. and Smith, C.R. 1881: "Short notice of a find
of Roman coins near Eastbourne" in "Notes and Queries"
SAC XXXI, 201-5.

1882: "The Roman villa at Morton" The Antiquary V, Feb.,
50-53. [reprinted as "Roman remains in the Isle of
Wight" IOWA, 18 Feb.]

"Roman leaden coffin discovered at Canterbury" AC XIV,
35-6 and Pl. opp. 35.

"Retrospective observations respecting a hoard of Roman
coins found in the sand dunes, near Deal" AC XIV, 368-9.

1883: "The Upchurch Marshes, and the Medway as it was and
is" Antiquary VII, 65-6.

"On Roman tessellated pavements" AC XV, 127-41 and Pl.
between 126-7.
"On a hoard of Roman coins discovered in Cobham Park"

["Note on a bill-hook of unknown date, found at Yarbridge, near Brading"] in "Proceedings of the Association" JBAA XXXIX, No. 4, 404-5.

1884: "Roman embanking and sanitary precautions" JBAA XL, No. 2, 185-9.

"Note on the British oppidum in the parish of Meon Stoke, Hants, called 'Old Winchester'" in "Proceedings of the Association" JBAA XL, No. 2, 227-8 and Pl. opp. 228.


"Notes on the Roman leaden seals found at Brough, South Shields and other places" PSANUT 2nd Series II, 25-26.

1886: "Richborough" in "Sandwich Meeting, 1885" AC XVI, lx-lxii.

"Discovery of Roman coins on Harndon Hill, Somerset" NC 3rd Series VI, 96.

1887: ["A hoard of Roman coins, found near Springhead"] in "Antiquarian news" Antiquary XVI, 127.
"Note on excavations at Richborough" AC XVIII, 5.

"Discovery of a hoard of Roman coins at Springhead" AC XVIII, 209-11.

"On the walls of Chester" in "[Account of a visit of the British Archaeological Association to Chester]" Chester Courant, 23 Aug.).

"Roman Chichester" JBAA XLIII, 13-20.

"[Note on the commemorative inscription at Greta Bridge, which some mistakenly call a milestone]" in "Antiquarian intelligence" JBAA XLIII, 298.

"Discovery of a hoard of Roman coins at Springhead, Kent" NC 3rd Series VII, 312-5.

1888: "On the Roman walls of Chester, and on the discoveries made in them" Antiquary XVII, 41-5 and 242-4.

"Roman work in Chester" in "Correspondence" Antiquary XVIII, 182-3.

"[Note on earthworks at Sawbridgeworth]" in "Proceedings of the Association" JBAA XLIV, 116.

"The walls of Chester" JBAA XLIV, No. 2, 129-34. [printed in advance, with short preface as 1887: On the Roman Walls of Chester (BAA). [8vo., pp. 11, Pls. 2]

"Pilgrim's route to Canterbury" Kentish Observer, 29 Dec. [republished - 1889: Gravesend and Dartford Reporter, 19 Jan.; also in Howell (1891) 33.]
"[On a sculpture from the Wall of Chester which proves it to be Roman]" in "Thursday, December 8th, 1887" PSAL 2nd Series 12, No. 1, 53-54.

1889: "The walls of Chester" Antiquary XIX, Feb., 41-44.

"British Archaeological Association, Lincoln Congress" Antiquary XX, Sep., 101-2.


"Roman castrum at Lymne" AC XVIII, 41-45.

"Roman coins found at Richborough; and now in the possession of Mr. Edward Gent of Sandwich" AC XVIII, 72-77.

"Lines" Gravesend and Dartford Reporter, 2 Mar. [reproduced in Howell (1891) 54-55.]

"The long ferry from London to Gravesend" Gravesend and Dartford Reporter, 25 May. [reproduced in Howell (1891) 98.]

"The borsholder" Gravesend and Dartford Reporter, 20 July. [reproduced in Howell (1891) 128.]

1890: "Notes on Roman antiquities at Lincoln during the Lincoln Congress" JBAA XLVI, No. 1, 53-57.

"Roman Chichester" in "Notes and queries" SAC XXXVII, 185.

Part C: Letters to Newspapers and Journals

1844: "The discovery of bones at Wrotham, To the Editor ..." MG, 2 Feb.

"[The tumuli in Greenwich Park]" T, 22 June, 8.

1844: "Church desecration [at Lenton]" T, 19 June.43

1845: "Do the citizens regard their antiquities" B III, No. XLVII, 29 Nov., 569-70.

"Do the citizens regard their antiquities" B III, No. CXLVIII, 6 Dec., 582-3.

"City antiquities. Mr. Tite v. Mr. Roach Smith" B III, No. CXLIX, 13 Dec., 593-6.

"City antiquities. Mr. Tite v. Mr. Roach Smith" B III, No. CLI, 27 Dec., 621.


"A London Antiquary" 1849: "To the Editor ..." T, 8 June.

1853: "[On a barrow at Coomb, Kent]" in "Quarterly meetings" Proceedings of the Bury and West Suffolk Archaeological Institute 1, 60.

1850: "[Note on a small brass coin of Carausius]" in "Miscellanea" NC XIII, 142.

43 Stated to be his work in Smith (1886) 181.
1851: "[Three British coins]" in PNS Session 1850-1, 15.


1854: "Roman antiquities of Colchester" in "Antiquarian researches" GM, Jan., 70-71. [reproduced from Essex Standard]


"The Anglo-Saxon antiquities of the Isle of Wight. To the Editor ..." HI, 29 Sep.

"The Anglo-Saxon antiquities of the Isle of Wight. To the Editor ..." HI, 13 Oct.


"Destruction of ancient works of art" T, 14 Sep., 7.


"Vandalism in France" T, 14 Oct., 8.


1862: "The want of small birds" T, 28 May, 6.

"Excavations at Wroxeter" T, 30 Sep., 9.
"The Excavations at Wroxeter" in "Correspondence of Sylvanus Urban" GM, Oct., 470.

"The Excavations at Wroxeter" in "Correspondence of Sylvanus Urban" GM, Nov., 598-601.

1866: "Small birds" T, 2 July, 11.


"The Lower memorial" in "Correspondence of Sylvanus Urban" GM, June, 787-8.

... in "Fruit growing" T, 11 Sep., 5.

"Scarcity of home-grown fruits" B XXV, No. 1288, 12 Oct., 753.

1869: "The Guildhall Library. To the Editor ..." CP, 5 June.

"Spurious antiquities. To the Editor ..." CP, 17 July.

"Progress of invention - fire places. To the Editor ..." The Student and Intellectual Observer ... III, 73.

1870: "The destruction of small birds. To the Editor ..." AW, 1 Apl., 126.

["On the Franco-Prussian war"] Vigil de Dieppe, c. Sep.-Oct. 44

["On the Franco-Prussian war"] Journal de Rouen, c. Sep.-Oct. 45

44 Reference cannot be checked as this newspaper unavailable in Britain.
45 Reference cannot be checked as this newspaper unavailable in Britain.
1871: "War v. humanity. To the Editor ..." AW, 1 Mar., 95.

"The Roman walls of Dax" B, 22 Aprl., 302.46

"Vandalism in France [at Dax]"

1872: "The destruction of small birds" AW, 1 May, 126.

in "Letters to the Editor. Protection to British birds" AW, 1 Aug., 189.

1873: "Our ancient national monuments" B XXXI, No. 1573, 29 Mar., 244.

1875-6: "Proposed monument to Josiah Wedgwood" in "Notes, queries, and gleanings" in B XVI, 63.


"An Islander" 1881: "The Roman villa at Brading" IOWA, 8 Jan.

"The Roman villa [at Morton]. To the Editor ..." IOWA, c. 17 Aug.48

"Archaeological societies" in "Correspondence" Antiquary IV, Aug., 83.

"Mr Albert Way" in "Correspondence" Antiquary IV, Oct., 183.

46 Stated to be Smith's work in THC III, CRS to TH, 19 Aprl. 1871.
47 Stated to be Smith's work in THC III, CRS to TH, 19 Aprl. 1871.
48 Reference proved impossible to check.
"Memoranda on Hamlet [in a letter to J.O. Phillipps]"
Notes and Queries, 2 Apl., 264.

1882: "Church monuments (V.275)" in "Correspondence"
Antiquary VI, July, 39.

"A Smallbird" 1882: "Caterpillars versus birds. To the Editor" MKJ 2 Dec. 49

1884: "Recent discoveries in Bevis Marks ...." T, 16 Aug.

1887: "[Letter to the Prince of Wales concerning] The Jubilee and the coinage" in "The antiquary's notebook"
Antiquary XV, May, 217-8. [republished with further remarks on the subject by Bruce, J.C. et al.: PSANUT 2nd Series III, 12-3.]

"The walls of Chester. To the Editor ..." Chester Courant, 24 Aug.

"The walls of Chester" B LIII, No. 2329, 4 Sep., 441.

"[The walls of Chester.] To the Editor ..." CC, 7 Sep.

"The walls of Chester. To the Editor ..." IOWA, 24 Sep.

in "The walls of Chester" B LIII, No. 2329, 24 Sep., 441.

"The walls of Chester. To the Editor ..." CC, 5 Oct.

in "The walls of Chester" B LIII, No. 2331, 8 Oct., 511.

49 Stated to be Smith's own work in a letter: LOA 96/22, CRS to JOH, 13 Dec. 1862.


1888: "Roman work in Chester" in "Correspondence" Antiquary XVIII, Oct., 182-3.

"[Sculpture removed from the wall of Chester]" in "Thursday, December 8th, 1887" PSAL 2nd Series XII, No. 1, 53-54.

1890: "Roman Chichester" in "Notes and queries" SAC XXXVI, 185.
Part D: Reviews

1840: ... of Donop, Baron de 1838: Description de la Trouvaille de l'Isle de Jersey (Hanover), in NC II, 140-3.50


1846: ... of Lee, J.E. 1845: Delineations of Roman Antiquities found at Caerleon ..., in "Notices of new publications" JBAA I, No. 4, 370-1.


... of Henslow, Revd J.S. 1846: On the Materials of Two Sepulcral Vessels found at Warden, Bedfordshire Pt. IV ... (Cambridge), in "Notices of new publications" JBAA II, No. 2, 213.


50 Stated by Smith to be his work (CRS:J3, 22 Sep. 1839).

1847: ... of Maitland, C. 1846: *The Church in the Catacombs* ... in "Notices of new publications" *JBAA* II, No. 4, 395-402.


1847 (for 1848): ... of de Longperier, A. 1846: "Notice sur une inscription Latine inédite" *MSRAF* XVIII, 262-7, in "Notices of new publications" *JBAA* III, No. 1, 75-76.

1847 (for 1848): ... of Neville, Hon. R.C. 1847: *Antiqua Explorata* ... (Saffron Walden) in *JBAA* III, No. 2, 173-9.


"Reprints of rare tracts, and imprints of ancient manuscripts, etc. chiefly illustrative of the history of the northern counties ...: from the press of M.A. Richardson, Newcastle-upon-Tyne", in "Notices of new publications" JBAA III, No. 2, 197-8.

1848: ... of Bateman, T. 1848: Vestiges of the Antiquities of Derbyshire ..., in "Notices of new publications" JBAA III, No. 4, 350-7.


... of Cole, J. 1847: The Real Romance of the Tombs at Great Addington, in the County of Northampton (Wellingborough), in "Notices of new publications" JBAA III, No. 4, 361.

1848 (for 1849): ... of 1848: Description of the Roman Theatre of Verulam ... (St. Alban's Architectural Society), in "Notices of new publications" JBAA IV, No. 2, 187-8.

1849: ... of Wakeman, W.F. 1848: Archaeologica Hibernica ..., in "Notices of new publications" JBAA IV, No. 4, 407-11.


... of Norfolk and Norwich Archaeological Society 1849: Norfolk Archaeology II, Pt. 2, in "Notices of publications" JBAA V, No. 4, 396-7.

"Lithographs of Romano-British tessellated pavements", in "Notices of new publications" JBAA V, No. 4, 401-2.

... of Gurney, H. 1847: Letter to Dawson Turner, Esq., on Norwich, and the Venta Icenorum (Norwich), in "Notices of new publications" JBAA V, No. 4, 402-4.

... of Filton, B. 1849: Déscription de la Villa et du Tombeau d'une Femme Artiste Gallo-Romaine, Découverts à Saint-Médart-des-Prés (Vendée) (Fontenay), in "Notices of new publications" JBAA V, No. 4, 404-5.

... of Hewett, W. 1849: Memoirs of Tobias Rustat, Esq., Yeoman of the Robes to King Charles II ..., in "Notices of new publications" JBAA V, No. 4, 417.


51 Stated to be his own work by Smith (1886, 151).
"Roman Pavement [from Autun, Exhibited at 11 Pall Mall East]", in "Notices of new publications" JBAA VI, No. 2, 161.


1853: "Layard's discoveries in Nineveh and Babylon" [- a review of Layard, A.H. 1853: Discoveries in the Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon] GM, June, 600-7.52


"Mr. Halliwell's folio edition of Shakespeare [- a review of J.O. Halliwell (Ed.), The Works of William Shakespeare Illustrated (1850-51)]", T, 19 May.54


1861-2: ... of Madden, F.W. 1861: The Handbook of Roman Numismatics, in GM, Aug., 137-8.56


52 Stated to be Smith's work in BLO:N, J.G. Nichols to CRS, 1 Jan. 1854.
53 Stated to be Smith's work in BLO:N, J.G. Nichols to CRS, 1 Jan. 1854.
54 Stated to be his own work by Smith (1891) 79.
56 Stated to be his own work by Smith (1891) 99.
57 Stated to be his own work by Smith (1891) 19-20.
Part E: Smith's Obituaries

Anon. 1890: in "Notes of the Month" ANT XXII, Aug., 94-5.


Anon. 1890: "The Late Mr. Roach Smith" ILN XCVII, 30 Aug., 261-2.

Anon. 1890: "Death of Mr. Roach Smith, F.S.A." Isle of Wight County Press, 9 Aug.

Anon. 1890: "Obituary" T, 14 Aug.


Evans, J. 1890: in "June 18, 1891. Anniversary Meeting" PNS Session 1890-1, 18-31.


Reed, W.J. 1890: "[Poem] In Memory of the Late Charles Roach Smith" CN, 16 Aug.
APPENDIX 2: Manuscript Collections Containing Items Relating to C.R. Smith

Part a: Catalogue of collections

Introduction

Information concerning potential sources was obtained from the following:

- English museums not in Devon or Cornwall established before 1880 which contain significant archaeological collections.
- Large museums containing important archaeological collections which have been established since this date;
- Descendants of Smith's relatives;
- Private book collectors interested in Smith;
- Institutions stated to hold holdings collections relating to Smith's antiquarian contemporaries, in the indexes of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts (for U.K. collections), and in published catalogues of foreign libraries on open shelves in the British Library and National Library of Scotland.
- Recognised centres for the preservation of English historical manuscripts, notably the principal County Record Offices in England (excluding Devon and Cornwall), and other potential sources listed by Foster and Sheppard (1982) and Hamer (1961).
- Relevant diaries, listed by Batts (1976) and Mathews (1950).
- References cited in footnotes of articles/papers on the history of archaeology;
- References known to others working on the history of archaeology in the 19th century.

The format of the catalogue entries is as follows:
1. Institution and title of collection. A contrived title is used if the item lacks one.
2. Accession number and known history of collection.

Remainder of entry: Summary of the information contained within the collection, mentioning site and place-names, names of antiquarians, and items of special interest.

Abbreviations have been used for the names of certain societies and publications, details of which may be found in the list of References. Apart from the use of "CRS" or "Smith" for C. Roach Smith, the names of antiquarians and places are given in full. Place names are only accompanied by a county name where there is likely to be confusion. For locations, see the index to any recent AA Road Atlas.

---

CANADA

Toronto - The Metropolitan Toronto Library: Sir Daniel Wilson Scrapbooks Vol. 1

Reg. No. 565; page nos. 22, 163, 178, 179, 186. Originally from Wilson's library. Purchased from his daughter Sybil in 1897.

Contains five letters from CRS to Wilson, 1849-51. They concern Roman archaeological finds, antiquarian meetings and excursions, the progress of publications, a request that Wilson should buy a book by Croker, and thanks for a donation to Smith's Lympne excavations. Of greater interest are Smith's misgivings about the new Scottish law of treasure trove.

---

DENMARK

Copenhagen - Det Kongelige Bibliotek: Miscellaneous Antiquarian Correspondence

Ref. 1599, 2° 2f.
A large collection of letters, arranged chronologically but uncatalogued. Includes a draft letter from C.C. Rafn to Smith, 1856, and two from CRS to Worsaae, May 1852. These concern a gift to the RSNA of the plaster cast of a Bronze Age spear mould from a barrow near Blandford. Comparable moulds came from near Chudleigh, in J. Croker's collection. C. Croker had a similar spear from Tipperary. CRS tells of a second Roman villa near Hartlip, his financial problems, and opposition to reducing subscriptions to the SAL.

Copenhagen - National Museum, Archive of Det Kongelige Nordiske Oldskrifsselskabs: Letters from CRS


Two prospectuses for Inventorium, another for CA III, with three letters from CRS to C.C. Rafn, 1855-9. The earliest proposes J. Mayer as a member of the RSNA and seeks the King of Denmark's patronage for Inventorium. Those of 1857-9 concern the exchange of publications, and a request that books for the SAL should no longer be sent via himself.

Copenhagen - National Museum: Letters from CRS to J.J.A. Worsaae

Archives of Second Department (2 Afd). Correspondence of J.J.A. Worsaae, who ran the National Museum from 1866-85.

Seventy-two letters from CRS to Worsaae. All but two date from between the start of Worsaae's first British tour, 1846, and Smith's retirement, 1856. They comprise an introduction for W.A. Coates, 1879, and a request for a history of Worsaae's mission to England for his Retrospections, 1893.

The letters written during Worsaae's tours include recommendations to visit sites and collectors in Britain, Ireland and France. CRS was irritated when Worsaae repeatedly ignored his advice to visit T. Bateman. Mutual acquaintances mentioned include C.J. Thomsen, who visited CRS in 1852, and F.C. Lukis.

The early letters mostly concern gifts via CRS to Worsaae of publications and antiquities, and the loan of antiquarian drawings. Among the gifts which CRS received in return were a collection of "celts", Oct. 1849. The men's mutual interests lay primarily in Dark Age antiquities: Saxon burials, brooches, chatelaines and runes. CRS often sought Worsaae's opinion on such matters, also
on treasure trove legislation, July 1850. Plans for publications and their progress are outlined, but Worsaae did not accede to Smith's requests to write articles for English antiquarian journals. Mention is made of Smith's antiquarian travels to Tréves and York, 1846, Germany, 1850, Hameldun and Hod Hill, Mar. 1851, France, 1853 iand 1854, his excavations at Lympne, 1850, and Pevensey, 1852, the discovery of Roman sculptures at Tower Hill, London, Aug. 1852, and his ideas concerning a supposed Saxon Shore Fort at Bramber, Dec. 1852. Also of interest are Smith's unsympathetic remarks about attempts to prove that the Itinerary of Richard of Cirencester was forged, 1849.

The progress of the BAA, AI and SALL, and their constant disputes one with another receive full coverage. There are interesting details of BAA and AI congresses, the AI's bid for a Royal Charter, Oct. 1849-Jan. 1850, the BAA's use of the LG as a medium of communication, and the SAL's revival, which, according to Smith, was unlikely to be assisted by halving the subscription. Through Worsaae, CRS became a corresponding member of the RSNA, 1850. In May 1852, CRS successfully nominated the King of Denmark as an FSA; there are copies of two letters from CRS to Lord Mahon on this subject. CRS later asked Worsaae to persuade the King to subscribe to Inventorium.

Efforts to form a museum of British national antiquities are mentioned, as is the 1847-50 Parliamentary Commission on the BM. Among remarks about the BM's refusal to purchase the Faussett collection, we learn that CRS tried to gain permission to publish the collection prior to Dr. Faussett's death in 1853.

Worsaae was sympathetic to Smith's frustration at class prejudice in British archaeology, concerning which CRS tells numerous anecdotes, and about the use of archaeology as an excuse for socialising (e.g. the SAL's centenary dinner). CRS also expressed his disgust at Denmark's war with Schleswig-Holstein, 1850, and the Crimean war, 1854.

There are letters to CRS from various antiquarians, namely The letters illustrate Smith's depressing circumstances as his business began to falter. In February 1850 he confessed a presentiment of serious illness, and by August was planning to retire to the "coast of France". Smith's poverty prevented antiquarian trips to Germany, 1851, the South of France, 1853, and excavations at Bramber, March 1853. It also frustrated the publication of CA and other works. The SAL refused to help by paying for illustrations. By November 1854 CRS had decided to sell his collection, after which this issue predominates. There are details of the collection's valuation and Smith's financial expectations after retiring, Apl. 1855.

F. Baigent, 1848, F.W. Fairholt, 18446, T. Wright, n.d., and J.G. Waller, 1848. The latter asked if Worsaae could provide information on brasses in Scandinavia, and probably received a reply as his
letter bears notes in Worsaae's hand. With them are prospectuses for some of Smith's publications and his excavations at Pevensey.

Copenhagen - Universitetsbibliotekets: J.J.A. Worsaae
Alterthumskunde des Nordens (Leipzig 1847)

B, 510/10-4. Lot 284 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by F. Hendriks. Lot 533 in the sale of Hendriks' library. Date and source of acquisition by Copenhagen University not recorded.

Contains twelve plates and two letters, one from Worsaae to CRS, dated 2 Oct. 1846 - during Worsaae's visit to Aberdeen. It describes his tour in Scotland, and refuses Smith's request of an account for the BAA due to lack of time.

FRANCE

Abbeville (Somme) - Bibliotheque Municipale d'Abbeville:
Letters from CRS to J. Boucher de Perthes, 1850-66.

MS.682 D11. Among a larger collection of letters by 137 writers to Boucher de Perthes and his father Boucher de Crevecoeur. Donated by the family.

The 26 letters from CRS deal primarily with the circulation of publications and antiquities and, on one occasion, of engravings of Smith. Customs duties on books were heavy, but in 1851 CRS persuaded the Treasury to waive the tax on books for the NS.

Other letters give news of Smith's excavations at Lympne, his preparations for publications, also his antiquarian excursions to Germany, 1850, to Jublains, and to Abbeville in de Perthes' absence, 1853. In 1857, CRS wrote introducing Councillor Thompson of Copenhagen. He also promoted de Perthes to English antiquarians, for example by arranging his election to the HSLC. In return, de Perthes sent antiquities, including pilgrim badges, 1850 and 1851, and a francisca, 1852. In 1866, CRS requested some antiquities from the Somme for the Blackmore museum, Salisbury.

Rouen (Seine-Maritime) - Musee Departamental des Antiquites:
C.R. Smith Collectanea Antiqua I (1848) with letters inserted from CRS
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Aberystwyth - National Library of Wales, Department of Manuscripts and Records: Manuscript notebook in C.R. Smith's(?) hand, entitled "Numismatica"

NLW MSS. 5117B. Stated to be Smith's work in the library catalogue, but with no means of identification other than the handwriting. This could be Smith's although this is not certain. Perhaps part of Lots 151 or 311 in Smith's library sale, which were purchased by Nattali and B. Quaritch, respectively. Later in collection of F.W. Bourdillon (1851-1921), which was purchased from his executors by the National Library in 1922.

Notebook, modern binding, blue writing paper, 211x170 mm, c. 100 pages, containing the draft of a dictionary of coins for the letters M-O. This is probably something to do with Stevenson, Smith and Madden's Dictionary of Roman Coins ... (1889), of which CRS edited letters L-T. If this is an early draft of Smith's section, the text is remarkably dissimilar to the published version.
Aberystwyth - National Library of Wales, Department of Manuscripts and Records: Miscellaneous archaeological notes, printed extracts, and correspondence compiled by CRS.

NLW MSS. 51180. Probably Lot 311 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by B. Quaritch, bookseller of London. Later in collection of F.W. Bourdillon (1851-1921), which was purchased from his executors by the National Library in 1922.

A substantial file of papers, from 1847-86. The majority comprise miscellaneous notes, sketches and tracings (mostly in Smith's hand) from publications and other sources. They concern Roman fleets, Roman leaden coffins, the names of Roman towns, the Roman cemetery at Jordan Hill, Weymouth, a Roman pillar from Wroxeter, coins, medieval seals, tiles, pottery, castles, and genealogy. There is a wax impression of an intaglio in a "gold signet ring" from Housesteads. These are accompanied by newspaper clippings, proofs of articles and illustrations, and extracts from journals concerning archaeological discoveries, antiquarian affairs, and a review of CA.

Numerous items relate to Roman inscriptions. These take the form of clippings from newspapers and journals, proofs of articles and illustrations, rubbings and sketches of readings, some accompanied by requests for readings, from correspondents such as E. Acton, F.W. Baigent, W.C. Capputhwaite, Mr Davis, and Mr Fairless. They are accompanied by notes (mostly by CRS) from publications including Cicero, Lysons, Gruter, Gough's Camden, Walpole's Anecdotes etc. Samian is another popular topic, with a letter on the subject from E. Acton, together with proofs of illustrations, ink sketches of published samian, and lists of potters' stamps.

There are original ink plans and crude pencil sketches of Roman structures excavated by CRS at Lympne, with notes on the derivation of the name. Other unpublished data includes a list by D. Wilson of Roman finds from Castlecary, 1840.

Of greater importance is a series of sketches by H. Hodge, on 21 sheets of thin note paper, most subsequently mounted on cartridge paper, of Roman sculptured stones from the "Castle Street Bastion" of London Wall, 1884. They are the fullest surviving account of these discoveries, and are accompanied by a page of rough pencil notes, and eight foolscap pages in fair-copy, of descriptive notes and a catalogue, also by Hodge. Two other sketches by Hodge(?) depict an unnamed castle.

The remaining letters are from E.S. Bass, A.H. Burkitt, G.R. Corner, J.B. Deane, W.H. Gomonde (3), G.J. Karney, J. Smart, T. Lott, W.F. Wakeman, J. Warren, A. Way and W.M. Wylie. They concern Wylie's visit to France, antiquarian information, preparations for publications, news of antiquarian friends, apologies for non-attendance at BAA meetings and cover-notes for subscriptions and publications. A
printed letter of July 1884, invites CRS to a lecture on the History and Antiquities of Rochester Cathedral by W.H. St. John Hope. Of particular interest are letters from J. Elliott (2), about the accounts for the Lympne excavations, from R.C. Jenkins about discoveries at Lyminge, with a plan of the rectory, 1855, and from M. Duprés (in French) which hints at the respect for CRS in France.

There are also some manuscript drafts of articles, with illustrations, by W. Bowman on a barrow at Driffield, on Ancient British Coins (unsigned), by W.H. Gomonde on Roman and later antiquities of Belgium and "Excavations and discoveries in Rome during the last few years". These are accompanied by a draft review by CRS of the Museum of Classical Antiquities and Akerman's Remains of Pagan Saxondom (1855).

---

Aberystwyth - National Library of Wales, Department of Manuscripts and Records: C.R. Smith, Manuscript Notebook - "Notes. 1839 to 1842"

NLW Mss. 5119B. Either from Lots 151 or 311 in Smith's library sale, which were purchased by Wattali and B. Quaritch, respectively. Later in collection of F.W. Bourdillon (see above).

Manuscript notebook, 194x161 mm, pp. 258, paginated to p. 111. Bound in white vellum in uniform with Vols. I-VI of Smith's manuscript journals in the BM. Contains miscellaneous antiquarian notes and mounted clippings. Many are dated and were evidently entered in chronological order, and mostly by place-name. The latest date from 1852.

The book begins with notes on a lecture on the Bramdean villa by Revd W. Bignall to Portsmouth Philosophical Society, 29 Nov. 1838, with another on "Dorchester" from an article in I.

The remainder comprises antiquarian notes and clippings (mostly from I). They reveal Smith's appetite for antiquarian information, no piece of news being allowed to pass unrecorded, be it a rumour of a discovery, a newspaper report, the name of someone with a collection of coins or antiquities or knowledgeable in "antiquarian lore". Many of the collections and collectors noted were visited within weeks of the relevant entry. Most of the sites mentioned are in south-east England. There is little about London finds, which seem instead to have been recorded in the journals.

A large part of the volume comprises notes and sketches made by CRS on visits to antiquarian collections, and of items shown or loaned to him by antiquarians, including transcripts of their
notes. Most of the entries concern coins, other artifacts being of secondary interest, with buildings, burials and topographical features in third place.

The coin notes concern: British, from Winchester in W.B. Bradfield's collection; moulds found by E.T. Artis at Caistor; Roman, from Alford, Lincs.; Roman, from the Great Western Railway between Bath and Bristol; Roman, from Felixstowe, procured by W.S. Fitch and bought by Major E. Sheppard; Roman, from Holbrook, Suffolk; Roman, from near Kits Coty House, in possession of T. Charles; silver Roman from Taunton, in possession of R.W. Lee and Mr Blake; William I pennies from Gravesend, in possession of Captain Fox, 1841; hoard of nobles from Westminster; penny from Winchester reported by Mr Drew, 1840; miscellaneous from Alfriston; from Ancaster; from Beauworth; from Charnwood Forest; from Chesil Beach, near Portland, Feb. 1840; from Essex; from Hartlip, reported by H. Wickham; in J. Lister's possession; from the French Protestant Church Site, London, in Mr Moxhay's possession; from Pevensey; and a hoard of 2000 gold coins from Thwaite, Suffolk.

Of particular interest are details of coins and other finds from the Strood cemetery site, in the possession of W.J. Charlton, S. Steele and H. Wickham, which formed the basis for two of Smith's earliest non-London papers.

Other sketches and information concern antiquities: a 'Saxon' tombstone from Andover; Mr Bridger's collection; finds from Maidstone and Rochester; a fibula from near Dover; another found in 1826 between Milton and Sittingbourne, Kent, owned by W. Bland; purse-frames owned by J. Clarke, 1842; bone ornaments from caves near Settle, North Yorks. (18 sketches); stone mouldings from St. Saviour's church, Southwark, 1839; Roman and medieval antiquities, including a lead bulla, from London, some in the collection of Mr Purdue; a seal from Winchester sent by Mr Bradford; pottery and a coin from Richborough; a spearhead from Springhead; and a stone coffin from Stratford, London. Accusations that Revd T. Horsfield of Cirencester forged antiquities are detailed. There is information about the following archaeological sites: Roman remains at Farley Heath, near Guildford; Roman pavements at Leicester; Roman pavement in Mersey, Essex; Roman villa at Watham excavated by Revd W. Money.

There is a ten-page transcript entitled "Extract from the Museum Book of Mr Thoresby (begun AD 1696), in possession of Mr Upcott". As well as containing records of presents, Thoresby had used this as an autograph book for eminent men who had visited the museum.

Aberystwyth - National Library of Wales, Department of Manuscripts and Records: C.R. Smith, Manuscript Notebook entitled "Notes Archaeological [1854]"

NLW Mss. 5123C. From Lot 151 or Lot 311 in Smith's library sale (see previous entry). Later in library of T.N. Brushfield; purchased by NLW from the executors of F.W. Bourdillon.

Manuscript notebook, with marbled card cover and green leather quarter-binding. Blue pages, 232 x 189 mm, pp. 182, paginated to p. 139, with end index. Used for miscellaneous archaeological notes arranged under subject headings, with space under each heading for further material. By contrast with earlier note-books, the notes consist primarily of bibliographical references, many to continental publications. There are also quotations from classical and medieval writers, descriptions and sketches of objects owned by various collectors, and occasional clippings.

The subjects include a torque, Caesar's invasion of Britain, Roman legions, castra, the Boulogue pharos, French and Italian antiquities, inscriptions (from Britain and abroad), the Notitia, the dea matres, representations of Mithras, tessellated pavements, coins and medals, Roman potteries, pottery and potters' names, leaden coffins, sandals, phallic objects, glass vessels, miscellaneous Roman finds, Frankish and Merovingian antiquities, Saxon and medieval pottery, place-names, medieval seals, costume, pilgrim signs, superstitions, notes on finds at various sites (including Bagber Farm, Fairlop, Othona, Strood, and Tunor-bury), and miscellaneous items, e.g. the transcript of a folk-song from the Weald. The largest category of information concerns horticulture and historical evidence for English vineyards - the basis of subsequent articles (Smith 1862a; 1862d; 1864b; 1868c).

Of particular interest are lists of "Roman Remains to be visited", wherein CRS usually stated the source of his information (mostly fellow antiquarians or reports in books, journals and newspapers), persons to name in order to gain access and details of his proposed routes. Also of interest are rubbings of panels of the "Copper Anglo-Saxon bowl, found at Lullingston, Kent". The volume ends with the transcript of a letter from CRS to W. Gladstone, which accompanied a copy of Smith's "On the Scarcity of Home Grown Fruits", and urged Gladstone to adopt the idea of fruit growing by railways.

Loose between the pages are clippings about various antiquities, proofs of illustrations, miscellaneous sketches and manuscript notes, some by CRS, some sent to him by F.W. Fairholt, Major W. Yorke Moore, H.E. Smith, and A. Way. There are four sheets bearing large, ink-sketched elevations by CRS of one inner and three outer walls of the church of St. Peter-on-the-walls, Othona. There is an unsigned five-page draft of an article "Saffron Walden, Essex. Discovery of a Saxon burial-ground.
also several letters to CRS, 1844-81, from R.P. Coates, I.M. Larking, W. Yorke Moore, F.K. Robinson, W.A. Scott-Robertson, W.M. Wylie (3), unsigned/illegible (2). These concern the interpretation of antiquities, especially inscriptions, and preparations for publications, together with snips of personal news. A letter from R.C. Jenkins describes his excavations at Lyminge, and another from T. Rivers gives his views on the practicality of Smith's idea about growing fruit by railway lines. A letter from CRS to T.W. Brushfield, 1889, concerns the walls of Chester affair.

Aberystwyth - National Library of Wales, Department of Manuscripts and Records: C.R. Smith, Sketch-book entitled "Chesters, Rochester, Housesteads, & Birdoswald. August, 1853"

NLW Mss. Part 5126B. From Lot 151 or Lot 311 in Smith's library sale (see above). Later in library of F.W. Bourdillon, and purchased by the library from his executors.

Slim artist's sketch book, 196 x 235 mm, containing mostly inked-over pencil sketches. They include four perspective views of structures excavated at Chesters and Amboglana, 1853; a Roman sculpture from Wycomb, Gloucestershire; a pencil sketch of "Roman Lime Kiln at Hucknell Hill, Chedworth, co. Gloucester, Aug. 7 1865"; and two more of "St. Peter's in the Wall, Bradwell, Essex, Sept 1865."

Aberystwyth - National Library of Wales, Department of Manuscripts and Records: C.R. Smith, Sketch-book entitled "Embleton [Cumberland, 1854]"

NLW MSS. Part 5126B. History as for above item.

Slim artist's sketch-book, 170 x 257 mm, containing generally rough pencil sketches made during the latter part of Smith's 1854 North of England tour (see Smith 1855b; 1857b, 220). The sketches depict a mosaic (1); views (2); the Embleton sword (with details) and a sculptured stone from Old Carlisle (later engraved: op. cit. 154), both in Keswick Museum; the Saxon urn with a Roman inscription owned by Joseph Mayer (with detail), views of "Kenfield or Kenville", Juliberrie's Grave, 1855, and various unlabelled antiquities.
Aberystwyth - National Library of Wales, Department of Manuscripts and Records: C.R. Smith, Sketch-book dated "1867"

NLW Part Mss. 5126B. History as for above item.

Slim artist's sketch-book, 178 x 270 mm. Contains four pencil sketches, mostly inked-over, of Champlieu including the theatre; three of Mont Berny, near Pierrefonds, two of Ampney Crucis, and four rough, inked-over sketches of scenes on Roman funerary monuments. Most were later published (Smith 1878). Additional pencil sketches depict a "Saxon"(??) tomb-stone from Whitchurch, Hants., and an unlabelled Roman building. They show that CRS found great difficulty with this sort of illustration.

Aberystwyth - National Library of Wales, Department of Manuscripts and Records: C.R. Smith, Two Sketch-books entitled "France 1876"

Part NLW Mss. 5126B. History as for above item.

Two artist's sketch books in dark brown paper covers. The larger (258 x 188 mm) includes pencil sketches of "Porte de St Helena", masonry captioned "Chateau Barrin", "Tour de Vaison from Railway Bridge", a Roman sculptured stone depicting tax collectors from "Narbonne", the postern gate at Arles, funerary monuments from Sens, and unlabelled sketches of Roman antiquities.

The smaller book (129 x 188 mm) includes an inked-over pencil sketch of a Roman funerary monument to a shoemaker(?) in Bourges museum; sketches of carvings on a "Semi-circular Colm. 3 heads, Museum of Perigeaux. Sept. 5th, 1876"; an inked-over pencil drawing of "Hercules and Achelons. Found at Martres-Tolosanes"; rough sketches of stonework in Toulouse Museum and "The city wall by Tour Magna"; a tomb-stone from Nismes; an inked-over pencil sketch showing two bastions entitled "The Walls nr. the Gymnasion. Arles. Sept 15, 1876"; figures on Roman tombstones in "Arles Museum"; four sketches of "Pont du Gard" as published (Smith 1878b, Pl. X); and inscribed stones in "Boulogne Museum. Copied Sept. 25th, 1876". At the back of the book, a note in Smith's hand summarises the tour.

Aberystwyth - National Library of Wales, Department of Manuscripts and Records: "Collectanea de rebus celticis" by Sir Samuel R. Meyrick (1783-1848)
An undated letter from CRS to Sir Samuel seeks help in interpreting a Celtic word on an inscription.

Aberystwyth - National Library of Wales, Department of Manuscripts and Records: Autograph letters collected by Henry Taylor of Chester (1847-1927)

NLW MSS.6270E, (ff. 139-44). Given to the Library at various times by the collector.

Includes three letters from CRS to H. Taylor, 1888, concerning developments in the walls of Chester affair.

Aberystwyth - National Library of Wales, Department of Manuscripts and Records: "Cambrian Archaeological Association, Letterbook, 1846-8"

Cambrian Archaeological Association Papers. L.1, f. 11v.

Includes one letter from CRS to Revd H.L. Jones about the date of the forthcoming BAA congress, 1847.

Adgestone, near Brading, Isle of Wight - Family heirlooms owned by J. Smith of Grove Farm

These include a tinted photograph of Maria Smith, a silhouette water-colour of Captain H. Smith, by J.H. Jolliffe (1824-80), and an embroidered portrait of a lady "worked by Mary Jolliffe Smith of Landguard, 1815 about". The labels on the back are in Smith's hand. A carved oak chest is said to have been used by CRS.

Bebington - Central Library: "Joseph Mayer Papers"
Ref. CUB 920. Some of the papers which escaped the sale of Mayer's manuscript collections in 1887. Most were sent to the Liverpool Central Library in 1972; the remaining items may have been retained for exhibition.

The papers comprise general correspondence and materials relating to the Mayer family, including ephemera, sales catalogues, newspaper clippings and miscellaneous correspondence. The latter includes letters from CRS to J. Mayer, 1873 and 1881, and to CRS from Charles Dickens, 1859, and J. Clarke, 1881. CRS is mentioned in letters to Mayer from T.J. Pettigrew, 1849, the Royal Cabinet of Coins in Copenhagen, 1856, and J. Clarke, 1857. The only important item is a letter from T.G. Faussett to J. Mayer, dated 5 Aug. 1854, which provides a biography of Revd B. Faussett.

Bebington - Central Library: Joseph Mayer's "Autographs" book, 1843-85

Presumably among papers which escaped the sale of Mayer's manuscripts in 1887 (see above).

Bound quarto volume, plain paper, in which Mayer collected autographs, some cut and pasted from another book, embellished with letters, prints, portraits, and sketches. The spaces left for portraits were often never filled. There are autographs of several of Smith's associates, notably, F.W. Fairholt (ff. 21, 46 and 56), A.W. Franks (ff. 59 and 77), T. Wright (f. 60), and Eliza Meteyard (ff. 63, 81-89). An entry for 2 Aug. 1849, contains signatures of leading BAA members made during the Liverpool soirée. There are two etchings of J. Clarke (ff. 58 and 80), one of Fairholt (f. 56), and pencil sketches of CRS and Eliza Meteyard by Virginia Fontana (ff. 57 and 81 resp.). Both Miss Meteyard and CRS provided auto-biographies (ff. 81-9 and 90-2, resp.). Smith's was written in 1877, and includes information not recorded elsewhere. He made two other entries, explaining the circumstances of visits in 1853 and 1883 (ff. 57, 149-50). A letter from CRS to Mayer followed his visit in 1883 (f. 150).

Cambridge - FitzWilliam Museum, Department of Manuscripts and Printed Books: Two letters to CRS

From De le Beche, 1844; Lieut. Waghorn, 1844.

[Visit considered unjustified]
Cambridge - Trinity College: Letters of Dawson Turner 1775-1858

The 82 vols. of correspondence contain 31 letters from CRS dated Feb. 1844 to Oct. 1845 (T. Hobbs, pers. comm.).

(Not examined because of lack of time, and because collection likely to be similar to a larger collection of Smith's correspondence with Dawson Turner in Norfolk Country Record Office, Norwich (see below).

Cambridge University Library, Department of Manuscripts:
Two letters from CRS to O.C. Pell.

MS Add. 6462/1/15 and 17

These concern finds of Greek coins in England, both dated 1889 (pers. comm. A.E.B. Owen).

[Visit not justified in view of date and likely inconsequential nature]

Cambridge - University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology: Neville Collection.

Ref. G02/4/1

Contains plans reputedly made by CRS and a letter from him about British coins found at Chesterford (pers. comm. D.W. Phillipson)

Canterbury - Royal Museum: Two letters by CRS

[The late Dr. Frank Jenkins informed the writer of their existence, but the museum staff were unable to trace them.]

Chatham - County Library: Collection of letters by Thomas Fletcher Waghorn
Mentioned in a letter from CRS, where he describes it as:

"a lot of some 200 letters relating to Waghorn, addressed to me! For security this collection was placed with the late Mr Joseph Mayerll I have written to the Triumvirate of Chatham to secure this for that town."\(^{61}\)

Perhaps the same as Lot 192 in Mayer's sale of autograph letters, which comprised correspondence relating to the striking of a medal of the "Pacha of Egypt", and was purchased by Barker for 18s.

[The Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts records that the collection is held at Chatham, but the librarian there states that the collection is unavailable for study for reasons which he cannot divulge.]

Chelmsford and Essex Museum: Copy of letter from CRS to T.C. Neale, April 1850

Among Museum correspondence.

Sent from T.C. Neale to G. Meggy, suggesting that he review Smith's CA. A cover note(?) for a copy of CA.

Chester - Grosvenor Museum: "Accession Book"

A letter from CRS, dated 3 Apri. 1856, has been tipped in. It concerns a lead stamp (CIL VII, No. 1268), which he suspects may be forged (pers. comm., Dr. G. Lloyd-Morgan).

Chichester - West Sussex Record Office: Two letters from CRS to the Duke of Richmond, 1832-3

Goodwood MSS. 1459 f.612; 1469 f.36

Request advice re. Lieutenant de Grassi's attempts to sell his commission.

61 SAL, part MS. 857: Ephemera relating to CRS and others antiquarians, CRS to Anon., 29 Jan. 1889.
Colchester and Essex Museum: Wire Collection - "Autographs No. 1"


Collection of c. 296 letters, primarily 1842-53 and to W. Wire, pasted in 462-page, leather-bound volume. Arranged alphabetically by name of writer, then chronologically, with page indexes by writer at back and front. Some engraved portraits, newspaper clippings, antiquarian notes, etc. also included.

[The above description arises from a brief perusal of the volume which I made in 1985. At this stage, it was housed in the muniments room in Hollytree House. In 1992, when I returned to make a more detailed examination, the item could not be found, despite an extensive search. It appears to have been mislaid immediately after my former visit, as unlike the rest of the Wire collection, it was evidently not transferred to Essex Record Office.]

Colchester and Essex Museum: Wire Collection - "Mr C.R. Smith's Letters"

Unaccessioned. History as for preceding item.

192 letters from CRS to Wire, dated Oct. 1841 to Feb. 1855, mounted in chronological order in a homemade book with a parchment cover.

[The above description arises from a brief perusal of the volume which I made in 1985. At this stage, it was housed in the muniments room in Hollytree House. In 1992, when I returned to make a more detailed examination, the item could not be found, despite an extensive search. It appears to have been mislaid immediately after my former visit, as unlike the rest of the Wire collection, it was evidently not transferred to Essex Record Office.]

Colchester and Essex Museum: Packet of "C. Roach Smith's Letters to Wm. Wire"

Unaccessioned. History as for preceding item.
Blue envelope, containing 49 letters to Wire from C.R. Smith. They date from 1843-55, although all but five were written between 1850 and 1853.

Smith’s relationship to Wire was evidently that of master to apprentice. Wire’s letters were often lacking in content, and Smith’s replies are sometimes impatient. For instance, in 1851, having returned from a visit to Mr. Fitch of Ipswich, Smith received an irritated letter from Wire who was disappointed when he did not call. Smith replied that he could not be tied down, ticking Wire off for his querulous tone which caused him to "feel so disappointed with almost every body". The friendship survived, and the following year Smith did Wire a service when his two youngest sons arrived penniless at Liverpool Street, having walked from Colchester with the intention of going to sea. Smith gave them a bed, ensured that they returned home, and subsequently advised Wire on how to treat them.

In 1844, Smith wrote Wire a testimonial stating that he was capable of curating a museum. Wire nevertheless revealed serious academic shortcomings by a paper which he wrote in 1851, which argued (correctly) that the walls of Colchester were 1st century, but based on spurious comparisons with other town walls. Wire also doubted that Colchester was Camulodunum, in response to which, Smith advised him to study the itineraries, remarking that remains of Cunobelin’s time would look the same as Roman.

There is much about antiquities and coins, and the loan of Wire’s antiquities for exhibition in London. The latter probably accounts for a wax impression of a coin of Carausius, and also an intaglio depicting a cherub watering a vine(?), although this could have sealed a letter. In 1844, Smith had to tell Wire that one of his coins had apparently been stolen while being exhibited to the NS.

Wire nevertheless remained keen to loan items - to gain Smith’s help in identifying them and to facilitate their sale - although their quality was often poor. From a letter of 1852, Smith was possibly seeking items for Mayer. He also bought a few items himself. In 1852 Wire sought his help in selling a volume of his manuscript notes. Wire’s interest in antiquities was nevertheless serious, since he asked to be kept informed about Colchester finds purchased by Edwards, and others, with which Smith complied. Among the Colchester antiquities mentioned by Smith are four intaglios and samian stamps purchased by E.B. Price.

As well as seeking information on coins and antiquities for BAA and NS meetings, Smith wanted it for his "Colchester portfolio", which by 1852 held enough for a published volume. In 1851, he sought information on large nails in Roman burials and an inscription on a Roman altar beginning
NVMNIB.AVG., which Wire noted was in the castle. Smith also wished to see some urns belonging to Mrs. Thorney, which Parker and the BM had pronounced forgeries, 1850. In return for Wire's help, Smith offered to obtain sponsors for various antiquarian causes which Wire supported, paid some of his expenses, and made gifts of publications, antiquities, and other items, including a portrait of Singleton. The men also helped each other by exchanging publications, and by helping to gain subscribers for published works, including Smith's Collectanea.

Smith kept Wire au fait with news of antiquarian societies and his own antiquarian activities. The topics include Dunkin's indiscretion in dedicating the Worcester congress proceedings to him (a proof was enclosed), foreign visitors to his museum, an invitation to excavate a supposed Roman temple at Godmandingham, and the jealousy roused by his Mount Bures article, all 1851, his excavations at Pevensey, his loss in publishing the Lympne report and mounting financial difficulties, and his lack of interest in tokens, 1852.

Other topics mentioned are the nature of names scratched on Romano-British tiles, burnt samian, an inscribed stone from Harwich, 1853, the need for someone to raise a subscription to excavate Colchester, Rev. H. Jenkin's paper on Colchester castle, and Mr. Vint's bequest. Antiquarian societies are mentioned in connection with the formation of the Essex Archaeological Society, 1850, (which roused Smith to give his views of societies), Lumley's purchase of back issues of Archaeologia, and a visit to Colchester by the "Ipswich savans", a proposed visit to Smith from J. Brown, all 1851, and improvements to Wire's shop, 1855.

---

**Colchester - Essex Record Office, Colchester and north-east Essex Branch: Journals of William Wire**


Wire's manuscript journals from 1842-57. The first part from 1842-5 is written on plain, light-blue foolscap sheets, stitched along the folds, and is without cover or title page. The remainder is contained in a small quarto, green leather-bound volume. The Colchester and Essex Museum possesses two transcripts of the journals, typed on quarto paper and bound in green buckram.

Contains records of visits to sites in search of antiquities (particularly new railway cuttings), with details of local discoveries, antiquarian excursions including visits to other collectors, antiquarian visitors, purchases, etc., interspersed with personal and local news.
Wire's main inspiration in antiquarian matters was probably CRS, although Profs. Henslow and Buckland, and J. Britton also knew and visited him. Wire records an antiquarian visit by CRS in August 1842, correspondence with CRS about purveyors of forged coins including one named Hunt Temple, Dec. 1842 and Oct. 1843, an offer from CRS to exhibit finds to the SAL, 1843, the early days of the BAA, during which Wire was elected as local correspondent, 1844, an antiquarian visit to London in August 1844, which included breakfast with Smith, and early meetings of the Essex Archaeological Society.

The diary reveals Wire as a somewhat pathetic character, with a tendency to feel depressed and sorry for himself, and a chip on his shoulder about his lack of education, and which caused him to feel resentment towards other antiquarians and to take offence and fall out with them.

---

**Colchester - Essex Record Office, Colchester and North-East Essex Branch: Wire Collection - Bundle of Manuscript Letter-Books, 1843-50**

Unaccessioned. History as for preceding item.

Bundle of notebooks containing contain drafts and copies of William Wire's letters. Each is made of white paper folded to around 36 foolscap pages, stitched along folds, some with rough covers of pages cut from 18th century newspapers.

The letters date from 1843-50, although due to lack of time and the relatively unexciting and somewhat repetitive contents, only those of 1843-4 were examined. Based on these, it is estimated that the letterbooks contain approximately 170 letters to CRS.

Wire met Smith during the latter's excursions to Colchester and first corresponded with him in his capacity as secretary to the NS, Aug. 1843. Wire was interested in the proposals for a BAA, and in Jan. 1844 agreed to become a corresponding member. He subsequently pressed it to seek the establishment of a Colchester museum, despite having previously refused to support Mr. Vint's idea of a museum as he disliked him. (Wire was prone to take offence, and later announced that he had stopped corresponding with D. Haigh.) That Wire's support for the BAA was tinged with self-interest is evidenced by his hope that it would pay for having objects illustrated, and his request to be made BAA inspector of local monuments, for which he understood there would be an annual payment of £40.
The letters are primarily concerned with details of Wire acquisitions, with coins and tokens, antiquities and site observations. Wire was diligent in sending antiquities to Smith for NS and BAA meetings, although following the theft of a coin at a NS meeting, he asked Smith not to exhibit any more. He also sought Smith's advice on how to clean brass coins, and on how to learn Anglo-Saxon.

The value of Wire's letters as a source of antiquarian information is diminished by an absence of information about provenance, but that Wire recognised its importance is shown by his loan to the BAA of fifteen plates of Colchester antiquities, with a colour map showing their provenance. The only useful details pertain to the appearance of and local traditions relating to a circular encampment near Wood House, Gt. Horkesby parish, June 1844; a tessellated pavement in St. Osyth parish; an urn containing human bones and over 40 beads associated with a coin of Gallienus; a tessellated pavement in "Mr. Francis' garden"; and the reading of a coin of Edmund. In 1843, Wire commented about the lack of coins from Honorius and Stephen in Colchester, but subsequently obtained a Merovingian coin. He also offered a report on antiquities from Butt Lane or Union House and to help Smith with his article on Colchester.

Wire evidently looked forward to visits from Smith and Prof. Henslow, since they alone encouraged his antiquarian studies. On one occasion Smith gave him some copies of African ring money. Wire expressed his appreciation through gifts of engravings, coins and publications, and upon request tried to collect money owed to Smith from a Mr. Patmore after Smith had returned a coin which turned out to be a forgery, but succeeded only in eliciting suspicion. He also tried to be helpful when Smith sought advice on how to obtain a position for someone on the railway.

Wire's letters highlight his many difficulties: of access to building sites, a lack of books, and the inability of local people to buy local antiquities, which forced him to sell them to visitors. In 1843, he records sending Mr. Fitch an inscribed silver handle from Suffolk. Other topics include the demolition of Colchester town hall, a visit by of sellers of forged coins calling themselves Mr. and Mrs. Hunt Temple, 1843, Prof. Henslow's excursion to Derby to examine "British urns", a request for information from the Antiquarian and Architectural Yearbook, and Wright's reading of the Great Seal of Colchester, which Wire held was incorrect. On one occasion, Wire asked Smith to prepare him some watch oil; it is unclear whether or not he complied.

Unaccessioned. History as for preceding items.

Small quarto, vellum-bound manuscript book. Ruled for Wire's accounts from June 1847 to March 1848, which comprise details of purchase and sale prices arranged by category of object: fossils, antiquities, curiosities, shells, coins, prints, pictures, animals and books. From July 1850 to April 1852, the partly-filled book was reused for drafts and copies of Wire's letters. The names of some of the addressees are not stated, but include E. Acton, F.W. Fairholt, Rev. J.S. Henslow, H.E. Smith and J.R. Smith. There are at least 30 letters to CRS.

The letters reveal Wire as a pathetic character, forever bemoaning his poverty, ill-health, and discrimination against him on social, educational and political grounds. Among those he claimed disliked him were Rev. H. Jenkins and Miss Smith of Colchester castle, but since Wire took offence when Smith failed to call upon him while passing through Colchester, it is evident that Wire was over-sensitive. In 1850, Wire created a Colchester Archaeological Society within the Literary Institution, but was not appointed as its paid secretary. He was eventually forced to resign from the Society, and was urged to form another.

Wire disagreed with Jenkin's ideas on Colchester castle and Duncan's on the walls of Colchester, and wrote a paper claiming that the walls were 1st century (using spurious evidence) and that Colchester was not Camulodunum. This exposed him to attacks from Duncan, whereupon Wire sought Smith's help in obtaining information on other Roman walls. When Smith's comments on his paper were not to his liking, Wire complained that errors were inevitable since he could not afford books, and that in consequence he had decided to abandon archaeology and sell his collection, Dec. 1851. This did not dissuade him from disagreeing with Smith about Colchester, or from offering an alternative explanation of the figures on a coffer published in Smith's Collectanea.

That Smith bothered with Wire is explained by the latter's diligence in circulating prospectuses for Smith's publications, in keeping Smith informed on local discoveries (like the discovery of two mutilated statues in Holy Trinity Church), and in sending Smith antiquities and impressions of coins for exhibition to London societies, and to see if Smith wished to purchase them for his museum. Unfortunately Wire's descriptions of these items are mostly valueless, being too vague to be linked with sketches in his notebooks, and entirely without details of provenance. The only details concern a large bracelet 3.5" diameter, a coin depicting a Janus head, medieval lead tokens depicting a bird, and a vase dated 1724. In return, Smith made Wire occasional gifts, including some well-preserved minims.

In 1851, Smith sought information about large nails discovered with Roman skeletons. Wire promised sketches, and noted that Prof. Henslow had discovered iron nails in the outer coffin found in Rougham
tumulus, 1844. Wire also tried to meet Smith's request for information about the whereabouts of a Roman inscription found in Colchester during 18th century, and approached Rev. J. Round and Marsden on his behalf.

The men also exchanged publications and news of antiquarian discoveries and society affairs. Topics mentioned include the offence which CRS caused by publishing the Mount Bures burial, the activities of coin forgers, purchasing trips to Colchester by W. Edward and E. Acton, an unsuccessful application by gentlemen from the 1851 British Association meeting at Ipswich to dig on Mr. Taylor's ground, a proposed visit to CRS from J. Brown, and a visit to Wire by Hon. R.C. Neville.


Unaccessioned. History as for preceding items.

Small booklet, comprising nine, light blue quarto pages, stitched along left margin. Contains copies of letters to W. Fitch, Rev. H. Jenkins, R.C. Neville and CRS.

The four letters to CRS include a priced list of recent acquisitions for possible exhibition at the SAL. They include a ring taken from the finger of a Romano-British lady a few years ago. Smith thought them unworthy of exhibition, and returned them with the gift of a publication. Wire also comments upon the discovery of a Roman sewer and fort attached to the Colchester walls.


Unaccessioned. History as for preceding items.

Small notebook, 176 light blue pages, 6 by 5 inches, with leather quarter-binding. Contains drafts or copies of W. Wire's letters to various correspondents, 1852-55. The principal recipients were: E. Acton, W. Chaffers, C. Clark, W. Edwards, J. Evans, Mr. Purdue, H.E. Smith, J.R. Smith, and CRS (at least 33 letters).

The general character of the letters is unchanged (see previous entry). The Colchester Archaeological Society having been largely discredited, in 1852, Wire attended a meeting to form the
Essex Archaeological Society, and was subsequently elected to the local committee. The next year he applied to be the Society's librarian, but the Society would not elect him despite his testimonials from CRS, J.H. Marsden, Prof. Henslow and Rev. S. Cavor. Wire subsequently repeated his intention to abandon archaeology. Nevertheless, in 1854, following a move to try to improve his business, Wire was trying to become a coin dealer. In 1855, he was still hoping to write a history of Colchester, and expressed regret at having sold part of his collection.

According to Wire, Smith was one of the few who encouraged his study of archaeology, and many of the letters contain requests for antiquarian information. These relate to the Roman wall of London, the reading of a Latin inscription on a gold ring, and the identification of a coin of Carausius, of which he enclosed a wax impression. Wire also sought advice on whether he should purchase a small bronze of monkey, which ultimately proved to be too expensive.

In return, Wire tried hard to answer Smith's enquiries. These concerned Roman tiles inscribed with pointed instruments, leaden coffins from Colchester published in JBAA II, and the Roman stone from Harwich Church in the possession of Rev. J.H. Marsden, Disney Professor of Archaeology, Cambridge. Wire also kept Smith au fait with his acquisitions (which included a coin of Cunobelin and what sounds like a Castor ware charioteer beaker), and with Colchester discoveries, most notably a terracotta group of an aged man leading a child, and other Roman antiquities discovered in digging land owned by Mr. Taylor.

Wire continued to send the occasional gift, including a 17th century token relating to Old Street, London, Roman pottery stamps and details of others. He offered to let Smith publish his original of the grant of pardon given to Colchester by Edward IV, and to borrow a 700-page octavo book containing his notes on Colchester, 1855. He nevertheless specified that information on Colchester which he supplied to CRS should not fall into the hands of his rivals.

Other topics include the life of Miss Smith of the castle, the sale of Mr. Vint's antiquities, 1853, and visits to Smith by T. Taylor and the son of Alderman Wire. We also learn that Wire's wayward son had gone to sea, 1852.

Colchester - Essex Record Office, Colchester and North-East Essex Branch: Wire Collection - "Illustrations for a History of Colchester"

Unaccessioned. History as for preceding items.
Plain quarto manuscript book in card covers. Contains a plan of Colchester showing the provenances of objects found in sewer works during the last six months. It is accompanied with a long report addressed to CRS describing the discoveries.

Cowbridge, South Glamorgan - owned by Richard Avent: Letter from CRS to D. Croker, Dec. 1876

Purchased during the early 1970s from Andrew Block, bookseller of London.

Gives the titles of some of dramatic works by F.W. Fairholt among Fairholt's manuscripts, and tells of a forthcoming reading.

Cowbridge, South Glamorgan - owned by Richard Avent: C.R. Smith Retrospections, Social and Archaeological (1883-91), with manuscript insert.

Formerly the property of R. Roach Pittis. Owned by Katerine Hearn from 1913. Purchased about 1971-2

Includes obituary of John Roach, an offprint of a review of Smith's reading in Southampton, and a letter from CRS to his cousin, Alfred Roach, describing his journey to Rome and Pompeii, 1873.

Dereham - owned by J.R. Gretton Esq.: "Shakespearean Essays"

Not in Smith's library sale. History unknown. Purchased from Norwich bookshop.

Smith's own, bound and interleaved copy of Remarks on Shakespeare, His Birthplace ... (Smith 1868-9; 1877), and Shakespeare's Rural Life ... (1870, 1874), with some inconsequential notes and letters tipped to the interleaving. They include letters from J. Mayer, 1877, from Anne Pratt about plants, 1878, and F.W. Fairholt.

Devizes - Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Society Museum Library: C.R. Smith (Ed.) Inventorium Sepulchrale (1856); formerly the property of Revd C. Wyatt.
Contains letter from CRS to Revd C. Wyatt, 7 May 1856. It mentions progress in transferring his museum to the BM.

---

**Dorchester - Dorset County Museum: C. Warne Ancient Dorset (Bournemouth 1870).**

Unaccessioned. Formerly the property of C. Warne.

An autographed photograph of CRS is pasted opposite the dedication. It dates to 1876 (see GLC Record Office).

---

**Dorchester - Dorset County Museum: "Ancient Dorset - Critiques & Correspondence"**

Unaccessioned. Donated to the Museum.

Bound volume of letters relating to C. Warne's Ancient Dorset. Includes two different applications forms for the publication, giving Smith's name for correspondence, and a prospectus for an entertainment by Strood National Schools on 20 Dec. 1872, which was supported by CRS. A letter from CRS to Warne, 1872, refers to the poor subscription to Ancient Dorset. Letters to CRS from T. Hugo, H. Campkin, E. Keet, J. Wyatt and J. Stacye contain requests for extra copies and comments on the publication, and were evidently forwarded to Warne. Of particular interest is a letter from J. Mayer to C. Warne, 1878, which mentions how much he values Smith's friendship.

---

**Durham University Library: "Select Antiquarian Tracts and Autographs"**

MS. 913.42 B8. Some material is probably ex. Mayer collection, notably letters to Mayer from Smith, 1883, and J.O. Halliwell, 1861, and a letter to CRS from N. Clayton which bears a biographical note in Smith's hand. Other matter could be from Lot 136 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by the bookseller George of Bristol. Some items come from J.G. Nichols' collections, including letters to Nichols, tracts and manuscript notes by him, and materials relating to his father. The bookplate shows that the volume comes from F. Hendriks' library: perhaps one of the seven volumes, which
formed Lot 404 in his library sale. Later owned by John Charlton and presented to Durham University by Prof. E. Birley in 1951. When contacted by the writer, Prof. Birley could not remember the item.

Leather bound, octavo volume containing 34 tracts, with newspaper clippings and reprints, interspersed with autograph letters by antiquarians and manuscript notes. The tracts include Smith's article on "The Roman Wall" (Smith 1851d) and a corrected proof copy of Smith's article on Anglo-Saxon remains from Faversham, etc. (Smith 1858d). Other tracts bear autograph dedications to CRS. A reprint of C. Baily's "Notes on a Gallo-Roman Altar in the Museum at Boulogne" from TLMAS bears comments in Smith's autograph, stating that Baily's reading is erroneous. Other printed items include prospectuses for Smith's Catalogue and Inventorium, also Sotheby's 1879 sale catalogue of J.G. Nichols' library, which included letters from CRS.

There are three letters by CRS. One is to F.W. Fairholt, May 1857, and concerns Fairholt's proposed visit, Smith's excursion to Leeds Castle, a nearby "Roman" road, and his intention to see a Roman villa at Huntspier Point. The others are to J. Mayer, 1871 and 1883. They promise an impression of Smith's medal from the NS, and include comments on drama and references to the 1st cohort of the Frisii - on stone at Melandra Castle and pottery at Manchester.

The 25 letters to CRS date from 1851-83. They contain news of antiquarian affairs, of friends, and preparations for and the circulation of publications. Five from J.C. Bruce exchange antiquarian information about Roman antiquities, partly for Bruce's lecture on the Roman occupation in Edinburgh, 1883. Reference is made to another Bruce lecture at Cambridge, 1882, the last illness of his daughter, his visit to Rome in 1883, Maria Smith's last illness, floods at Strood in 1882, and a stone inscription from Cockermouth Castle. A letter from J. Clayton concerns work on the Thorngrafton hoard in 1859; another from his brother Nathaniel, 1854, promises a visit. In 1864, Sir Henry Dryden asked CRS to identify a forged(?) leaden badge. John Harris describes an excursion to examine Dene Holes at Joyden's Wood, and his research on Lesnes Abbey, 1883. Revd R.C. Jenkins outlines his research on St. Dunstan, his excavations at Wing and the poor state of English drama, 1881. J. Kendrick (2, dated 1852-69) supplied drawings of jet chess men(?) from Moot Hill, Warrington, and sought Smith's opinion on coins. J. Mayer thanks CRS for arranging his election to the RSNA, and discusses the publication of Inventorium, a gift from Hillier, a sword discovered near Rome, and requests coins from Lord Londesborough's recent find, 1856. W.C. Neligan sent drawings of coloured glass beads from the west of Ireland, 1857. J.G. Nichols reports that Billy and Charley had admitted their forgeries, and promises to campaign against the mutilation of sepulchral monuments, 1861. J. Parish (2, dated 1877) gives CRS permission to publish engravings of Roman potters' kilns at Colchester, and H.J. Slack (2, dated 1882-3) invites CRS to visit. H. Eckroyd Smith asks CRS to persuade J. Clarke to buy his collection, 1874 and 1877, and C. Warne discusses medieval burial
practices, 1855. T. Wright comments upon Nevile's excavations at Chesterford in 1851, and the lack of Boudican coins, 1851-4.

---

**Durham University Library:** Correspondence between CRS and J. Bell of Gateshead

Unaccessioned. From a much larger collection made by J. Bell of Gateshead, and later acquired by J.O. Halliwell-Phillipps. In the posthumous sale of Halliwell-Phillipps collection, and acquired by Dr. Burman of Alnwick, who published extracts (Burman 1909-17, esp. VII, 187-8). It was subsequently auctioned and acquired in whole or part by Winifred Myers, manuscript dealer of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. She sold some items to the SANUT (see entry under Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Northumberland County Record Office), and donated the remnant to Durham University Library (see entry under this heading). The rest of the collection is still missing (see Appendix 2b).

The one letter from CRS to J. Bell is a cover note for a journal, 1845. The five from J. Bell are dated 1846-52. They illustrate how he provided information (especially rubbings of inscriptions) for BAA meetings, and kept CRS au fait with activities of the SANUT. The men exchanged clippings, publications, and news of their health and literary ventures. The antiquarian information concerns a bronze shield found at Chester Commons, 1802, Roman altars from Chester le Street, a Roman altar found at Chesters, 1843, and Roman coins discovered at Colchester c. 1794-5, by Sergeant Bearpark of Hexham.

**Durham University Library:** Bound volume of tracts entitled "Archaeologia V"


One of a series of bound octavo volumes of offprints of articles and clippings on archaeology. Unlike the others this one contains a few antiquarian letters. One is from CRS to J. Bell of Gateshead written on the back of a report to subscribers to the Templeborough Excavation Fund, Apl. 1878. It concerns the preparation of a plate of Roman leaden seals and Roman tile stamps from Templeborough.
Durham University Library: Proofs of J.C. Bruce *The Roman Wall* 2nd Edit. (Newcastle-upon-Tyne 1853).

Acc. No. XL 913.42012. Acquired during the 1960s; source not recorded.

Two, bound, interleaved, octavo volumes of proofs, notes, clippings, sketches, letters, and corrections made by Bruce in preparation for his 3rd edition. They include the proof of a plate from *CA V*. Evidence of Smith's advice is provided by four of his letters to J.C. Bruce, 1854-63, and notes in his hand mostly clipped from other letters, including a list of corrections. They concern inscriptions on Roman coins and lapidary inscriptions from Axelodunum, Binchester, Ebchester, Elenborough, Lympne, and Wetherby, the interpretation of sculptured figures, the Castra Vetera on the Rhine, the goddess *Setiocenia*, the *Stones* of Pliny, the manufacture of Roman tile, and an angon found near Strood.


Lot 146 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by "Nattali". Bought by the present owner in early 1970s from B. Quaritch, bookseller of London.

Interleaved, octavo volume, bound in gilt leather, with a few items of printed ephemera, proof engravings of antiquities - many in Smith's collection, a photograph of some of his medieval jugs, eleven letters from various antiquarians to the author, with numerous manuscript additions. The volume was used, apparently by Smith, as the basis for an incomplete attempt at pricing his collection. Values in pencil are jotted in the margins alongside each item, and running totals at the bottom of each page, ending at p. 156 with a total of £ 2,200.

The printed ephemera includes a prospectus for Smith's *Catalogue* and a reminder that subscriptions were due, Feb. 1854. The clippings concern archaeological excavations and discoveries, antiquities in Smith's collection and a note on its purchase. They are derived from newspapers, periodicals, and F.W. Fairholt's *Costume in England* (1846).

Most of the manuscript entries comprise emendations to or expansions of the published descriptions (the most important being details of provenance). There are also descriptions and sketches, in pencil and occasionally water-colour, of additional items - mainly potters' stamps, pilgrim badges, coins and tokens, some listed in tabular form. Some of the unpublished drawings may have been
intended for the Catalogue, and include a half-finished sketch by CRS for a plate of decorated medieval shoes.

Other sketches and descriptions relate to London finds in collections other than Smith's. They include a Roman patera with inscribed handle in the Charles Museum from St. Bartholomew's Church, 1841; samian stamps collected by T.D.E. Gunstone and E.B. Price; and a medieval pewter knife-chape, found in 1846, in Syer-Cuming's collection.

There are also some descriptions and illustrations of parallels to London finds. These include a red enamelled, Roman shoe-shaped fibula from an inhumation at Great Waldingfield, Suffolk, 1859, in the collection of J. Warren of Ixworth; a medieval ampulla from Sandwich in the collection of W.H. Rolfe; and a token in Fairholt's collection.

Other manuscript additions comprise references to published discussions and parallels. Of particular interest is a reference to an otherwise unknown manuscript volume of Smith's entitled Notes 1857. Some of the notes are on pages torn from one or more earlier antiquarian notebooks. There are literary references to various classes of antiquities and medieval craftsmen. A section on leaden tokens includes notes on inn signs, and incorporates sketches (one at least by CRS) of the sign of The Hare, 1676, in Borough High Street, and of The Fruiterers Arms, 1662, in Milton, near Sittingbourne.

Five of the letters to CRS concern medieval seals, tokens and inn signs, on which CRS exchanged notes with W.C. Ewing, 1850. A letter from M.A. Lower concerns the "Chequers" as a sign, 1854. W. Pryer provided notes on a token of the Black Swan in a letter which concerns a proposed visit and introduction to the Blacketts, 1858. Letters from J.O. Halliwell, Feb. 1854, and F.W. Fairholt, undated, concern a book about Jack Newbury, which Phillipps failed to buy for CRS at a sale. An undated letter from T. Wright includes comments upon seals, and on financial and family matters, n.d.

The remaining letters to CRS are as follows: C. Brent lists potters' names from his collection, including some from Pudding Pan Rock, Canterbury, Margate and London, 1865. F.W. Fairholt writes about his health and preparations for a publication, n.d. L. Jewitt writes about his excavations, Bateman's library, and preparations for publications including a request for CRS to prepare reviews for The Reliquary, 1862. W. Phillips sent CRS an engraving of lead brooches from Coventry, 1854, and a letter in French from C. de Linas, 1856, requests information about Smith's medieval shoes; the writer had encountered similar shoes while studying ecclesiastical clothing.
Edinburgh - National Library of Scotland, Department of Manuscripts: Letter from CRS to F.W. Fairholt, May 1849

Ms. 3218, f. 139. From autograph album of Allan Park Paton, which was Lot 622 in the Sotheby's sale of 4-6 Dec. 1944, which was sold to Quaritch, bookseller of London, for £100.

Concerns engravings, preparations for the Richborough book, a recent illness, and Smith's intended visit to Hartlip.

Edinburgh - National Library of Scotland, Department of Manuscripts: [Letter from Letter from Samuel Smiles to Eliza Meteyard, 1862].


In a volume of mounted letters, 1793-1929 and n.d., mainly 19th century, bought at various times, 1961-8.

Smiles accepts with thanks Miss Meteyard's offer to introduce him to CRS.

Edinburgh - National Library of Scotland, Department of Manuscripts: "Chalmers of Auldbar papers"

MS. 15475, ff. 71, 81, 105, 139. Letters sent to the antiquarian Patrick Chalmers. Purchased from various sources, 1964-78.

Four letters by CRS of 1851-2 contain notes on antiquities, the exchange of publications, the failure of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland and SANUT to publish transactions, and Smith's intention to withdraw from subscribing antiquarian societies.

Edinburgh University Library: Diaries of Henrietta Phillipps, later Mrs. Halliwell-Phillipps

Halliwell-Phillipps Collection, vols. 327-30 (see below).
Four bound diaries covering the years 1836–75. They contain a few isolated references to CRS and comments on her husband’s contributions to BAA congresses and other antiquarian endeavours.

**Edinburgh University Library: ”Letters of Authors” [to J.O. Halliwell-Phillipps]**


Three hundred volumes, with calf half-binding and purple buckram boards, containing c. 15,000 letters to J.O. Halliwell-Phillipps, dated 1836–86, from antiquarians and literati, with copies or drafts of replies and biographical notes. Halliwell records that at some periods of his life he kept all his letters, and at others, only a selection. In arranging the letters for binding he had “taken care to remove everything at all likely to cause pain or annoyance to anyone”. He not only removed letters, including some by CRS, but cut out names, thus rendering interesting passages difficult to place in context. Fortunately the correspondence relating to Halliwell’s disputes with Sir Thomas Phillipps is complete: clearly Halliwell wished to justify himself to future generations. The letters are in approximate chronological order, and at the back of Vols. 1–258, Halliwell provides a brief author index.

The collection is important for the light it sheds on the personality of T. Wright. He and Halliwell were friends at Cambridge University, and thereafter Wright seems to have written to Halliwell at least weekly, sharing every aspect of his personal and professional life. The 1,268 letters by Wright are accompanied by four of Halliwell’s replies, and five of Wright’s letters to and from other correspondents. Vol. 40 includes a photograph of Wright c. 1849.

Wright reveals himself as intensely clever, but voluble, ever bragging, jolly, and full of awful puns. An easy mixer, he clearly revelled in popularity, fashionable society and the company of pretty women, with whom he would indulge in mutual flattery and playful innuendo. In a letter of 1865, he confesses to a pre-marital affair. Although apparently faithful, his marriage was problematic, for Mrs Wright spent much time in Paris with her aunt, leaving Wright alone in London.

The Wrights spoke fluent French, and he was as much at home among Parisien intellectuals as those of London. His letters from France of 1848 give vivid accounts of a party with Victor Hugo, and of the revolution. Although he enjoyed rowing with his rivals and exploiting their intellectual blunders, Wright’s attitude was playful rather than spiteful. But one can see why he aroused resentment and jealousy among those of a more serious disposition. Despite his somewhat shallow personality, Wright occasionally attended church, and was capable of sincere fellow feeling.
From the late 1830s, both Wright and Halliwell were involved in the Camden, Historical Society of Science, Percy, Royal, and Shakespeare Societies, and the SAL. Halliwell joined the BAA at its inception, and due to Wright’s urging, participated in its congresses. Living out of London, he relied on Wright for news of its doings, such as the decline under Pettigrew’s dictatorship, and Pettigrew’s spiteful moves to oust CRS as a secretary, 1849. Wright also describes how Smith’s house and museum narrowly escaped fire and his excavations at Richborough, both 1849. In 1852, Wright outlined plans for his “Warton Club”; Halliwell served on its committee. In 1855, he outlined his attempts to get CRS elected to the Institute of France. Wright eventually became accepted within the BAAS, and, following his 1854 lecture on Anglo-Saxon archaeology, inaugurated the Faussett dinners to promote ethnology and archaeology within the Association; even CRS attended one, 1862. Unfortunately Wright’s self-confidence led him into an erroneous attack upon the “prehistoric folks” at the BAAS meeting of 1865. Despite growing recognition, mismanagement prevented archaeology from being properly represented at the Manchester Art Exhibition of 1857.

From 1851, Wright was increasingly found on the borders of Wales, staying with friends, lecturing, dining, making antiquarian excursions with field clubs, and enjoying country pursuits. Before long Shropshire held the added attraction of two female admirers, whom Wright visited regularly, and innocently, although he enjoyed creating gossip. He kept Halliwell informed about his excavations of barrows near Ludlow, 1855, and Thruerton, 1867, a Roman villa at Lindley Hall, 1856, Saxon barrows in Yorkshire, 1857, and his seasons at Wroxeter, c. 1859-67. His work there not only attracted a visit from royalty, 1863, but from Smith, 1862, who was astounded at the discoveries. CRS and Wright visited Shrewsbury together in 1868. During the 1860s, in the West country at least, Wright was viewed as a celebrity, mixing freely with the aristocracy. Signs of his declining intellect may be seen in his letters of 1872, which are shorter and mostly concern arrangements for visits. By 1875 he was clearly very ill, although at least one letter to CRS is perfectly lucid.

Halliwell’s letters from F.W. Fairholt number 232, including three copies. They are accompanied by a poem in Fairholt’s autograph. Of those mentioning CRS, two of 1857 are of particular interest. One describes the Billy and Charley trial. The other intimates Fairholt’s intention to collect antiquities from the Thames because “there is nobody now Smith has gone [to Strood]”.

Many of Fairholt’s letters concern his illustrations for Halliwell’s folio edition of Shakespeare, but the men continually exchanged personal and antiquarian news. Of particular interest are accounts of Fairholt’s tours to France and Rome, 1856, central Europe, 1857, and along the Nile, 1861.

Fairholt was a shy and lonely man, who easily sank into melancholia. He had no success with women, despite growing a moustache, 1854. To judge from a comic poem and invitations to annual meetings of
the Noriomagians, he possessed a keen sense of humour. From 1859 he suffered declining health. He was wracked by coughing at night, and in 1860 informed Halliwell that in future he would illustrate only for him and Smith. Although asthma forced him to seek good air, he disliked the country and coast, especially in the winter, preferring London's warmth and theatres, which he would beg Halliwell to attend with him.

Smith's letters to Halliwell number 355, and are accompanied by copies (?) of three of Halliwell's replies. They date from 1842-86. The men became acquainted through the SAL and other associations and publishing ventures. In 1842 CRS agreed to write notes for Halliwell's Archaeologist and Journal of Antiquarian Science. From 1844 they collaborated through the BAA, exchanging news and views about arrangements for the congresses, which for the 1848 Worcester congress at least were highly chaotic. After Halliwell declared himself for Wright's faction, CRS sent him a copy of a poem by S. Isaacson expressing support for Wright. The next year, CRS supported Halliwell's campaign to be re-admitted to the BM after he had been banned following allegations of theft. Halliwell later supported Smith's attempts to pressurise the BM to buy his collection, 1845-6. In 1848 CRS arranged Halliwell's election to the Society of Antiquaries of Normandy. After the BAA refused a testimonial for him, CRS began to withdraw by degrees. Pettigrew was left unchallenged, and his subsequent rows with Croker, 1849, and others led to many resignations. Living outside London, Halliwell was not involved, and remained loyal to Pettigrew. In 1852 he wrote to explain his position to Smith, who was sympathetic. In 1860, CRS commented that he had intended that the BAA should be a stop-gap until the Government could be persuaded to preserving antiquities. From this perspective it had failed - a view shared by Fairholt and Halliwell. In 1853 a meeting at Lord Londesborough's to form a new society foundered, and the next year saw the demise of the Warton Club.


A year before his death in 1866, Fairholt asked Halliwell to aid CRS in the execution of his will (although this did not prevent a potentially costly blunder on Smith's part). The work was laborious because Fairholt had no close relatives, although some cousins considered opposing the will. Following the funeral CRS not only wrote an obituary in his CA, but sought subscribers and materials for an extended biography, 1866-75. Several letters mention manuscripts relating to Fairholt, which
have not been traced. Eventually, the biography failed through lack of support, although CRS and friends commemorated Fairholt by laying a brass to him at Stratford in 1868, where they were dined by the mayor and CRS gave Shakespearean readings to schoolboys.

CRS and Halliwell often collaborated in organising subscriptions and testimonials for friends. When Wright became ill, they were unsuccessful in raising a testimonial, but were able to raise some funds for his widow, 1877-80. From 1879-82 CRS organised with difficulty a subscription to publish J.R. Planché's *Extravaganzas*; a testimonial for Chaffers also attracted little interest, 1883.

Throughout their long association, the men exchanged and circulated each other's publications, discussed their preparation, and sought subscribers to works by friends. CRS sought information from Halliwell on literary references to antiquities, and permission to publish illustrations from his works. In return CRS passed on information about historical sources, such as an inventory of goods of the Chapel of St. Thomas, Newport, IOW, and provided introductions to antiquarians and manuscript libraries. The men corresponded on dialect and archaic (especially Shakespearean) terms. As early as 1844, CRS sent a draft of his brother, Captain H. Smith's *Isle of Wight Words* (Smith and Smith 1881-2), asking for advice on its publication. Captain Smith later supplied Halliwell with more IOW dialect terms and with stories and songs, 1849, presumably for a revised edition of Halliwell (1872).

From 1859, Halliwell provided literary references for Smith's articles on horticultural history and the cultivation of vines and fruits. Both loved gardening, and following Halliwell's move to Hollingbury Copse, CRS sent him plants and seeds, 1877-82. From the mid 1860s, their greatest mutual interest was Shakespeare. Their earliest correspondence on this subject followed a BAA visit to Stratford-upon-Avon during its Warwick congress, at which it declared support for a campaign to save Shakespeare's house. The same visit aroused Smith's interest in identifying localities mentioned by the bard, which years later found expression in *Remarks on Shakespeare* (Smith 1868-9; 1877). His interest was revived following his first public reading of Shakespeare in 1855.

From 1862, at Smith's request, he and Halliwell exchanged references relating to rural references in Shakespeare, discussing Miss Pratt's hypothesis that flowers mentioned in Shakespeare showed he had visited Dover, also Shakespeare's superiority over Ben Johnson, the authorship of Edward III, and plans for the Shakespeare Tercentenary celebrations, with which CRS was disappointed, 1866-9. In 1874 CRS was furious to learn that his tract on Shakespeare's Rural Life had been plagiarised; and subsequently spoke of a 3rd edition which never appeared. Halliwell's problems with Furnivall, 1881, and with the Corporation of Stratford also figure in their correspondence. CRS supported Halliwell in his attempts to raise funds for the new Shakespeare theatre at Stratford, and donated items for its Shakespearean Museum, founded by Halliwell. They include programmes of his readings, manuscripts relating to Stratford found among Fairholt's papers, a photograph of S. Aveling, reviews of
Shakespeare productions in Kent, and (preserved here) a printed invitation from the Avelings to a performance of "As You Like It" in 1877.

The collection is the best single source of information about Smith's public readings, which centred upon Shakespeare, and King Lear and Hamlet in particular. We learn of performances at Strood (in 1865, 1866, 1868, and 1883), Andover, East Peckham, the Isle of Wight, Lewes, Maidstone, Rochester, Wrotham (in 1866), Tenterden (1867), Newport, IOW (1867 and 1873), Bebington, Birkenhead, Higham and Shoreditch (1868), Southampton (1871), Newcastle-upon-Tyne (1871 and 1874), Canterbury (1873), West Hackney (1874), and Lewisham (in 1884). In 1867, CRS read to raise money for a testimonial for M.A. Lower, which Halliwell supported. The year 1872 saw the formation of the Strood Working Men's Club and the Elocution Class founded by Smith, and in 1882 CRS lectured on Shakespeare at Sidcup.

After his first readings, CRS became anxious for impartial assessment because although he attracted enthusiastic audiences in Kent, these had rarely gained newspaper reviews. Despite repeated requests, Halliwell seemed reluctant to attend; in 1868 it transpired that he believed that Shakespeare should be acted, not read! With a performer's eye, CRS also discussed various performances of Shakespeare which he attended in Kent, London and elsewhere. Humble local entertainments often pleased CRS more than West End productions, especially Irving's, although CRS never forgot hearing Edmund Kean, whose voice he imitated.

CRS also kept Halliwell abreast of his archaeological excursions, which took him to Dover (1849), to Caerleon, where he examined a Roman inscription, 1848, to see Chaffer's London collections, 1849, to the Roman Wall, 1851, again in 1855 accompanied by Lord and Lady Londesborough and in 1877, to Honfleur and Jublains, 1853, to Hartlip, the Isle of Wight, and to Cobham to inspect Waller's restoration of the brasses, 1866, to Canterbury, 1870, to Silchester, 1871, to Wiltshire, Old Sarum, a walk from Cheam to Chichester, 1876, to Procolitia, 1877, to Dover, Betshanger, Sandwich, Richborough, Cranbourne Chase, Blandford, the Brading (Morton) Roman villa, Chichester, 1880, and to Old Winchester, in 1884.

There is news of his excavation of the Hartlip villa with W. Bland, 1848; digging at Richborough, 1849; the Billy and Charley trial, 1857; his discoveries relating to Reculver including the Church columns, 1861; the destruction of a stone circle at Penzance, 1866; the Noviomagians, 1868; of a public meeting about Rochester castle, 1869; his unsuccessful attempt to save Ashley House, Maidstone, 1870; a controversy over the date of British hillforts, 1872-8; torques from Chatham Lines, 1872; his public lectures at Leicester and Sheffield in 1873, and his subsequent campaign to save Leicester's Guildhall; the opening of the Charles Museum, Maidstone, 1873; a pilgrim badge at Stratford, 1873; prehistoric earthworks at Bradfield, 1873; Hillier's Isle of Wight manuscripts, 1874; and about Smith's work in indexing Lapidarium Septentrionale (Bruce 1875).
After his troubles with the BAA, CRS developed an aversion to societies. Whereas in 1849 he was proud to be elected a correspondent of the Society of Antiquaries of Normandy, in 1859 he had qualms about being an honorary member of the KAS, and only just accepted a vice-presidency of the West Kent Natural History Society. He strongly objected to the appointment of aristocratic vice-presidents who knew nothing of antiquities. This did not prevent him from assisting the AI's 1859 congress at Rochester, their visit to Lympne, 1875, attending a LAMAS dinner, 1869, or assisting their 1884 Rochester congress. When Halliwell was elevated by his wife's fortune and changed his name to Phillipps, CRS persisted in addressing him by his former name.

Visits between Halliwell and CRS were few, although CRS did get to Hollingbury Copse in 1882. Nevertheless, the letters contain many interesting items of personal news. These relate to Smith's dislike of blood sports and his campaign to prevent the killing of small birds, 1862; his costly law suit with the Dean and Chapter of Rochester, 1864; his land purchases to prevent development, 1870; Charles Dickens's burial, 1870; an attack of shingles, 1872; his refusal of a librarianship at Stafford, 1872; his attendance at a dinner of the Library Committee of the Corporation of London, 1873; a London performance by J. Maas, 1873; his grief at losing his sister Maria and laying her brass at Newchurch, 1874-5; the grounds for spelling his name "Roche"; his facial operations in 1879 and 1882; a visit to J. Mayer at Bebington, 1883; and an attack of neuralgia, 1885. Floods at Strood in 1874-84 caused CRS to contemplate a law suit against the Corporation, who eventually responded by embanking the river, 1885.

Also of interest are 104 letters to Halliwell from T.J. Pettigrew, 1840-65. Others from J. Bell, A.J. Dunkin, G. Johnson and A. White mention CRS. So do letters from Lord Albert Conyngham concerning the proposed testimonial to CRS and arrangements for the 1849 congress. A letter from Lord Albert to CRS also concerns the congress.

---

Edinburgh University Library: [Letters from CRS to Mr Burn, 1867-8]

La.II.423/206-212; La.II.647/355-6. Bequeathed to the University by the 19th century Edinburgh bookseller and antiquarian, D. Laing.

Eight letters from CRS to Mr Burn accompanied by items of printed ephemera. The letters concern Smith's dramatic readings in London, Birkenhead and Strood, including comments on Miss Ball's singing and the elocutionary talents of H.F. Dickens, son of the novelist. Other topics include Smith's visits to France in Aug. 1867, and Stratford in Oct. 1868, Kentish tokens, a painted window at
Fairford, attempts to complete Mr. Burns' set of CA, and the final illnesses of Mrs. Jolliffe and Captain H. Smith. They are accompanied by programmes for Smith's readings at Chatham (Oct. 1867), Strood (Nov. 1867), and Shoreditch (Feb. 1868), and a review of the last of these reprinted from Bell's Weekly Messenger and prospectuses for Smith's CA VI and C. Warne's The Celtic Tumuli of Dorset.

Edinburgh University Library: Correspondence of C.R. Smith, 1850

La.II.646/173.4 and 234. Bequeathed to the University by the 19th century Edinburgh bookseller and antiquarian, D. Laing.

Two items relating to CRS from a large collection of literary correspondence. They comprise a letter from CRS, on behalf of the BAA, to an unnamed correspondent about the difficulties of sending coins through the post and Roman remains at Headington, and a letter from J.G. Nichols to CRS concerning preparations for publications, and thanks for information.

Glasgow University Library: Two letters from CRS to J. C. Bruce

Hunterian Museum Records: MR 45/11; MR 45/12. Donated to the Museum by Bruce's nephew, Andrew (see MR 45/13).

They concern a BAA tour of Cilurnum led by Bruce, new finds at Coventina's Well, a gold coin of Allectus similar to one in the Hunterian Museum, and a poem by H. Smetham.

Leicestershire Record Office: Letter from CRS

Letter of 18 Apr. 1854, on his election to Leicester Literary and Philosophical Society, written on prospectus for Inventorium (pers. comm. R.A. Rutland).

Lewes - Sussex Archaeological Society Library: "Brooke Collection"
Presented to the Society by Henry Griffith, FSA.

Two hundred drawings, etchings and letters, etc., formerly owned by W.H. Brooke. They include twelve letters from Brooke to Smith, 1849-59, about preparations of engravings for Illustrations and Pevensey, the future of Smith's collection, the distribution of publications, and family and friends. There are also various letters to CRS and others, e.g. 1860 following Brooke's decease. These concern details of his career, probably for an obituary.

A large folder of topographical and archaeological water-colour sketches and ink drawings contains several items relevant to Smith's career. These include sketches of Lympne, 1852; Pevensey, 1840 and 1850; the Hartlip villa; an iron medieval helmet as a "Gypsy's Camp Kettle" from Smith's museum. The folder includes three ink and wash sketches of Roman stonework at Lillebonne and Rouen by CRS, mounted next to Brooke's etchings of the same.

Lewes - Sussex Archaeological Society Library: "Lower Papers"

Some were presented to the Library by Mr. W.J. Smith in 1891. Others were purchased in two or more batches.

The working papers of M.A. Lower with other family papers. They comprise bound volumes of letters, scrap-books, notebooks and sketch books, family photographs, etc. The 846 letters include some to his publisher, some on family history and genealogy, and some on antiquarian matters. The individual components are described below.

Lewes - Sussex Archaeological Society Library: M.A. Lower, Antiquarian Letter-Book

Acc. No. 6421

8vo. volume bound in red cloth with red leather quarter-binding. Contains e.g. 150 letters to Lower from various correspondents, 1839-46. Fourteen are from CRS, who receives passing mention in some others.
The earliest letter dates from Sep. 1845, when Smith wrote explaining how the BAA's was organised. Much of the subsequent correspondence also concerns BAA business. Lower made several communications to the BAA, and Smith kept him informed as to the JBAA's progress. Arising from a delay, in Feb. 1846 Smith reported that the JBAA would thereafter be published less often in larger parts so that the committee could personally supervise its delivery. To keep members au fait with developments, details of meetings were being given to the Literary Gazette. A printed slip of Oct. 1845 advised members of forthcoming open meetings

Smith kept Lower informed of events following the split, including "tricks" by the AI to increase their list of supporters, their intriguing at the SAL, the Duke of Norfolk's election as their president, and errors in the AI. Lower asked Smith to join the Sussex Archaeological Society, but he could not afford to.

In Oct. 1845, Smith sought Lower's opinion about heraldic devices on medieval leaden tokens found near Aldersgate, London. In 1846, Smith repaid the favour when on Lower's behalf he sought C. Baily's advice respecting a design for a tomb. Smith and Lower had discovered a mutual interest in Pevensey by June 1846, when Smith commented that the Roman and Norman phases are distinct, and that the site would repay excavation, 1846. The following week he exhibited ancient deeds relating to Pevensey at the SAL.

Other topics include Smith excavations at Ozingell and his excursion to Tréves, 1846, and the activities of W.H. Brooke at Battle and elsewhere.

____________________________________

Lewes - Sussex Archaeological Society Library: "Letters to M.A. Lower - Geneological - Vol. II.

Acc. No. 548, Lower Papers Box 3. Purchased July 1891.

The second of two quarto volumes, bound in red buckram with red leather quarter-binding and gilt lettering. Contains 120 letters to M.A. Lower on genealogy, archaeology, etc. Five are from CRS, and another from S. Isaacson concerns an escutcheon in Smith's museum.

Smith's letters date from 1844-5, and concern the date of a medieval vessel, a request for details of Roman coins and fibulae from Lewes castle, and arrangements for and tricks perpetrated by Way's party prior to the Winchester congress.

____________________________________
Lewes - Sussex Archaeological Society Library: Letters to M.A. Lower from C.R. Smith

Lower Papers, Box 2, CRS/1-105

Ninety-eight letters from C.R. Smith to M.A. Lower, 1845-66, with 21 envelopes, some with wax seals. (Lower was interested in heraldry and seals, and Smith occasionally asked for assistance with readings and iconography.) With them are clippings of reviews and obituaries, a letter from Lower to Smith, and an allegorical account (by Lower?) of the trial of C.R. Smith for abandoning his child (the BAA) in 1849.

Smith's earliest letters are primarily concerned with BAA affairs, including thanks for Lower's communications, and preparations for, and the exchange and circulation of publications. From 1849, they contain much about Pevensey, demonstrating that CRS was the prime mover in their joint excavations. (CRS subsequently urged Lower to excavate at Seaford also.)

Smith's interest in Pevensey was revived when he revisited the site in 1849 while researching Richborough, and he sought information on coins from Mr. Gunn. He subsequently arranged for W.H. Brooke to make etchings. In 1850, CRS offered to collaborate if Lower and Blaaw decided to excavate, and in 1851, he reported that Lord Londesborough would fund the excavations in return for the finds. That April, CRS promised money so that Gunn could start digging. He also negotiated with the tenant, prepared and helped circulate the fund-raising brochures, applied for free railway tickets, arranged for Mr. Figg to prepare the plans, and subsequent nominated him as FSA. Lower was better able to visit the excavations, and other letters advise him on the best approach. They also provide coin identifications, ideas on interpretation, and comments upon Lower's subsequent publication.

Other antiquarian discoveries mentioned are Boucher de Perthe's collection, flints from Newhaven, Dr. Wake Smart's offer of flints to the Sussex Archaeological Society, cists at Hardham, 1863, Roman objects previously thought to be modern inventions, a Roman enamelled bronze object in C. Ade's museum, Mr. Evershed's iron objects, Mr. Wood's Roman lead ingots, sepulchral remains at Dymchurch, the excavations at Silchester, 1865, the Roman villa at Bignor and the Thésée mansio, a possible Saxon shore fort at Château de Giaville, near Honfleur, the origin of French place-names, Hillier's Saxon cemetery excavations at Chessel Down, IOW, Brent's at Sarre, a Saxon bowl sent to CRS by KAS, diggings at Hurstpierpoint, a set of medieval coins from Newport, IOW, a Dymchurch seal owned by J. Elliott, a seal owned by R. Fitch of Norfolk, the Romsey medieval trumpet, and the date of Billy and Charley's. CRS also details his excursion to the wall, 1853, to Pulborough priory, barrows by West Burton, and the Roman road to Earitham, Sussex, 1854, to Offham, 1857, and to Knole House, Seven Oaks, n.c. We also gain scraps of information about the proposed corpus of Roman inscriptions, 1857,
Smith's campaign for the walls of Dax, and his work towards Stephenson's Dictionary. We also learn that Smith thought Douglas's ideas very advanced.

The main items of news concern antiquarian societies. Regarding the BAA, we learn of Mr. Epell's attempt to levy an unwarranted charge, and young E.B. Price's visit to the Warwick Congress. The problems caused by T.J. Pettigrew in the late 1840s are outlined: an excess of meetings, ill-feeling leading to the resignation of T.C. Croker, Sir W. Betham, Sir W. Chatterton, Lord Londesborough and T. Wright, in 1849, the failure of the congresses in 1853 and 1855, and the publication of BAA's tactlessly named Collectanea, 1862. Interestingly, Smith dismisses as ridiculous the excuse that Pettigrew's misbehaviour was due to illness. Wright's reconciliation with Pettigrew in 1860 is also mentioned.

The conduct of the Institute following the split is detailed, including the poor conduct of an unnamed cleric, of Cooper, Owury, and of Way, who perpetrated all kinds of tricks prior to the Warwick Congress. We hear of an insult to Smith's servant by Lane, the Institute's secretary, 1849. Smith and Elliott did everything possible to achieve a reunion; a claim by Way that Smith was obstructing one was totally false. In 1851, he even attended an archaeological party by Mr. Yates of the Institute. When all else failed, in 1850 Smith outlined plans for encouraging collaboration between the societies and establishing a regional structure, and in 1853 participated at a meeting at Lord Londesborough's to form a society of workers.

Concerning the SAL, we learn of their poor publications, the blackballing of Mr. Winston in 1849, of C. Brent in 1866, and the near blackballing of E.B. Price in 1851. Smith made several proposals for the Antiquaries centenary dinner, which were mostly not adopted, 1851. The Antiquaries also refused the Duke of Northumberland's suggestion of a committee of Wall antiquaries, 1852. Not surprisingly, Smith refused when friends suggested that he should stand as Director, 1858-60. Smith had a poor opinion of Lord Mahon, and an even lower one of the Society's leaders after 1862, when they refused to send him a library book.

Another institution criticised by Smith was the BM. In 1853, it was rumoured that they intended to buy and remove the Bignor pavements. In 1855, they agreed to purchase the Bernal collection, but initially refused Smith's, causing him to ask Lower to write to the newspapers. They also refused J.Y. Akerman's Saxon antiquities, which were purchased by J. Mayer, along with W.H. Rolfe's collection, 1857.

In 1849, Smith told Lower about the charge levied against him for theft, and the near destruction of his museum by fire. In 1852, he explained his reasons for selling his collection and retiring, and
his dismay over the sale of Price's collection. A letter of 1865 lays claim that the French had accepted his advice and were ordering dwarf apple trees from England.

Smith was heartened by the support he received from foreigners, by his election to the RSL, 1853, and a reception to him in the Isle of Wight, 1855. But apart from Mayer, who donated plates for *Collectanea*, the English gave him little support by way of subscriptions. Smith's poverty stopped him from visiting friends, from excavating at Melandra castle, 1853, from attending a congress, 1857, and later forced him to postpone invitations to Compiègne and a chateau near Thèrovanne, 1862-4. Matters were not improved by his dispute with the Dean and Chapter of Rochester in 1862-4, which although successful, cost £100. From 1865, Smith found a way of raising money for charity - by giving public readings. He also tried to find pupils for Lower's school, and in 1864, to help B. Thorpe raise funds to publish.

As well as raising a testimonial for him, Smith also helped Lower by donating antiquities, advising him on antiquarian contacts in Normandy, and on whom he should include in his book on Sussex worthies. He also encouraged him to write an obituary of Price. In return, Smith sought help in stemming bird-killing, and for information on a vineyard. We hear of the deaths of Sir J. Annerley and E.T. Artis, 1848, and W.H. Brooke and Lord Londesborough, 1860. Other antiquarians mentioned include F.W. Fairholt, Rev. H. Jenkins, Lord Talbot, Mr. Tupper, J.G. Waller and J.J.A. Worsaae. In 1863, Smith received a visit from none other than M. Maury, private librarian to Emperor Napoleon III. We also learn about an attack on Miss Meteyard's *Hallowed Spots*, 1863, and that in 1866, Lord Ashburton held charters stolen from the Royal Library, Paris.

On a more personal level, we learn about Smith's purchase of Temple Place, that his heart was in the garden (from 1858), and that he was continually applied to for autographs. In one place Smith records that he views his nieces and nephews like children. He also records the death of a niece in Jamaica, 1852, and of T. Eveleigh, 1853.

Lower's letter to CRS concerns a toast to them at the Sussex Archaeological Society's AGM, 1860, and the Indian practice of using pounded tile in mortar.

---

*Lewes - Sussex Archaeological Society Library: Letters to C.R. Smith, 1852-88*

Lower Papers, Box 2, RS/1-14. Some of the letters were either addressed to Lower or sent to him by Smith, and clearly belong with the Lower papers. Another group relates to Smith's *Retrospections*, and may have been removed from a volume in the Library (see below).
Ten letters to CRS from various correspondents, two from CRS to M.A. Lower, and two more, one of which is unconnected with CRS.

The letters probably sent to Lower comprise a letter to CRS from C. Ade, about the meeting of subscribers to the Pevensey excavations and his dispute with W. Figg concerning who discovered a Roman road between Pevensey and Lewes, 1852. Smith sent this to Lower in 1884 with a covering letter asking if it was worth printing in the Sussex Collections. The following month he sent an extract from a letter by W. Figg.

The letters possibly from Smith's Retrospections with one exception date from 1881-4. Those from W. Clayton, G. Fontana and "O.F.R." concern proposed visits and subscriptions to publications, and must have been kept as autographs. The others are from J. Clayton, F. Grayling(?), J.G. Waller (3) and J. Wood, and are concerned with the BAA Gloucester Congress of 1846, the proposed BAA testimonial to CRS, and reminiscences of J. Hodgson and T. Wright. A note in Smith's hand states that he contemplated incorporating a note by E.T. Artis about the difficulty of excavating and publishing, with a transcript of a note from the Duke of Bedford offering Artis his assistance, 1827.

Lewes - Sussex Archaeological Society Library: C.R. Smith
Retrospections, Social and Archaeological I (1883),
containing manuscript additions and clippings.

From a clipping stuck inside, this seems to have been Lot 1108 in an unidentified sale of 20 Oct. 1891. It is described here as the author's copy, but this is probably incorrect since Smith's working copies were sold as three complete sets in his library sale earlier that year. Since the additional matter is inserted on separate sheets at the beginning and end, it may have been extracted from Smith's portfolio's relating to his Retrospections so as to make a single, rebound volume more saleable. (For details of Smith's Retrospections portfolios, see below under Liverpool Central Library Record Office.)

A single volume rebound in dark blue buckram. The additions comprise a proof list of subscribers corrected in Smith's hand, one or two clippings about antiquarian discoveries, reviews of Retrospections and clippings and notes about obituaries of persons mentioned therein, namely: H.W. Diamond, Ll. Jewitt, Dr. Kendrick of Warrington, Mrs Moncrieff, W.T.P. Shortt, E. Solly of Canterbury, Sir John Stoddart and Rev. R. Wilson. These are mounted on blue pages, tipped in at the front and back.
Part of a huge collection of illustrations, autograph letters and other manuscripts collected by Joseph Mayer for his private museum and library at Bebington. Many of the documents are grouped in paper folders or mounts bearing pencilled annotations by Mayer. A year after his death in 1886, the collection was broken up and sold at a series of auctions (see Appendix 2b). Parts of the collection, particularly those with Liverpool connections, have been repurchased from time to time by Liverpool Central Library. In 1972 part of a small portion not included in the Mayer sale was donated by the Borough of Bebington (Ref. No. 920 MAY).

The greater portion of the collection comprises Mayer's personal correspondence, including letters from CRS and J. Clarke, to which have been added illustrative materials, and autograph letters sent primarily by CRS, 1851-82. Various distinct components of the collection are described separately below although some are being amalgamated and regrouped by the library.

Liverpool Central Libraries Record Office: Mayer Papers — "Art in Liverpool I"

Part of Mayer Papers, Acc. No. 2528a; see above.

Large folio volume, containing letter of Dec. 1855 from J. Pelham to CRS concerning the delivery of Inventorium.

Liverpool Central Libraries Record Office: Mayer Papers — "Letters on Art"

Part of Mayer Papers, Acc. No. 2528a; see above.
Two, bound quarto volumes of autograph letters. Vol. 1 includes an etching of Fairholt, 1847; Fairholt's passport to France, July 1846, and a letter from E. Meteyard to CRS asking to see his museum prior to reviewing his Catalogue. Vol. 2 contains two letters to CRS from B. Gibson, 1847. They provide details of excavations in Rome and offer a paper to the SAL.

Liverpool Central Libraries Record Office: "Materials relating to C. Roach Smith's Retrospections, Social and Archaeological"

Part of Acc. 2528a. Compiled by J. Mayer, mostly from materials sent by CRS g. 1851-81. Part of Lot 260 in the 1887 sale of Mayer's autograph letters. This was purchased for £ 5-17s-6d by F. Hendriks, who rearranged the collection. At the Hendriks sale of Feb. 1910 (Lot 254) they were purchased by the dealer W. Daniell for Dr Cock (see letter in Vol. I and receipt in Vol. II). Thereafter, various items mentioned in the Hendriks sale catalogue were removed, including autograph letters from E. Hasted and Kentish materials. In 1944, Liverpool purchased the collection from Dobell, bookseller of London.

Three large quarto portfolios with red leather quarter bindings, containing manuscript items, some mounted on art paper and annotated in pencil by Mayer (mostly in Vol. I). The portfolios are variously titled in gilt lettering, although all three mention Smith's Retrospections, and their contents are similar.

Of particular interest are a series of portraits of CRS in Vol. II. These comprise a silhouette at the age of 17, a pencil sketch of him as a young FSA by J. Thurstone, an ink sketch by J.B. Cuff, 1844, and photographs of his portrait on the Fontana medallion and Dax medal. With them are illustrations of places associated with CRS. Five are of Landguard prior to its refurbishment in 1876, and comprise a sketch by H. Stothard of a "harvest home" in 1830, a water-colour by Mrs G. Payne copied from Fairholt's sketch, another by J.W. Jolliffe from a sketch of 1852, a pencil drawing by "M.S." and a photograph dated 1876. A water-colour by Mrs Captain Thorpe depicts Miss Trattle's school, Brading, IOW. Other items include a photograph of Arreton Manor g. 1883, a pencil sketch by J.G. Waller of Smith's shop in Lothbury, and another by W.G. Evans of Temple Place, Nov. 1883. The significance of a pencil sketch of 46 and 45 London Wall by G.W. Wilkie is unknown; the same applies to a photograph of the "Corporation Arms".

There are engraved portraits of the antiquarians E. Cartier, Revd J. Clayton, Abbé Cochet, J.C. Bruce, J. Fenwick, Prof. Henslow, H. Hatcher, Revd A. Hume, J. Cove Jones, J. Mayer (2), T. Purland,
Lieutenant Waghorn (2); also photographs of C. Bailey, of a painting of J. Clarke, of J.F. Dillon Croker, W.G. Rogers, and a specimen of "The Envelope used by the late H.W. Diamond F.S.A.". A series of humorous etchings come from stories in Bentley's Magazine by P. Pindar (J.Y. Akerman), and there are newspaper clippings about CRS and B. de Perthes.

There are proof pages from several of Smith's publications including CA and Retrospections. One shows that the frontispiece to Retrospections II originally incorporated Mayer's Saxon urn with a forged Roman inscription. Etchings of items associated with Mayer and his museum include proofs of the title page for his abandoned volume of Materials Towards a History of the Arts. Others depict antiquities including prehistoric Irish and Celtic ornaments, the gateway of Birdoswald, South Shields Roman fort, and Saxon antiquities, including Gundred's coffin. An unpublished etching by CRS of Halinghen Church is marked "my first effort".

Drawings definitely by CRS include an iron axe head found at Rowlrich, 1849, spears from an Oxfordshire barrow, an iron spear from the Thames at Chelsea, and a Roman brooch of North German type. Of particular interest are seven ink and wash sketches of the Roman theatre at Lillebonne, 1851, from Vol. I. Other drawings of Gallo-Roman antiquities, mostly unpublished, include an inscribed pot used as a funerary urn from Norville, monumental stonework from Lillebonne in Rouen museum (10 sketches), and the interior of the Largay castrum. Other items relating to Smith's French visits include his sketch of Montrichard bridge, engravings by Fairholt of Merovingian brooches from Bourg-sur-Aisne, 18th century etchings of the amphitheatre at Doué, and a letter from J. Windele seeking details of two Ogham (?) inscriptions in France.

Vol. I contains seventy ink and wash drawings and etchings by W.H. Brooke, with additions by CRS, of castles and antiquities in Sussex and Kent. They include 29 drawings of Hurstmonceux Castle, with others of Pevensey Castle and church, Bramber Castle, Lymnpe, and Portchester; also the "Multiangular Tower, York", drawn by CRS, Apl. 1854. Also proofs, some unpublished, of Brooke's etchings from drawings by CRS of Roman monuments at Rouen and the Lillebonne Roman theatre.

The other drawings and water-colours were evidently sent to CRS by correspondents. The largest group comprises water-colours and ink sketches mostly by W.F. Wakeman, of Irish antiquities, mostly Bronze Age, from Athlone, Bohermeen, Dublin, Dunshaughtin and Limerick. There are ink and wash sketches by L. Champion of umbos and armatures found at Londinières (Seine-Maritime), 1852; water-colours by F. Troyon of graves-goods at Bel-Air and of Swiss lake antiquities; drawings of a flint tool from Godalming and a spear from Surrey; water-colours of Roman funerary vessels from Crendon, Bucks.; a brass Roman weight from the Gogmagog Hills, Cambs., and other items in the collection of H.E. Smith; a drawing by H. Durden of one of 14 currency bars found at Hod Hill, 1857; a decorated iron vessel.
from Felixstowe Head; and an ornamental Roman buckle from near Tréves, drawn by W.M. Wylie. A
drawing of the German limes by C. Gerville, is accompanied by maps of the Roman Empire and Italy.

Illustrations of Saxon antiquities include fibulae from Stowe Heath, a girdle-hanger and buckle from
J.Y. Akerman's collection, ornaments from Fairford, Gloucs., 1851, three swords drawn by J.Y.
Akerman, an urn with knops and swastikas owned by J. Johnson of Bury, pottery from Little Wilbraham,
1852, coins of Otho, and a carving on an oak beam from Coggeshall Church, drawn by J. Parish.
Illustrations relating to W.H. Rolfe include a pencil sketch of his Richborough excavations, and one
in ink of knives from Ozingell, Kent. Vol. I contains impressions of Merovingian coffer decorations
sent by Abbé Cochet, and sketches of Merovingian pots and weapons from Envermeu (Seine-Maritime).

The photographs include three of British antiquities owned by the Revd R.E. Hoopells of Byers Green,
of a Roman tombstone of a cavalry-man trampling a barbarian, a painting of excavations at Chesters,
1860, three photographs of a hypocaust and fallen columns at South Shields sent to CRS by R. Blair,
1877, and four of antiquities from Frasnes, Belgium, sent by M. Chalon.

There are two groups of letters from Smith. The larger is in Vol. II, and comprises eleven from CRS
to W.H. Rolfe, 1842-6. They concern antiquities, particularly coins, preparations for publications,
proposed visits, the death of J.G. Rokewode, moves to create the BAA, and other antiquarian
activities, including his attempt to save the Roman wall on Tower Hill, London, his first visit to
see the Faussett collection, other antiquarian trips to Kent, Essex, etc., and his plans to excavate
at Richborough. A letter of Aug. 1846 supplies important background information about Smith's visit
to Tréves and Igel. Nine letters to Mayer concern preparations for the 1849 BAA congress at Chester,
the exchange of publications, gifts of plants, autographs and a water-colour of Landguard, his
research at Pevensey, publication plans, his medals, the Franco-Prussian war, news of friends and
various activities including his readings and a proposed trip to Rome, 1869. Three letters from
Mayer to CRS mention gifts of autographs from CRS, his offer to print Smith's essay on Shakespeare,
and the gift of a goblet, 1882. A letter from CRS to W.H. Rogers concerns antiquities, and there are
notes in Smith's hand, from information supplied by Mr King, about antiquities from Sinodun Hill,
Little Wittenham.

Most of the letters are addressed to CRS. They concern the receipt of papers and archaeological
finds, antiquarian endeavours, numismatics and antiquities, together with occasional remarks about
antiquarian affairs and news of mutual friends. Included here are letters from W.H. Brooke, A.
Charma, Abbé Cochet, J. Evans, J. Fenwick, M. Lower, B. de Perthes, T. Purland, J. Kendrick, W.H.
Of generally similar character are a letter from T.T. Dukes about two unpublished coins from
Wroxeter; from A.W. Franks about the transfer of Smith's collection to the BM, 1856; J.O. Halliwell
(2) about his attendance at the BAA congress of 1852, his displeasure at some of Smith's remarks about him in *Retrospections*, and the trials of being a landowner; J. Lane Oldham (5, dated 1848-9) concerning Smith's paper on Roman cremations from Ickleton, and his method of recording a Roman villa excavation at Chesterford; from A. Ruckinqueund, 1853, about the organisation of archaeology in Prussia; from J.A. Worsaae (2) telling CRS of his appointment as Inspector of Antiquarian Monuments, and commenting on the Runic stone from St. Paul's, London; and from T. Wright about a Saxon cemetery near Walton Bridge.

Letters to CRS from C.C. Rafn, 1850, and E. Tudot, 1860, announce his election to the RSNA and the Société d'Emulation de l'Allier, respectively. Six from T.J. Pettigrew (1848-9) concern Lord Londesborough's resignation as BAA president, and chide CRS for being absent from BAA committee meetings. Six from W.H. Smythe (1849) concern moves to reunite the BAA and AI.

Other letters include one from Revd J.G. Joyce to W.H. Wylie, 1864, about forthcoming excavations at Silchester and the discovery there of Carausian coins. A letter from the RSNA to the Percy Society tells of plans to publish a saga relating to the Orkneys, 1851; another via. CRS, informs Mayer of his election in 1856.

The largest group of letters is in Vol. III. It comprises c. 130 letters, in two packets, from J.C. Bruce to CRS, 1853-81. These are accompanied by others, mostly from North of England antiquarians, especially J. Clayton. Three similar letters, an invitation card and a letter from R. Blair, in Vols. I and II probably belong with them. These letters are in roughly chronological order, and provide useful information about the chronology of research and discoveries along Hadrian's wall. There are details of Roman inscriptions and coins, on which Smith's opinion was usually sought. The coins from Coventina's fountain were so numerous that CRS had to visit Chesters to catalogue them. Their publication inspired a controversy with W.T. Watkin.

Bruce usually asked CRS to check the proofs of his publications, which CRS also reviewed and publicised. In return, Bruce assisted in efforts to embarrass the BM into purchasing Smith's collection and the French government into saving the walls of Dax. Other remarks concern the exchange of publications, antiquarian affairs, including the "Mural controversy" of 1857, details of tours and visits, Bruce's ecclesiastical and educational activities, family news, and J. Clayton's poor health.

Here also is a letter from J.E. Price about London discoveries. It contains a quotation from his father's journal describing his first contacts with CRS.

920 MAY. Part of Mayer Papers (see above). Presented to Mayer by CRS on 2 Nov. 1857.

Small bound notebook containing a dedication from CRS to Mayer. It begins with five sheets of signatures of participants at the Winchester congress, with details of where they were staying. To this are appended eleven pages of notes by CRS, including lists of those who purchased tickets but could not attend, of persons absent who contributed papers and items for exhibition, and of those who attended or contributed papers who had died in the intervening years. The remaining notes incorporate information not recorded elsewhere. There are reminiscences of M. Lemonier, whom CRS visited at Sanvic, France, 1853, and of M. de Gerville, whom CRS visited at Valognes, Sep. 1843. Other anecdotes concern W. Brandreth, and a luncheon which participants at the Winchester congress missed through discourtesy. We learn also that CRS had advised the committee to visit the Bramdean pavements instead of digging barrows, but was unwisely ignored.

Liverpool Central Libraries Record Office: Mayer Papers, Correspondence

920 MAY. Part of Mayer Papers (see above). The library is rearranging the collection by author, but with no great consistency.

Nearly 2000 letters, mostly addressed to Mayer, with 280 to, and 98 from CRS. Many are arranged in art paper folders, some with interesting pencil annotations by J. Mayer.

The largest group comprises 263 letters to Mayer from J. Clarke of Saffron Walden, 1852-78. They concern personal matters, arrangements for visits, and their mutual hobbies, which included collecting, learned societies and philanthropic ventures (especially Mayer's buildings at Bebington). From 1860, when Mayer became a Captain in the volunteer movement, news about their respective cadet corps came second only to gardening. A letter of Apr. 1871 discusses their friendship, which Clarke thought arose from their similar age, single status, sympathies, beliefs and interests, especially in instructing and benefiting mankind. They assisted each other by exchanging seeds and plants (Clarke was able to make purchases from T. Rivers), military regalia, band music, publications, antiquities, and objets d'art, especially ceramics. Although, with the exception of his attempts to save the Bartlow Hills, Clarke's antiquarian activities were of limited value, there is useful information
about Saxon finds at Allington Hill, 1860, and a Saxon cemetery in Saffron Walden which CRS visited in 1876.

There are frequent comments about the activities of mutual antiquarian acquaintances, including J.Y. Akerman, W. Blackmore, Lord Braybrooke (Hon. R.C. Neville), W. Chaffers, J. Clarke, J. Evans, F.W. Fairholt, W.S. Fitch, Prof. Henslow, Lord Londoerborough, Eliza Meteyard, H.E. Eckroyd Smith, Major H. Smith (CRS's brother), A. Way, and the sculptor, G. Fontana. There is much about Mayer's purchase of Rolfe's collection, which Clarke encouraged, Rolfe's death, and the subsequent sale of his coins. Lord Talbot de Malahide's rebuke to the BM trustees for refusing the Faussett collection (July 1854) is mentioned, as are Wright's excavations at Wroxeter, his failure to obtain the secretaryship of the SAL, 1860, and his disputes with the "pre-Adamites".

Clarke's letters often mention "our mutual friend" (CRS). Mutual visits are mentioned, and Smith's antiquarian activities, although like others, Clarke was frustrated by the low priority which CRS gave to archaeology after c. 1861. There are comments about Smith's unpopularity; details of the sale of his collection; his move to Strood; horticulture; the Billy and Charley trial; the Hertz sale, 1859; his poor opinion of Bateman, 1861; his case against the Dean and Chapter of Rochester, 1863; the Fontana bust, 1865; his mistakes as executor of Fairholt's will; his membership of the Royal Horticultural Fruit Committee, 1870; his reason for supporting France during the Franco-Prussian war; his losses due to floods at Strood, 1874; and his distress at the death of his sister Maria. Details of Smith's public readings include an amusing mishap in 1869, and his admiration for Miss K. Ball, 1866-8.

Many other letters to Mayer refer to CRS, usually in connection with visits, or suggestions by CRS that Mayer might like to makes certain purchases. Letters from the Revd Godfrey Faussett (3), A.W. Franks (2), F.W. Fairholt (3), and T.J. Pettigrew, concern the sale and publication of the Faussett collection, and are accompanied by W. Chaffers' valuation (Sep. 1853). Fairholt's letter of Feb. 1857 enclosed his bill for illustrating Inventorium. Pettigreu's complains that CRS did not send him a prospectus. A letter of Sep. 1881, from C. Warne, intimates that CRS has Rodens disease.

The 54 letters from Clarke to CRS date from 1852-81. They mention the following mutual friends: J.Y. Akerman, J. Buckett (Smith's shop assistant), F.W. Fairholt, R. Fitch, G. Fontana, J. Mayer, Hon. R. Neville, E.B. Price, T. Purland, T. Rivers, W.H. Rolfe, Eckroyd Smith, S. Stevenson, and T. Wright. Other subjects include personal news, liberal politics, arrangements for visits, the receipt of publications, and Smith's progress with CA for which Clarke provided plates. In 1852, Clarke subscribed to Smith's Lympne excavations. In March 1856, he sent CRS a puppy. The men also discussed natural history, gardening, and exchanged seeds and plants. A letter of Dec. 1856 describes a visit to Smith's Liverpool Street shop, now in new hands. Smith's readings at Andover
and elsewhere are mentioned, although from the 1860s Clarke often chided him for ignoring archaeology. Nevertheless, there are notes on seals; a Roman cremation group in Clarke's collection; a Roman domino and silver coins of Aurelius from Chesterford; a Roman figurine from Harlow; a bracteate from Bosham Church, 1871; antiquarian discoveries at Saffron Walden Church, 1859; and an inscription from Rickling church, Essex. There are details of the Bartlow Hills affair, comments on various societies, include the Ethnological Society, and on preparations for the Manchester Art Exhibition, 1857. There are comments about various posthumous sales, such as those of Fairholt, 1866, Fitch, 1859, Prof. Henslow, 1861, and T. Hugo, 1877. Clarke encouraged Smith's idea of writing memoirs of deceased friends, and in 1866 promised notes on Fairholt's visits to "The Roos". In 1873 he advised CRS concerning his legal position regarding the ownership of land bordering his estate. Mention is made of the cancellation in May 1871, of Smith's intended visit to Rome.

There are 95 letters from CRS to Mayer, with a printed BAA form of Feb. 1849, signed by CRS, announcing Mayer's enrolment as an associate. The letters date from 1852-81, but most belong to the period 1870-81. They provide an important source for the chronology of Smith's researches and excursions.

From 1852, CRS actively obtained books and antiquities for Mayer's collection, and frequently recommended purchases. Items obtained via CRS include a Bronze Age urn from Felixstowe, Wickham's Saxon casket, and the residue of Smith's London collection. CRS kept Mayer well supplied with autographs, and on request, would add useful snippets of information about the writers, including Revd Brooker of Alfriston, Baroness de Faucheus, Mr Pimm. In 1856 CRS sent Mayer a collection of letters about the medal to Mehemet Ali. It became the first of several arranged collections which he sent for safekeeping and in the hope that Mayer would eventually published a selection. By 1880 CRS had become so confident in Mayer that he sent Fairholt's papers in several batches and at his own expense.

CRS regularly reassured Mayer that his collecting and sponsorship of publications would one day lead to recognition, and reinforced this belief by securing his election to various societies. He kept Mayer well informed of his progress with the various publications he sponsored, particularly Inventorium and B. Thorpe's Diplomatarium (see below). Occasionally, he would also call upon Mayer to write newspaper reviews. The letters include news of his diggings at Richborough and the proposed sale of his collection, comments on antiquarian finds such as the Ribchester helmet and Brading (Morton) Roman villa, and comments on antiquarian matters, including the seizure of Crimean antiquities, the misdeeds of various societies, and Smith's attempt to persuade the SAL to purchase Wright's bust. They contain news of events in Strood, Smith's public readings, gardening, and his family and friends. There were frequent invitations in both directions, and the men often exchanged small gifts such as books, coffee, and plants. In 1857, Mayer presented CRS with his portrait in
marble by Fontana. A letter from Maria Smith to Mayer was written in her brothers absence, in reply to an invitation to Liverpool.

Other CRS letters are to F.W. Fairholt, about the expulsion of Hugo from the BAA, and to Rolfe about his planned excavations at Richborough, 1849.

The largest group of letters to CRS are by B. Thorpe (70) and his widow (3). Dated 1861-9 these are primarily concerned with the progress of Smith's campaign, from 1862, to find sponsors for the ageing Thorpe's Diplomatarium Anglicum Aevi Saxonici (1865). Eventually, Mayer agreed to underwrite it, 1864. Following its publication, Thorpe was unable to find someone to sponsor a sequel on the Saxon charters of S.E. England, and bundled away his incomplete draft when his health finally deteriorated. Also of interest are notes on the entymology of Crundel, Kent.

A letter from Miss H.W. Barber concerns items for Mayer's museum, including a chair of Napoleon. Two letters from E. Baker are accompanied by another to "Mrs Bliss" enthusing about a Roach Smith reading. There are three letters from W. Chaffers to CRS. One of March 1854 concerns the purchase for Mayer of Douglas's letters to Faussett. A letter from G. Dowker discusses the 1881 excavations of the Wingham villa; another from J.P. Eawaker discusses his researches at Congleton, 1877. Nine letters from F.W. Fairholt, 1855-6, concern illustrating the Faussett volume and attacks on G. Hillier. A letter of Nov. 1859 from E.H. Farnden informs CRS of Rolfe's death, and eight letters from G. Fontana, 1857-68, concern his marbles of CRS and Mayer, and ask CRS to persuade Mayer to obtain commissions for him. Seven letters from D.H. Haigh, 1859-70, concern Saxon discoveries from Wilham, Worgate and Bifrons, and the Kerch discoveries. Two of 1880 from Revd R.C. Jenkins lambaste religious extremists. A poem by T.J. Jenkins is dedicated "To C.R. Smith". Four letters from M.A. Lower, 1865-8, concern his tiff with Warne and resignation from the SAL, an invitation for CRS to perform, his portrait for Percival Boxale's gallery, his poverty and problems in obtaining a pension for the Literary Fund, and his plans to dig a barrow at Rodwell. Four letters from H.S. Milman, 1881, discuss arrangements for removing Wright's bust to the SAL. Five from J.E. Price, 1880-2, concern London discoveries, and the excavations which CRS arranged for him to undertake at Brading (Morton) villa. One of six letters from J.G. Waller, 1876-81, complains of Price's fanciful interpretation of London discoveries.


Other items, probably associated with CRS comprise a sketch by T. Thurston of a Saxon glass vessel found at Ashford, Kent, a sketch by F.W. Fairholt of an African(? pot, and a drawing of Temple Farm, Strood. Smith's name is included in a printed list of associates of the Blackmore Museum.

Liverpool Central Libraries Record Office: Mayer Papers, unlisted

Part of Mayer Papers (see above).

Several large boxes of papers. They include letters to CRS from Abbé Cochet, de Ring, R. Fitch, and T. Purland, mostly about publications. Letters from Revd R.C. Jenkins and J. Thorp of Brading, 1880-81, concern Roman remains at Lyminge and Morton, respectively. There are c. 30 drawings of Irish prehistoric and medieval antiquities, a photograph of the Saxon urn with a Latin inscription from the Faussett collection, and proofs of drawings of incised marks on pottery with notes in Smith's hand. Materials relating to Inventorium include a prospectus, reviews and an invoice for printing some of the plates. Of particular interest is W. Chaffers' valuation of the Faussett Antiquities, dated 20 Sep. 1853. A small notebook of Mayer entitled "Prints, Drawings &cet, laid down 1849 to 1853" records two payments to CRS.

There are photographs of the Fontana medallions of CRS and Eliza Meteyard, a photograph of CRS (made in preparation for Walford's Portraits... (1866), a clipping about CRS, and an invitation card to Smith's dramatic reading at Bebington, April 1868. Materials relating to Smith's acquaintances include a photograph of Lord Braybrook, engravings of Abbé Cochet, E. Hawkins, and M.A. Lower, and a printed poem by A.B. James about his relative Colonel J.H. Jolliffe.
Of special interest is an unpublished work by CRS entitled Some Remarks on London in the time of the Romans... Submitted for an essay competition in 1840, it represents Smith's first general statement on Roman London.

Liverpool Central Libraries Record Office: Three letters from J. Mayer to CRS, 1854-58


These include arrangements for the Liverpool Soirée, 1854, the promise of a marble portrait by Fontana to hang in Temple Place, arrangements for Smith's public reading, receipts for publications, cover notes for money owed to CRS and Fairholt, and gifts to cover the cost of postage and travel.


Liverpool Central Libraries Record Office: Letters of W.E. Gladstone

920 GLA 6. Acquired by the library at various times. The letter to CRS may be ex. Mayer collection.

Copy by CRS of a letter of Aug. 1855, in which Gladstone replies to his enquiry as to the date on which the petition relating to Smith's museum was presented to the House of Commons.

Liverpool Central Libraries Record Office: "Letters, autographs and sundries collected by Nicholas Waterhouse of Liverpool (1877-1888)"

481
942 WAT. The items relating to CRS are presumably ex. Mayer collection. The collection was arranged by E. Waterhouse in 1915. It was purchased from Sotheby's for Liverpool in 1972.

1/78 comprises two items relating to Smith: his autograph on a scrap of paper, and a sketch by J.Y. Akerman of CRS fishing in a floppy hat. Akerman made this on a letter to CRS at his Liverpool St. address.

Liverpool Museum: "Guard Books"

Unaccessioned Museum records

Two bound folio volumes compiled during the 1870s. They contain the correspondence of C. Gatty (curator) with various persons in an attempt to determine the provenance of items in the collection which Mayer gave to Liverpool, together with associated notes, lists, sketches and photographs, etc.

Of particular relevance are two letters from CRS to Gatty. That of Nov. 1877, recommends using the Richborough volume to identify unprovenanced finds. A cover note for a cast of Chaffer's archer from Roman London is dated Oct. 1883. Also of interest are specimen labels and sketches of antiquities in Smith's hand, plates from CA, and notes by CRS on Mayer's Roman inscriptions. A letter to CRS from G. Faussett corrects family details given in an account of the BAA's visit to Heppington in 1844, published in AJ. Other letters to CRS, 1854-9, are from J. Earle, Mr Camden, and T. Wilson. Of greater importance is a letter of Feb. 1875 from J. Clarke to Gatty, which provides insights into what might be termed the "collecting policies" adopted by Rolfe and CRS.

Liverpool Museum: Papers relating to CRS and J. Mayer

Acc. No. 38.48. Almost certainly from the Mayer collection and included in his sale of autograph letters. Perhaps among the CRS correspondence which was split up following the sale of Hendriks' collection in Feb. 1910. Later owned by Martyn Mowll of Dover and presented to the Liverpool Museum after his death by W.P.D. Stebbing of KAS.

Twenty-one letters together with illustrative materials and notes. Ten of the letters are from CRS to Mayer, of which all but two date from 1856-63. They mainly concern the exchange of publications and personal news. In 1862 CRS offered Mayer a selection of coins and part of the Cuerdale coin hoard, and in May 1881 he promised to send portraits of himself, including a cameo water-colour (now
in LCLRO), a photograph, and an oil-painting by W.H. Brooke, both of which are missing. His letter of Feb. 1883 covers an autograph letter from Lord Vernon. Three of the remaining letters to CRS are from A. Maury, A. Scott Robertson and Prof. Worsaae. The latter, dated 1847, concerns the interpretation of antiquities in collections by Rolfe and B. de Perthes. Several of the remaining letters to Mayer concern the publication of Inventorium and his election to various societies.

Liverpool Museum: Papers Relating to Mayer Collection

Acc. No. 50.131. Mode of acquisition unknown.

Miscellaneous manuscripts relating to CRS and Mayer. They include a copy in Smith's hand of a "memorandum in the Revd. Br. Faussett's handwriting" dated 27 Mar. 1762, respecting his "Roman" urns from North Elmham, Norfolk; a draft by CRS of his article about the one with a Latin inscription, and another of his paper on Anglo-Saxon remains from Faversham in AC I (Smith 1858d). A letter from CRS to Mayer concerns his method of arranging pottery according to kiln source and some pottery he intended to send from Neville's excavations at Little Wilbraham, 1852. A letter from J. Clarke to J. Mayer, Apl. 1855, mentions Lord Londesborough's offer for Smith's collection. There are letters to CRS from J. Clarke, J.O. Halliwell-Phillips and J. Mayer, 1867-82. A letter from C.T. Getty to CRS, June 1875, asks for help in identifying objects from the Rolfe collection and other items in Liverpool Museum.

Liverpool Museum: Visitor's Book for Mayer's 'Egyptian Museum' in Colquitt Street, 1852-67

Bound quarto visitor's book, containing signatures. May include Smith's signature and his comments upon the museum (pers. comm., E. Southworth).

[unable to examine as on display at the time of my visit to Liverpool]

Liverpool University, Sydney Jones Library, Special Collections: Joseph Mayer - "Sprott's Chronicle Papers"

A blank-leafed volume containing William Bell's hand-written text of his *Thomas Sprott's Chronicle of profane and sacred history*, translated from the original manuscript ... in the possession of Joseph Mayer ... (Liverpool 1851). Accompanying this are 45 letters from Bell to Mayer, 26 to Mayer from others, acknowledging gifts of copies. Of eight further letters, three relate to CRS. In a letter of 1851, CRS asks Mayer to assist a fund to help Jerdan (fol. 89-90). A letter from W. Dunkin to CRS, fol. 92, mentions his excavations at Pevensey, c. 1852. Another of 1852, from J. Clarke to J. Mayer, gives a witty account of Smith's preoccupations (fol. 86. ff.).

London Borough of Camden - Swiss Cottage Library:  
Collection of letters from Eliza Meteyard

Autograph Letter File. The letters from Miss Meteyard to CRS were sent by CRS to J. Mayer, who added them to his existing collection of letters from Miss Meteyard. Lot 176 in the sale of Mayer's autograph letters, which was purchased by the Liverpool bookseller, Howell. On 28 Jan. 1924, The Camden Library purchased the collection from P.J. and A.E. Dobell, booksellers of London.

Collection of letters from E. Meteyard, 1816-79, mostly to CRS (62 letters of 1855-78) and J. Mayer (23 letters, one of 1867, the rest of 1874-5). Also one letter to Miss Meteyard from S. Walford, 1864, and a letter of introduction for Smith, from Miss Meteyard to J. Watkins, 1866.

The letters reveal Miss Meteyard's hard-working, self-effacing personality, her Pantheistic beliefs, and her high regard for CRS and Mayer. She produced kindly reviews of Smith's works, helped publicise the need for the BM to purchase his collection, and provided snips of information for his articles on the history of fruit growing. In return CRS read the proofs of her *Life of Josiah Wedgwood* in 1865, and helped publicise her books. They discussed suggestions for publications, and informed each other of their progress. Some of Miss Meteyard's works, notably the *Life of Josiah Wedgwood* were produced at great personal cost and she suffered from mean publishers and bad reviews. Interminable financial difficulties forced her to sell her cottage on Hampstead Heath. On at least two occasions she successfully petitioned CRS to help her obtain grants from the Literary Fund. CRS also ensured that she received a legacy from Fairholt's estate, and interceded with Mayer to obtain a loan for her, which apparently caused Mayer some offence. In 1868 CRS loaned her £10, which she had still not repaid in 1874. Letters of 1874 reveal that CRS was also experiencing financial difficulties at this period, which coincided with his sister's illness and death.

In a lighter vein, they exchanged comments on the weather and gardening, news about the health of relatives, her rogue servants, holiday plans, visits to mutual friends and her excursions to Strood.
London - British Library: J.C. Bruce The Story ... of the Thorncroft "find" (privately printed, Newcastle-upon-Tyne 1871), with manuscript addition.

Shelf mark 7756.de.22. Lot 210 in Smith's library sale, which was sold to the London bookseller Quaritch for 16s.

Contains dedication to CRS and a tipped-in letter from J.C. Bruce to CRS. It concerns excavations at Procolitia and arrangements for Smith's intended visit, Oct. 1871.

---

London - British Library: Sotheby's Sales Catalogues - Annotated by the Company

S.C. Sotheby (1). Deposited by the company.

Sotheby's own copies of their sales catalogues, mounted on lined paper, bound in sequence, and annotated with buyers and prices.

CRS is recorded as making a large number of purchases of Egyptian, Greek and Roman antiquities at the three-week Hertz sale of Feb. 1859. Clearly he was acting on behalf of a wealthy purchaser. CRS also bought numerous books at Fairholt's library sale of 23-26 July 1866, of which he was a beneficiary.

Collections of manuscripts pertaining to the life and work of CRS were included in the following sales:

- Apl. 1879 - Engravings, Books etc. of J.G. Nichols
- July 1887 - Autograph Letters collected by the late J. Mayer
- July 1887 - Drawings and Engravings collected by the late J. Mayer
- June 1888 - Library of the late Lord Londesborough
- Apl. 1891 - Library of the late C.R. Smith
- Nov. 1896 - Library of the late J. Clarke FSA, etc.
- Nov. 1909 - Library of the late F. Hendriks
- Feb. 1910 - Autograph Letters and Historical Documents collected by the late F. Hendriks
Unspecified items pertaining to CRS were probably also sold at a sale of 23-24 Mar. 1900 - Autograph Letters, Historical Docs. etc. of J.G. Waller

The smaller collections sold for a few shillings; the larger and more important ones for a few pounds. The only items which fetched over £ 10 were Smith's collection of illustrations relating to Roman London from J. Clarke's library, his collection of "British Antiquities", and his interleaved set of CA. Only the latter has been traced (see "London - The Society of Antiquaries of London").

There is no list of sales catalogues from 1900, so records of sales after this date which included relevant collections cannot be identified for examination.

Details of purchasers' names are incorporated into the descriptions of individual collections. Most of the relevant lots were bought by dealers, so in most cases the information cannot be used to trace missing collections. The main value of the catalogue entries lies in the evidence they provide of manuscript collections the existence of which would otherwise be unknown (see Appendix 2b).

Presumably some of these still survive in private hands.

London - British Library: T. Wright A Volume of Vocabularies ... from the Tenth Century to the Fifteenth ... 2 vols. (privately printed, Liverpool 1857 and 1873)

Press mark 12,983 h 14. From Smith's library (his bookmark on flyleaf of Vol. 1). Lot 184 in his library sale, which was purchased by B. Quaritch, bookseller of London.

The volumes contain two letters from J. Mayer, 1858 and 1873, and three from T. Wright, two of April 1857, all addressed to CRS. Those from Mayer concern details of gifts including copies of the Vocabularies, W.H. Rolfe's collection, personal and gardening news. The letters from Wright concern Anglo-Saxon words, a gift from Lord Londesborough, excavations at Wroxeter, a tile from Caersws, distributing the Vocabularies, and a request that CRS review it for the GM. There is a clipping about T. Wright from I (18 Apl. 1884).

London - British Library, Department of Manuscripts: Revd T. Hugo, "Correspondence Vol. I, 1850-1856"

Add. Ms. 30,296. Acquired 1877, by bequest from Revd T. Hugo
About 354 antiquarian letters, mostly to T. Hugo, with some BAA prospectuses, clippings and pamphlets. Most items relate to the dispute between Hugo and T.J. Pettigrew about the latter's autocratic style of running the BAA. The earliest of the 33 letters from CRS complains of Hugo's endorsement of a BAA council resolution against him, 1855, but relations between the men warmed as the row unfolded in the autumn of 1854. CRS sent Hugo comments about the poor state of the JBAA, remarking on the BAA's failure to correspond with or send the journal to foreign societies, and listing numerous resignations from the committee due to Pettigrew. He also forwarded letters on the affair from A. Hume, L. Jewitt, H.L. Long, T. Purland, T. Rankin, J.G. Waller, and J. Wodderspoon. Several of the mostly sympathetic letters received by Hugo show that Smith's ill-treatment by the BAA committee was remembered. Why Pettigrew retained any support is unclear, although in September 1854 Halliwell begged Hugo not to press his complaint because, although Pettigrew had become sensitive due to "the wear and tear of life ", he owed him too much to oppose him.

When Hugo was removed as secretary in Dec. 1854, CRS advised him to remain in the BAA and fight, but nothing could avert a mass resignation early in 1855. LAMAS was formed in consequence. CRS eventually agreed to sit on the committee, eliciting a jubilant letter to Hugo from Bish Webb. Hugo was also involved with Wright in the campaign to preserve Smith's collection and, at the beginning of 1855, wrote asking the Lord Mayor to use his influence on the Corporation. As well as comments on the progress of the affair, Smith's letters mention arrangements for LAMAS meetings, his disapproval of the appointment of aristocratic vice-presidents, the state of the SAL, the debate in November 1855 about a public library for London, London antiquities, his move to Strood, his dispute with the Dean and Chapter of Rochester, his antiquarian and social activities and those of his sister, and the draft of his paper "On Some late Discoveries in Roman London" (Smith 1856a). CRS and his sister apparently sometimes attended Hugo's church. A letter to CRS from Abbé Cochet concerns antiquities received from Wylie, and finds at Bouteilles.

---

London - British Library, Department of Manuscripts: Revd T. Hugo, "Correspondence Vol. II, 1857-1861"

Add. Ms. 30,297. Acquired 1877, by bequest from Revd T. Hugo

About 423 letters, with a few envelopes, and enclosures such as sketches and prospectuses. The 26 letters from CRS concern the campaign for his museum; the sale of Rolfe's collection, Oct. 1857; work towards publications; the Roman wall at Aldermanbury, London, 1857; finds at Rochester, 1861; the walls of Dax affair and the medal struck in his honour; his friendships with Lord Londesborough and J. Harris; and the Shrewsbury Peerage case, 1857. CRS makes acerbic comments about the social character of the KAS, which he believed was damaging archaeology, the inactivity of the SAL, the
authenticity of "Billy and Charleys", D. Turner's will, and T. Bateman's meanness. Smith's poverty not only prevented visits to France, but even prompted his retirement from LAMAS.

London - British Library, Department of Manuscripts: Revd T. Hugo, "Correspondence Vol. III, 1862-1875"

Add. Ms. 30,298. Acquired 1877, by bequest from Revd T. Hugo

About 410 letters to Hugo (41 from CRS) and 35 pages of clippings. The latter are mostly letters to the press by or about Hugo, or accounts of his lectures, and ecclesiastical affairs in London.

Smith's letters concern the exchange of publications; his poverty, 1863; his sponsorship of the CA and determination to maintain its second hand value; his antiquarian visits to Silchester, 1865, Shorne, 1868, Dorchester, Wareham and Portchester, 1870; his articles for GM and other publications, 1865-8; the state of the JBA; the AI's 1863 Rochester congress; his efforts to get subscribers for B. Thorpe's works, 1862-8; his suit against the Dean and Chapter of Rochester, 1863-5; criticisms of his museum in the CP which evoked comments about R.L. Jones, 1869; and plans for safe-keeping his correspondence, June 1869. There are remarks about Roman antiquities: a candelabrum in Andover museum, an altar at Ribchester, an inscription at Halton, and a villa near Maidstone, 1870.

Hugo and CRS co-operated on a number of occasions. In May 1867 CRS asked him to support C. Brent's election as FSA. The next month, CRS persuaded a reluctant Hugo to arrange for him to give a Shakespearean reading under the aegis of LAMAS, in support of M.A. Lower's testimonial. (There are references to Smith's other readings, including the Strood readings of 1870.) In 1870, both men took an unconventional view of the Franco-Prussian war. They campaigned for the French by writing to French newspapers via Cochet, but failed to publish any letters in England. After the war, CRS sought Hugo's held on discovering that the walls of Dax were again being demolished, 1871.

Matters concerning family and friends include Hugo's marriage, 1865; and the deaths of G. Corner, 1863, F.W. Fairholt, 1866, Mrs. Jolliffe and Captain H. Smith, both 1868, B. Thorpe, 1870, and Wickham Martin, 1870. There are details of Smith's mishandling of Fairholt's bequest, and his abortive plans to publish Fairholt's memoirs, 1869. Smith's last letters to Hugo concern the dismissal for incompetence of a governess recommended by Hugo to the Blisses school at Rochester, 1871. Thereafter, the woman lost a suit against her employer, and CRS pestered Hugo to explain why he had recommended her.
London - British Library, Department of Manuscripts: Revd T. Hugo, "Archaeological Collections Etc."

Add. Ms. 30,299. Acquired 1877, by bequest from Revd T. Hugo

Large bound volume containing clippings and ephemera relating to the BAA and other archaeological societies, prospectuses for publications, and drafts, proofs and reviews of articles by Hugo and others. Proofs corrected in Smith's hand include pages from CA and his "Note on the Medallion of Diocletian and Maximian ..." NC New Series III (1863) 194-5. There are notes in Smith's hand on pottery (in preparation for his Catalogue(?); prospectuses for the Warton Club and Thorpe's Diplomatarium Anglicum Aevi Saxonici (probably sent by CRS) and some of Smith's publications including CA, Inventorium, Illustrations, and his Memoirs of the late Frederick William Fairholt (dated 28 May, 1869), which was never published.

London - British Library, Department of Manuscripts: Revd T. Hugo, "Collections relating to the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society. 1855-1870"


A large bound volume of prospectuses, printed notices of council meetings, etc., invoices, lists of exhibits, newspaper clippings about meetings, manuscript reports, notes preparatory to articles in TLAMAS, hand-written drafts of the same, miscellaneous offprints, and proofs of articles for TLAMAS, including Smith's paper "On Some Late Discoveries in Roman London", bearing the author's corrections.

London - British Library, Department of Manuscripts: T. Wright letters to J. Mayer and others, 1853-75

Add. Ms. 33346-7. Wright's letters to Mayer were collected by the recipient and augmented by letters from Wright to Smith, which CRS had sent to Mayer for safekeeping. Lot 251 in Sotheby's 1887 sale of Mayer's collection of autograph letters, which was purchased by "Barker". Presented to the BM in Jan. 1888 by S.G. Perceval.

Two bound octavo volumes, containing 470 letters, mostly from T. Wright to J. Mayer, including 41 letters to CRS, two from CRS to Wright, both 1857, and two from CRS to Mayer, both 1875. A few letters to Wright from other antiquarian were enclosed with his letters to Mayer, and there are two
clippings about Wright, one entitled "Praise of Thomas Wright ..." by "D.D. Cantab.". The second volume ends with Wright's paper "On Anglo-Saxon Antiquities", read at Liverpool, 27 Sept. 1854.

The relationship between Wright and Mayer seems to have been based equally on friendship and mutual self-interest. They co-operated in gaining publicity for one another and - in return for gifts of books and financial support for his publications and favourite societies - Wright gained Mayer many prestigious appointments. These include election to the London Ethnographical Society, 1854, the Society of Antiquaries of France, 1858, the council of the Ethnographical Society, 1858, the vice presidency of the BAA, 1867, and the FSA, 1868. Wright even tried to find Mayer a wife. In 1859, Mayer nevertheless refused Wright's request for a loan, after which letters became infrequent for a while. Of the books sponsored by Mayer, the most important was Wright's Anglo Saxon Vocabularies, preparations for which generated a great deal of correspondence.

Wright gave Mayer tips about forthcoming sales and advised him on the purchase of various manuscript collections; a number of letters refer to the Simonides manuscript. Many more concern arrangements for Wright's frequent visits to Liverpool and his attendance at various lectures and conferences, including his 1854 lecture on Anglo-Saxon antiquities at the BAAS meeting in Liverpool. When they met at conferences, Mayer and Wright generally shared a meal with other leading antiquarians, which they termed "Faussett Club dinners". They had several friends in common, including CRS and Halliwell, who are often mentioned.

There are interesting sidelights on Wright's rift with the BAA, which was healed in 1859, his dispute with Sir John Lubbock on the antiquity of prehistoric swords, and his literary and archaeological excursions in England, Wales and France. There are useful details about Wright's excavations at Wroxeter, including the politics and fund-raising, problems in executing the work, and the initial interpretation of various discoveries, including the forum.

Wright's correspondence with CRS concerns details of his antiquarian activities and discoveries, the exchange of publications, requests for information and the loan of plates. There are comments on Smith's offer of his collection to the BM; details of a hoard from Wroxeter, which CRS examined, 1859; the Dax affair; and arrangements for his proposed readings at Ludlow and Shrewsbury, 1868. Mutual friends are referred to, and there are remarks about the death of Rolfe and Fairholt's illness, 1859. In 1858, Wright enquired about D. Turner's will, which CRS wrongly expected to benefit from.

From the end of 1874, Wright repeatedly requested Mayer to make him principal librarian at Liverpool. He was already ill, and two letters from CRS to Mayer in 1875 and two subsequent letters from Wright
to CRS reveal his decline into imbecility. His impending financial ruin was partly averted by a generous gift from Mayer, which arrived shortly before his death.

London - British Library, Department of Manuscripts: T. Wright letters to J. Mayer and others, 1845-66


Thirteen inconsequential letters, mostly from T. Wright, including one to J. Mayer of Nov. 1857, and one to CRS of May 1865. Notes by Wright include one page of the draft of a lecture on Anglo-Saxon cemeteries.

London - British Library, Department of Manuscripts: T. Wright letter to CRS


Undated, but clearly >=July 1852 as it refers to an obituary by CRS of John Dennett. Mentions public interest in Verulamium, and requests information about Pevensey.

London - British Library, Department of Manuscripts: Diaries of Sir H. Ellis


Various notebooks, including eleven manuscript diaries covering the period 1832-49. They provide interesting side-lights on the affairs of SAL and the Antiquaries' Dining Club, and include incidental references to Smith.

London - British Library, Department of Manuscripts: "Hazlitt Correspondence Vol. VIII"; letter from CRS to W. Hazlitt, 1885

Add. MS. 38905, f. 30. Bequeathed by W.C. Hazlitt
Reply to an "illegible" letter, concerning a proposal that Hazlitt's son should become secretary to the SAL.

London - British Library, Department of Manuscripts: "Baigent Collection"; Letters from CRS to F.J. Baigent, 1851 and 1879

Add. MSS. 39983, f. 413; 39985, f. 257. Donated by H.E. Cardinal and F.A. Gasquet

In the earlier letter CRS informs Baigent that he has relinquished his BAA duties. The second discusses a leaden coffin which Baigent found near Bishopstoke.

London - British Library, Department of Manuscripts: "Correspondence of Sir. R. Peel, first lord of the Treasury, 1841-50"; letters from CRS to Sir R. Peel

Add. MSS. 40555, f. 230; 40593, ff. 94, 104.

In 1844, CRS asked for a copy of D. Hardy's Catalogue of the Norman Rolls in the Tower as a gift for the Société des Antiquaires de la Ouest. In 1846, he asked for a donation to the Waghorn Testimonial. A pamphlet accompanying the letter shows CRS was an honorary assistant secretary to the appeal.

London - British Library, Department of Manuscripts: "Antiquarian Collections, correspondence, and notes by Albert Way, F.S.A., 1841-70"; letter from CRS to A. Way, 1862

Add. Mss. 41749, f. 51. Transferred from BM:DNA.

About a coin, followed by a brief account of Smith's dispute with the Dean and Chapter of Rochester.
Four letters, mostly answering enquiries about antiquities, especially coins, with a reminder that hoards are more worthy of study than rare coins because they reveal history. Other noteworthy remarks concern T. Wright, Mayer's loss in publishing *Inventorium*, an observation that "nothing substantial will be achieved" in the preservation of antiquities without a Minister of Public Instruction, and comments about the auction of an estimated 20,000 items of correspondence, which CRS sent Mayer for safekeeping. Other items include a clipping of Smith's obituary and a price list of his publications, which CRS circulated in 1887.

About Jones' attendance at a forthcoming excursion to Reculver.

Letter in preparation for visit.
London - British Library, Department of Manuscripts:
"Wellington Papers"

Wellington papers 21/123

Letter from CRS to Duke of Wellington, 11 July 1844, with draft notes of Wellington's reply.
Concerns blocking of the entrance of the Dover pharos.

London - British Museum, Department of Coins and Medals:
"Minute Book of the Ordinary Meetings of the Numismatic Society of London, Commencing 22 December, 1836" [and ending 18 Dec. 1862]

Transferred from library of the Royal Numismatic Society.

Leather-bound, lined quarto manuscript book, each entry written in ink by a secretary and signed by the chairman. Meetings followed the order: confirmation of minutes, presents, certificates, elections, admissions, exhibitions, and papers. The minutes were published in PNS but discrepancies between the published and manuscript accounts show that they were produced independently by different writers; neither is complete.

Smith's election and admission to the Society are not recorded, but there are references to his donations of publications and casts of coins, and to exhibitions and papers presented by or through him. Several coins were loaned to CRS for exhibition as a result of his antiquarian excursions in the late 1830s and 40s. On 30 Apr. 1840 CRS presented a translation of a note written in French - evidence of his proficiency in that language. It is remarkable that so many French publications were donated to the new society, also that many of its members later became members of the BAA. The meeting of 22 Apr. 1841, immediately before Smith's election as secretary, is notable for four separate contributions by CRS including his paper on Roman coins from the Thames. This suggests that CRS was anxious to be elected. The entries for 20 May 1841, to 23 May 1844 are in Smith's autograph and include long descriptions of his exhibits. AGMs are not recorded, but there are minutes of the SGM of 24 Nov. 1842, which considered the recommendations of the finance committee, on which CRS
played a prominent role. CRS remained active in the Society until his retirement in 1856, after which he made only two contributions.

London - British Museum, Department of Coins and Medals:
"Numismatic Society. Minutes of Council 1837 to 1867"

Transferred from library of Royal Numismatic Society.

Leather-bound, lined manuscript book, quarto, containing minutes of the council of the NS, written in ink by the secretaries and countersigned by the chairman. The minutes provide some insights into the early days of the Society, but are often too short to permit events and decisions to be seen in context.

Initially the Society seems to have been well funded, which raised the possibility of appointing a paid secretary - a matter of contentious debate from Nov. 1837. The issue was decided at an SGM on 14 Feb. 1839, following a requisition signed, amongst others, by CRS. The absence of a constitution probably increased the confusion which surrounded this controversy. The relationship between the Society and the Numismatic Journal is another interesting early issue. The Journal became the official publication of the Society in Dec. 1839 and was renamed the Numismatic Chronicle.

The minutes show that CRS attended as a member of council from 5 Nov. 1840. Later that month, the BM trustees refused to allow Birch to become secretary, and CRS was asked to fill his place. He seems to have refused until elected as such in May 1841. The entries for 20 May 1841 to 20 June 1844, and 27 Nov. 1845 are in Smith's hand. He resigned in June 1844 to serve in the BAA, but not before he had obtained permission from council for the BAA committee to meet fortnightly in one of their rooms, Jan. 1844.

CRS was involved in several sub-committees: A "Committee of Papers" was formed in June 1841 to oversee publications. A committee to furnish the Society's rooms was formed in the same month. In Feb. 1842 a committee was appointed to investigate the Society's financial affairs. Subscriptions had not been collected efficiently and, in consequence, strong measures were taken to ensure that members paid their arrears or were struck off the books. Numerous resignations ensued. In Oct. 1842, another committee was formed to find alternative accommodation.

From 1847, council meetings seem to have become a mere formality, and Smith's attendance became infrequent. He was nominated as secretary at annual ballots from 1848 to 1851 but no longer wrote the minutes. In Feb. 1852, CRS resigned to avoid the subscription, but was elected as an honorary
member along with J.Y. Akerman (another past secretary). He was listed as a council member from June 1853 to June 1857, and from June 1860 to June 1861, but except during 1855, rarely attended.

London - British Museum, Department of Coins and Medals: "Numismatic Society. Miscellaneous Papers" [1837 to 1841]

Transferred from library of Royal Numismatic Society.

Leather-bound, plain manuscript book, containing mounted papers. These comprise receipts for money and publications, draft agendas, minutes and letters in draft, and prospectuses for publications and sales. Items relating to CRS include a memo to him, receipts in his hand, and two petitions of c. Dec. 1838 against the appointment of a paid secretary, which CRS signed with twelve other members.


Early history unknown. From the library of Miss Mary Cobley, headmistress of Truro School for Girls, who sold it to R. Harper (antiquarian bookseller). He later sold it to W.S. Boundy of Westward Ho, who donated it to the Society in 1961.

Leather-bound, plain quarto manuscript book, containing mounted bills and receipts relating to the NS, with proof engravings of coins. The vouchers detail the Society's purchases, expenses, and financial affairs. They include a few bills submitted by CRS on account of his secretarial expenses, and orders for payment signed by him.

London - British Museum, Department of Medieval and Later Antiquities: C.R. Smith's Manuscript notebook/journal of 1830-5 "Notes on Antiquities found in City of London and in its Vicinity"

Almost certainly part of Lot 151 in the sale catalogue of Smith's library, which was purchased by "Wattali" for £2-15s. One of a group of notebooks acquired by A.W. Franks (it bears his signature) who bequeathed it to the Museum.
Notebook (184 x 161 mm) with red leather quarter binding. It begins in 1830 before CRS established his business in Lothbury. It falls into three sections, the advent of his career as a collector of London antiquities being marked by a second series of page numbers. The contents of the sections is summarised as follows:

i) Comments on stage performances, followed by two "letters" in which CRS describes his early years. These may be copies of letters sent to an admirer, or a literary device used to record his story for posterity. There follows a note of 14 Feb. 1835, about an occasion on which he met Dr Busby, with notes on Carus, drawings of samian and other antiquities, an index of place-names, and notes on coins from Sicily.

ii) Illustrations and notes of antiquities from London, with details of find-spots and dates; notes on antiquities mentioned by Latin writers and observations of workmen's trenches.

iii) Obituary of Julian Hibbert with copies of two of his letters and of his will. The latter requests friends to never speak or write of him thereafter. CRS went some way towards this request by stitching the relevant pages together.

Loose between the pages are a letter from CRS to an unknown person about antiquities, Aug. 1864, and two letters from H. MacClean to CRS, July-Aug. 1864, about a Roman leaden coffin.

London - British Museum Department of Medieval and Later Antiquities : C.R. Smith's journal/notebook "1836: Vol. II. Notes on Discoveries in London, and also on private matters"

Probable history the same as above.

A note-book (416 pages, 197 x 161 mm) bound in white vellum, used mainly to record personal matters and archaeological discoveries in London from Jan. 1836 to Apl. 1838; paginated, with a topographical index at the end.

By the end of 1836 CRS was known to leading antiquarians, notably H. Stothard and A.J. Kempe (Jan.), and H. Newman (Mar.). Kempe encouraged him to discover what he could of the layout of the Roman city. Smith's resultant paper on Roman London was read to the SAL in March 1836. He was elected, after some unpleasantness that December, and to the NS in Jan. 1837.
The journal abounds with information on City of London finds and site observations, although from Oct. 1836, CRS encountered problems of access due to obstruction by the City authorities. His most interesting observations concern Roman wall-paintings and a vault in Eastcheap; Roman piles and building remains on various sites including Lothbury, St. Thomas's Street and St. Saviour's, Southwark, and Gracechurch Street, which produced a mosaic of tesserae pressed into a matrix. A thick Roman wall (perhaps an early city wall) was discovered at the west end of Cheapside, and a drain through the City wall at London Wall. CRS also details coins and other artifacts purchased from bargees engaged in dredging near London Bridge. Much of the spoil was disposed of at Barnes, which he began to visit to make purchases.

CRS made twice yearly visits to his family in Portsmouth and the IOW, which they returned from time to time. In July 1836, he made his first antiquarian excursion to St. Alban's, where encountered "Antiquary Brown". Of greater note was his first visit to Richborough and Reculver in Oct. 1836, whereupon he met the Sandwich antiquarians W.H. Rolfe and E.S. Reader. Other excursions took him to archaeological excavations at Centurion Apse, near Brading, IOW, to "Caesar's Camp" Keston, Waltham Abbey, Guildford, Hook, Silchester and the Crondall Roman villa, Hampshire.

Mention is made of the following coin collectors: W.H. Barton of Newport, IOW, Mr Christian of Canterbury; R. Elliott of Chichester, J. Harris of Petersfield, Mr Hoof of Brook Green, Mr and Mrs Smith of Bishops Waltham, and Revd Tafnell of Mundham, Sussex. The following antiquarians and collectors are named: W. Barton of Silchester farm, W.B. Bradfield of Winchester, H. Brandreth of Brighton, J. Dennett of Newport, IOW, Mr Drew of Winchester, R. Freeman of Minster, Revd Gordon of Hemel Hempstead, Mr Hill of Chichester, T. King of Chichester, and Mr Robinson of Reading.

Smith's descriptions of antiquarian finds include a British gold coin from near Yaverland; urns found near Brighton, Roman coin hoards from the dunes near Deal, from Earnley, and near Maidenhead; samian from Pudding Pan Sands; Saxon(?) fibulae from tumuli on Shalcombe Down, IOW; and an early medieval hoard found near Bishops Waltham.


Probable history the same as above.

Note-book, similar to the above, used for personal notes and archaeological records from May 1838 to Dec. 1839. Paginated, with a topographical index at the end.
Smith's reputation and antiquarian influence grew and important London discoveries continued, including what may now be identified as monument to the dea matres in Seething Lane, and part of the Cheapside cross near Milk Street. Smith's most important acquisition was the Dowgate Saxon brooch.

A keen member of NS, CRS found himself leading a campaign (culminating on 14 Feb. 1839) to prevent the Society from employing a paid secretary. He was exasperated by the sale without record of a hoard of Saxon coins from near Gravesend and in December 1839 suggested that the NS should write to clergymen asking them to report coin finds. He became increasingly dissatisfied with the apathy of the SAL towards the preservation and recording of antiquities.

CRS made increasingly ambitious antiquarian visits, often with H. Stothard. Those to Kent took CRS to a Roman pottery at Upchurch, and a Roman and Saxon cemetery on what was later his estate at Temple Place - the source of numerous Roman coins. Other Roman sites visited by CRS included: the Bramdean villa, the mausoleum at Keston, Springhead, and a cemetery at Bow. He also visited Waltham Abbey, Butser Hill, Faversham church, and various Canterbury sites including St. Augustine's.

Antiquarian finds mentioned here include: a stone axe from Sandown, Roman pavements near Basildon, Berks., grave goods from Roman cemeteries at Oare, and near Boulogne; Roman antiquities from near Winchester and near Kits Coty House; a Saxon coin-hoard from Gravesend; and a hoard of Charles II from Brampton, Cambs.

Reference is made to the following coin collectors: Mr Christian of Canterbury, Mr Eames, J. Harriss, T. Holland and T. Tigg of Petersfield, Mr Johnstone of Croydon, Mr and Mrs Smith of Waltham, and a Miss Thatcher; to the following collectors of antiquities: E.T. Artis of Caistor, Mr Backs of Canterbury, W. Barton, farmer of Silchester, W. Crafter of Gravesend, M. de Rheims of Calais, G. Greenwood, owner of the Bramdean Roman villa, S. Steele and H. Wickham of Strood, Kent, Mr Sylvester of Springhead, and Mr Wright of Croydon; also to the following antiquarians and collectors: E.T. Artis and Revd Hodgson of Caistor, W.B. Bradfield and J.W. Hughes of Winchester, T. Charles of Maidstone, J. Dennett of Newport, IOW, Mr Drew of Winchester, R. Fox of Godmanchester, W.H. Harrison of Rochester, M. Hermand and M. le Grand of St. Omer (Pas de Calais), T. King of Chichester, and Revd J. Woodruff of Upchurch. Smith's first visit to Northern France, Sep. 1839, included a brief visit to J. Boucher de Perthes.

London - British Museum Department of Medieval and Later Antiquities: C.R. Smith, Manuscript Notebook/Journal "Vol. IIII. 1840 & 1841"
Probable history the same as above.

Note-book (378 pages, 191 x 161 mm) bound in uniform with the above, used to record personal matters, archaeological excursions and antiquarian information from Jan. 1840 to Dec. 1841. Paginated, with a topographical index at the end.

Smith's high antiquarian standing was marked by his election to the council of the SAL, Apl. 1840. His relations with the City authorities nevertheless deteriorated following a notice of eviction from Lothbury in Jan. 1840, for which CRS was awarded inadequate compensation at a court hearing in May (a verbatim account is provided). CRS moved to Liverpool Street in Sep. Notwithstanding official permission to visit excavations, he was evicted from the Royal Exchange site in Feb. 1841. His letter of protest is copied here. By contrast, a private developer allowed him full assistance in recording and preserving Roman mosaics on the site of the French Protestant Church, Threadneedle St.

Other London discoveries included Roman buildings in the Borough, hypocausts in Pudding Lane and at the junction of St. Paul's Churchyard with Cheapside, and portions of the Roman river-side wall in Upper Thames Street, which incorporated carved stones from a frieze.

CRS continued his archaeological excursions through south-east England, especially Kent, where he examined: earthworks in Mangravets Wood; Roman remains in Dane Field, Hartlip, and by Canterbury town wall; Roman cemeteries at Batfield and Gravel Pit Field in Bapchild, and at Borough Green, Bersted; a villa at the Slade, Maidstone; potteries in the Slay Marshes; and the Saxon cemetery at Milton. He also noted reused Roman tile in the fabric of the churches of Ash, St. Paul's Cray, Darenth, and Lower Halstow. Other visits in search of Roman remains took him to Colchester, Clausentum, Lympne, Pevensey, Dorchester, Oxfordshire, the Bignor Roman villa, and along the course of Stane Street near Chichester,

CRS provides details of the following antiquarian finds: a British log-boat from the river Horsey; British coins from Lexden, Essex, and from near Alfriston; a spear head from Raven's Haite, Kingston-upon-Thames; Roman coins from Bitterne, the hill opposite Kits Coty House, from near East Hill, Hastings, near Portland Castle, and from the Cheddar Mills; Roman kiln waste and coin moulds from Caistor; samian from Pudding Pan Sands; Roman burials from Harbledown, Dartford Brent, Upchurch, and near York; other Roman remains from Ightham, from caves near Settle, from Colchester and Lexden; and Saxon coin-hoards from Gravesend, and Cuerdale, Lancs.

Mention is made of the following coin-collectors: Mr Johnstone of Croydon, C. Orde of Milton, Sussex, Mr Pitmore of Colchester, R. Royce of Canterbury, Captain Stirling of Chatham, Mr Whitelock.
of Putney; the following collectors of antiquities: Mr Biggs of Bersted, Mr Briggs of Ightham, W. Crafter of Gravesend, Mr Hall of Pennenden Heath, Messrs Humphreys of Chichester, J. March of Woolwich Arsenal, Mr Merton of Tunstall, Dr. Newbury of Upchurch, Captain Shedden of Bitterne, Captain Thorley of Colchester, and its mayor - H. Vint, W. Walter of Rainham, Mr West of Tonbridge, H. Wickham of Strood, Revd J. Woodruff of Upchurch; also the following collector/antiquarians: E.T. Artis of Caistor, W. Bland of Hartlip, Kent, Revd C. Brooker of Alfriston, T. Charles of Maidstone, T.C. Croker, Captain Fox of Gravesend, Revd H. Jenkins of Stanway, Essex, Mr Lake of Bapchild, Mr Laudale of Dartford, Major E. Sheppard of Mill Hill, C. Smythe of Maidstone, Revd W. Vallance of Patrixbourne, T. Windus of Stamford Hill, and W. Wire of Colchester. CRS also records how he first met W.H. Brooke of Hastings, who later illustrated several of his publications.

Other matters concern his efforts to raise a subscription for a medal of Mehemet Ali Pacha of Egypt, and his sister Betsey's death in Sep. 1840, after a lingering illness.

London - British Museum, Department of Medieval and Later Antiquities: C.R. Smith, Manuscript Journal "1842 Vol. V".

Probable history the same as above.

Note-book (372 pages, 194 x 161 mm) similar to the above, used to record personal matters, archaeological excursions and antiquarian information from Jan. 1842 to Sept. 1843, with intermittent later entries up to Jan. 1855. The pagination ends at p. 67, but there is still a topographical index.

In October 1842, CRS visited Heppington to examine for the first time the Faussett collection. Other excursions took him to Stonehenge, Suffolk, and to Essex, where he visited Revd H. Jenkins' excavations in Cheshunt Field, Stanway. In 1842 and 1843, CRS visited France, respectively with E. Keats and with H. Stothard, his sister Maria and Miss Law. During these visits, CRS extended his contacts with French antiquarians and visited several sites, including Abbeville, where he met M. Boucher de Perthes and examined his stone implements. He also visited the Bayeux tapestry, and the Lillebonne Roman amphitheatre.

Despite being obstructed, Smith's continued to make London site observations, including a Roman pavement in Threadneedle St. and cremations at Woolwich Arsenal. In Apr. 1843, he petitioned Sir Robert Inglis to save the Roman city wall at Tower Hill. Inglis subsequently intervened with the City authorities. Smith's many London purchases included a collection of antiquities from the
Thames, compiled by the late Arthur Thiselton, of which he gives a catalogue with find-spots and sketches.

There are copies of correspondence with F. Duffus Hardy, who published some of Smith's coins without permission, Feb. 1849; notes on a court session of 22 Feb. 1849, when CRS appeared on the charge of having stolen a carved statue; and a copy of a letter which he sent to W. Tite, on 19 Nov. 1845, complaining about remarks which Tite made to the Society of British Architects. The journal also records the death of Smith's elder brother Richard in July 1842, and Smith's efforts to obtain subscriptions for medals of Prince Albert and the Pacha of Egypt.

Archaeological sites visited by CRS include Stonehenge, a cromlech below Kits Coty House, earthworks at St. George's Hill, Walton-on-Thames, Roman remains at Richborough, Walton Castle, the Balkerne Gate at Colchester, the Dover pharos, in Lockham Wood near Maidstone, in Church Field, Snodland, and at Springhead. CRS noted the presence of reused Roman tile in churches at Snodland and Swanscombe, and St. Martins and the Moot Hall, Colchester. He also visited Saxon cemeteries at Ash and Wodensburgh, Kent.

There are descriptions of the following antiquarian finds: a Gaulish gold coin found near Gravesend, British coins found in Sussex, Roman funerary monuments in the churches of Franc and Halinghen, Roman burials from Woolwich Arsenal, Roman coin hoards from Colchester, and Ancaster, Lincolnshire, and various Roman antiquities from Colchester and Upchurch.

In the course of his excursions, CRS met the coin-collectors H. Colin of Arras and G. Souquet of Étaples (both Pas-de-Calais); the following collectors of antiquities: M. Legrand of St. Omer (Pas-de-Calais), Mrs Mills of Lexden, Essex, Mr Neale of Chelmsford, H. Vint, mayor of Colchester, and H. Wickham of Strood; also the following collector/antiquarians: F. Baigent and W.B. Bradfield of Winchester, T. Charles and C. Smythe of Maidstone, M. Deville of Dieppe museum and M. Feret of Dieppe, A.J. Dunkin of Dartford, M. Durand and M. de Rheims of Calais, M. de Gerville of Valognes (Manche), M. Grandquillaume of Arras (Pas-de-Calais), W.S. Fitch of Ipswich, Revd H. Jenkins, Revd J. Layton and W.H. Rolfe of Sandwich, M. Lambert of Bayeux, Cure M. Ledieu of Étaples, M. Marmin of Boulogne museum, J.A. Repton of Chelmsford, M. Sueur-Merlin of Boulogne, C. Warne of Blandford and W. Wire of Colchester.

London - British Museum, Department of Medieval and Later Antiquities: C.R. Smith, manuscript notebook "Notes 1842. 1851 etc.".
Probable history the same as above.

A note-book (372 pages, 193 x 160 mm) bound in uniform with the above and with two manuscript notebooks in the National Library of Wales, with which this forms a series. It contains miscellaneous archaeological observations including sketches, notes from publications, and clippings, usually dated and mostly entered in chronological order, with details of the source, under boldly written subject headings. It ends with transcripts of three ballads known to his father and his brother Major Smith.

Smith's interests now appear even wider than in his notebook of 1839-42, which is primarily concerned with antiquities in south-east England. Unlike the Aberystwyth notebooks, it contains information about London antiquities, which is probably why Franks obtained this item but not the others. From Nov. 1843 there are many small London site observations, including details of mosaics, a Roman leaden coffin from Old Ford (found Oct. 1844), Roman and medieval walls found in Little Friday Street and Bread Street, sketches of other walls by W. Chaffers and E.B. Price, and remarks about artifacts and coins from the Coal Exchange site, 1848. There are sketches of London finds "sent to Newcastle", and a memo of Oct. 1844 about the theft of gold coins from the Thames by R.L. Jones.

The first part of this volume reveals an emphasis on coins, which disappears after the summer of 1844. It begins with a copy of "The Cuerdale Coins. Abstract Report of the Duchy of Lancaster" signed "D.L.O. 3rd. Oct., 1840". Other numismatic information concerns: British coins from Bognor and Alfriston; Roman hoards from near Rouen, from Kyn Gadel, near Langherne, Carmarthenshire, from Amberwood, Hants, from near Cirencester, from the Black Grounds, Chipping Warden, Northants., and Black Land, King's Sutton, Wootton, Northants. Individual Roman coins were recorded from Colchester, Horncastle, Lincolnshire, and Coddenham, Sandy, together with a silver coin found near West Dean, Sussex. Other records concern Roman and Saxon coins owned by Dr. Faussett, stycas found at York and Breach Down, Kent, Saxon coins from the Thames and from Bradwell-on-Sea, a coin of Canute from Alfriston, and coins of Henry III from Pembroke.

Another new feature is notes on French antiquarian research - often from English newspapers. There are also notes on Silchester by Captain W.T.P Shortt and J. Puttock, clippings about proposals to create a Museum of National Architecture, the state of the SAL, and about the rise in ground level in the City of London, taken from R. Kelsey's evidence before the "Commissioners for inquiring into the state of large towns ...". Other clippings concern the controversy over Smith's identification of a bridge at Tadcaster as Roman.

Setting aside the newspaper clippings, the manuscript notes refer to: "Druidic" remains from Brittany, "a sword, dagger etc." from Ireland owned by T. Bateman, a rich barrow excavated near
Battersea Bridge, Bronze Age shields from the Thames at Wandsworth, Greek terminology for spears, antiquities from the Vale of the White Horse, Oxon., Roman finds from caves near Settle, a Roman pavement found near Grantham, an inscription in tesserae found at Aldborough, Yorks., the Roman villa at Hartlip, Roman burials near Étaples, a Roman barrow excavation near Alfriston, a statuette of cupid found at Gayton, Northants., Roman pots from Caistor, Ewell, Ixworth, and Tilmanstone, Roman glass vessels from Saffron Walden, Roman fibulae from Springhead, Kent, a Saxon spear from Stowting, the Amherst composite Saxon brooch, the Saxon cemetery at Warston Hill, Northants., Saxon grave goods from Threcton, Norfolk, references to artifacts in Beowulf and medieval Latin texts, medieval wall-paintings, leaden fibulae, a papal bull found at Kingsland, "lead pieces" from Bury St. Edmunds, a bronze fibula from Burrow Castle, Sussex, and clay objects from Colchester, and Longwittenham Field.

Mention is made of the following coin-collectors: J. Barnard of Harlow, A. Kirkman, Mr Groves of Sleaford, Lincs., Mr Parker of Woodham Mortimer, G.T. Andrews and E.J. Powell, Mr Pretty, Revd Mr Maclaine, Revd E.G. Walford. CRS names H.W. Diamond and J. Inskipp of Shefford as collectors of coins and antiquities. He also mentions the following collector/antiquarians: T. Bateman, Goddard Johnson, Revd T. Horsfield of Cirencester. Two antiquarian letters, from W. Legge and H. Syer Cuming, are tipped in.

London - British Museum, Department of Medieval and Later Antiquities: Folder of letters, papers and drawings, formerly owned by CRS

Donated to CRS by W.H. Rolfe. Probably removed from Boy's Collections for a History of Sandwich in Smith's library sale (Lot 205), which was purchased by H. Southeran, bookseller of London. Includes items relating to F. Hendriks, so was probably in his collection.

Contains papers from the collection of W.H. Rolfe of Sandwich, including items passed to him by W. Boys, such as Boys' engravings of the seals of the cinque ports, 1782. Other items relating to Kent include newspaper clippings and a copy in Smith's hand of a speech on the duties of a freeman of Sandwich. Three letters from W.H. Rolfe to CRS, 1857-9, touch upon Smith's role in the sale of Rolfe's collections.

The most interesting items are seven letters from E. Keet to CRS, written between Dec. 1843 and Apl. 1844, during a tour of Italy. Keet had taken with him the Roman forceps from the Thames, and was trying to obtain an identification. He was also actively collecting for Smith, and at his behest was trying to encourage the exchange of archaeological publications.
Other papers include a letter from Captain H. Smith (C.R. Smith's brother) dated Jan. 1841, concerning recent action at Aere, the activities of Mehemet Ali, antiquarian matters, and family news. Also the original plan of Jublains, presented to CRS by G. D'Ouzouville and published in CA III and his Pevensey report, two letters from C. Sandys, 1851-4, and other letters which CRS mounted on card as autographs.


Supplied by CRS to accompany his collection when it was purchased by the Museum. Extensively annotated by A.W. Franks to enable it to serve as an official catalogue of Smith's collection.

Franks' annotations include a copy of Sotheby's valuation of the collection, with supporting sketches, dimensions, find-spots, publication references, and extensive lists of items not individually listed in the published catalogue. The unlisted items are primarily coins and tokens, pottery stamps, medieval and Roman leatherwork, and small metal objects, such as cloth seals. Each item listed has been given a BM accession number, the highest of which is 5515, indicating the total number of items in the collection. Non-London finds listed by Franks include Upchurch pottery, a Merovingian vase from Envermeu, Normandy, and bracteates found in the Somme. Evidently, Franks sometimes found it hard to match objects in the collections with entries in the published catalogue.

CRS supplied additional lists of mostly non-London items not included in his original offer to the BM. These include a dea matres altar from Winchester; a phallic statuette from Essex(?); a horse-shaped padlock, inscribed tiles and an altar inscribed by a prefect of the British fleet, all from Lympne; a bronze sword from a Roman equestrian statue(?) at Rouen; a currency bar(?) from Hod Hill; the bust of a Bacchante from Nursling; "Celtic Weapons and Implements" from Denmark, Ireland and the IOW; Gaulish coins from Brittany and the Channel Islands; Saxon pottery etc. from Ozingell and Little Wilbraham. A variety of London finds made in 1855-6 show that CRS was collecting to the very moment that he sold his collection.

Later annotations concern the whereabouts of items in the collection. They reveal a number of items sold on the basis of a false provenance, such as an African arrowhead.

London - British Museum, Department of Medieval and Later Antiquities: Departmental correspondence.
Official Museum records.

Large collection of correspondence relating to the Department's collections. Contains two letters between J. Mayer and A.W. Franks, 1853-4, concerning the BM's refusal to purchase the Faussett Collection; also eight letters of 1855-6 concerning the purchase of Smith's London collection. These include letters from CRS to Sir John Bart and Lord Londesborough, intimating his intention to sell the collection, two from A.W. Franks to E. Hawkins, advising on a suitable offer, and two from E. Hawkins advising the trustees on progress with the purchase. Two letters from CRS to J. Mayer, 1857 and 1859, concern discoveries near Strood. A letter from A.W. Franks to CRS speaks of the BM's attempts to obtain G. Payne's collection.

London - British Museum, Department of Medieval and Later Antiquities: Lord Londesborough and F.W. Fairholt

Miscellania Graphica (1857), with manuscript insertions.

Lot 523 in Sotheby's 1866 sale of Fairholt's library. Purchased by CRS who inserted his book-plate. Lot 218 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by A.W. Franks and later presented by him to the Museum.

The insertions comprise letters, notes and clippings tipped in by CRS and A.W. Franks. They include three letters from Lord Londesborough to Fairholt. One dated Jan. 1858, mentions Londesborough's acceptance of a vice-presidency of the AI. The others concern preparations for publishing the volume and antiquarian purchases. A letter to CRS, c. 1858, mentions proposals to strike a medal of him, and comments upon Smith's deserved "European position". A letter from J. Paffrone to CRS, 1869, thanks him for loaning the volume. There is a letter from Otho Fitzgerald to A.W. Franks, a newspaper obituary of Lord Londesborough, and two of Lady Otho Fitzgerald who died Nov. 1883.

London - British Museum, Department of Medieval and Later Antiquities: F. Troyon Description des Tombeaux de Bel-Air près Cheseaux sur Lausanne (Lausanne 1841), containing letter from Troyon to CRS, 16 Aug. 1852.

Shelf 3c/6. In volume of tracts of c. 1835-1940 entitled "Pamphlets. Foreign Teutonic Mixed". Perhaps part of Lot 226 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by A.W. Franks.
The Bel-Air volume was autographed and sent to CRS with a covering letter by Troyon. He states that he wrote the work while he was a student, and that subsequent discoveries have shown the graves to be of Swiss Burgondes. Differences between Burgondian graves and those of the Allemani, Franks and Anglo-Saxons are summarised.

London - British Museum, Department of Medieval and Later Antiquities: E.B. Price and J.B. Price "Antiquarian Diary" 1841-62

Date and circumstance of acquisition unknown. Probably ex. Franks collection.

Small (105 x 153 mm) jotter with plain cream pages, and red leather cover. Written with a small nib pen, often over erased pencil handwriting, with scant regard for punctuation. A pencilled note at the beginning stating it is one of Smith's journals is erroneous. The identity of the principal writer as E.B. Price is confirmed by references to his publications in GM. The identify of the second writer as Price's son is shown by a passing reference to his father's collection.

E.B. Price refers in several places to Smith, Smith's collection, and gifts from Smith, but the diary's main value lies in the insight which it provides into the life of a contemporary London collector (albeit of inferior ability to Smith). The diary contains unpublished London site observations, whose importance deserves appraisal, but is primarily devoted to records of what Price paid for various London antiquities. Unlike Smith, Price recorded the cost of each item and from whom he bought it (usually Edwards, one of Smith's young site-watchers, who later became a professional dealer). The diary reveals many similarities between Price and Smith, notably their mutual love of antiquarian excursions and their displeasure with the Corporation of London for permitting the destruction of City antiquities.

London - British Museum Central Archives: "Minutes of Standing Committee of Trustees of British Museum, Vol. XXV (1850-52)"

Official Museum records

Meetings of 22 Nov. and 13 Dec. 1851: Mention a letter from CRS to the Trustees dated 19 Nov. concerning J. Doubleday's request some years earlier to take casts of coins of Carausius and Allectus.
Meeting of 5 June 1852: Mentions letter from Hon. W. Patrick Talbot and another from CRS concerning the preservation of Verulamium.

London - British Museum Central Archives: "Minutes of Standing Committee of Trustees of British Museum, Vol. XXVI (1852-55)"

Official Museum records

Meetings of 8 Oct., 12 Nov. and 10 Dec. 1853, 14 Jan. and 3 June 1854: The Trustees reject offers of the Faussett and Wylie collections, despite pressure from the AI, etc.

Meetings of 1 and 10 Feb., 10 and 24 Mar. and 8 Sep. 1855: The Trustees consider evidence relating to the offer of Smith's collection.

London - British Museum Central Archives: "Minutes of Standing Committee of Trustees of British Museum, Vol. XXVII (1855-57)"

Official Museum records

Meeting of 8 Mar.: Trustees consider Sotheby's valuation of Smith's collection and Franks' report. They ask the Treasury to allocate an additional £2,000 for the purchase.

Meetings of 20 Mar., 24 May and 28 June: Verbal reports on progress of financing the purchase of and transferring Smith's collection.

London - British Museum Central Archives: "Original Letters and Papers XLVII (Jan.- May 1852)"

Official Museum records

Include a letter from CRS to Earl of Derby, 20 May 1852, with the latter's covering note, respecting the imminent destruction of Verulamium.
London - British Museum Central Archives: "Original Papers and Letters LII (Jan.-June 1855)"

Official Museum records

Includes letters regarding the offer of Smith's Museum, notably letters from CRS to Sir John Boileau and Lord Talbot, which were redirected with covering letters to the Trustees. Also a letter from Earl of Ellesmere covering another from Lord Londesborough.

London - British Museum Central Archives: "Original Papers and Letters LIII (July 1855 - March 1856)"

Official Museum records

Contains a letter from the Treasury, and a petition from Lord Talbot de Malahide and others recommending the purchase of Smith's collection.

London - British Museum Central Archives: "Officers' Reports 51 (June-Dec. 1853)"

Official Museum records

Includes a report from Hawkins on the Faussett collection.

London - British Museum Central Archives: "Officers' Reports 54 (Jan.-May 1855)"

Official Museum records

Contains Hawkins' report of 8 Feb. 1855, on the offer of Smith's Museum.
London - British Museum Central Archives: "Officers' Reports 56 (Jan.- May 1856)"

Official Museum records

Includes Sotheby's valuation of 8 Feb. 1856, and Franks' report on Smith's collection, which states that CRS was now including some objects from outside London.

London - British Museum, Department of Prehistoric and Romano-British Antiquities: "Sketches of Roman Pottery etc. found in London, and formerly in the Museum of C. Roach Smith, now in the British Museum"

Presumably part of Lot 151 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by "Nattali" for £2-15s. From the collection of A.W. Franks.

Plain paper drawing book (276 pages, 163 x 208 mm). The entries date primarily from Dec. 1835 - Dec. 1838 (the latest is July 1841). The title is overwritten upon an earlier pencilled title: ANTIQUITATES LONDINII ROMANI LIB II. Contains mostly pencil sketches, one or two with colour wash, which occur only on the right hand side of the page. Most depict decorated samian and pottery stamps, and include items in the collections of W. Chaffers and W.D. Saul. The annotations are brief and generally separated from the drawings so as not to spoil the aesthetic effect. They mostly comprise street names, although extra details such as depth or the donor are sometimes included. Heights are given where objects were drawn to scale. It is interesting to note a switch to drawing complete vessels in side view (rather than perspective) after g. 1837-8. Two letters are tipped in: J. Mayer to CRS, 1857, and T. Wright to CRS (undated).

London - British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings: F.W. Fairholt "A Collection of Prints and Literary Scraps Illustrating Costume"


Two small, bound folio volumes of 132 and 134 pages. In them are mounted 18th and 19th century prints of medieval costume as depicted by old manuscripts, brasses, archaeological finds and contemporary fashions; notes and articles on costume clipped from periodicals; manuscript notes,
including poems about costume in Fairholt's hand; and autograph letters about costume. The latter include a letter from J.A. Repton, which mentions CRS and SAL politics, and a cover note from A. Bromd to CRS regarding a drawing of embroidered gloves of James I, 1847.

London - British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings: F.W. Fairholt "Miscellaneous [Plates]"

Acc. Nos. 1866.5.12.3997-4072; Press Mark 290* a.3. Bequeathed by F.W. Fairholt

Large bound volume, containing proofs of engravings by F.W. Fairholt for various publications. They include engravings made from Smith's drawings of Birdoswald for his Pevensey report, and of Jublains and other subjects for CA.

London - British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings: Proofs of F.W. Fairholt's engravings for three publications by C.R. Smith

Acc. Nos. 1866.5.12.3508-3575 and 3636-3643; Press Mark 290* a.5. Bequeathed by F.W. Fairholt

Large bound volume containing proofs of illustrations for: C.R. Smith The Antiquities of Richborough, Reculver and Lyme (1850); C.R. Smith (Ed.) Inventorium Sepulchrale (printed for the subscribers, London 1856); C.R. Smith Illustrations of Roman London (printed for the subscribers, London 1859).

London - British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings: F.W. Fairholt, "Reports of Congresses held at Canterbury, Winchester and Gloucester"


A large volume containing Fairholt's compilations relating to the first three BAA congresses, and other BAA events. Although the contents were mounted by Fairholt, the binding was clearly supplied by the Museum. It is unclear if the mounts were previously bound, or had been loose in a portfolio. The principal items are clippings about the congresses from newspapers and periodicals, accompanied by drawings and engravings (mostly by Fairholt) of BAA congresses and exhibits, and commercial engravings of places visited during the congresses. With them are autographs cut from letters, and
correspondence about BAA affairs, especially requests for Fairholt's services. The accompanying printed ephemera may represent the fullest compilation relating to the early years of the BAA. It comprises prospectuses for the BAA, with details of its officers, its congresses, meetings, publications, and medals. Other items include tickets for meetings, and public notices displayed at congresses. Some items of correspondence were apparently given by CRS as mementoes or autographs.

Items of particular interest are described under Fairholt's sectional headings:

The First Congress at Canterbury. 1844

A note explains how Fairholt came to be involved with the BAA. Sketches by Fairholt of barrow-digging in Bourne Park, show the position of some of the Saxon barrows and a skeleton in situ. Antiquities exhumed include a spear, purse clasp, [Frankish] urn, and a Roman flagon and glass vessel. Sketches of Breach Down show the relative position of the barrows. Other illustrations include three sketches by Fairholt of Bourne Park (Lord A. Conyngham's home), a water-colour of Saxon antiquities by W. Bowman, and a pencil sketch of Richborough in a storm.

There is a full collection of newspaper clippings and tracts relating to the BAA schism of 1844-5. The seeds of dissent were sown in Canterbury: viz a copy of a letter from F.W. Fairholt, which refutes an accusation that he was engaged by the ILN, 15 Sep. A pamphlet of doggerel verse entitled Archaeological Lavs bemoans the troubles. Transcripts by T.C. Croker of 34 letters of Mar.-Apl. 1845, include letters from CRS to T.C. Croker, T.E. Jones, T.W. King and J.H. Parker. A letter by CRS informs "Mr Hardwicke" that his BAA donation could not be returned. Letters between others concern H. Ellis's resignation from the Wright party's committee, Croker's resignation from Way's committee, disclaimers re. statements issued by Way's party, inquiries made to Croker about what had transpired, and his replies. The Earl of Caernarfon was surprised to find that he had agreed to preside at two BAA congresses at Winchester. Letters to Croker from A. Way stress that no one on his committee was behind an accusation to Lord Haddington that he had neglected his Admiralty work because of antiquarian matters.

There are letters to CRS from S. Bing(?), F.C. Lukis, R. Sainthill, Captain W.T.P. Shortt, H. Wickham, and W. Wire. They concern antiquities, preparations for publications, and the demolition of Heavitree Church. Another from J. Bell describes his method of drawing pots from their shadows, and complains of the vandalism of antiquities in Newcastle. A letter from CRS to Fairholt concerns preparations for publications.

The Second Congress at Winchester. 1845
Illustrations by Fairholt of exhibits (some unlabelled), and events and places visited during the congress, include: water-colours of 'The Round Table, Winchester', a circular brooch in J. Dennett's IOW collection, ink and wash sketches of Barton Oratory, IOW, pencil sketches of St. Thomas's Church, Winchester (5), a bench(?) in Winchester Cathedral, a "Saxon sundial" in St. Michael's Church, a headless statue in J.N. Hughes' collection from Hyde Abbey, Kent, and Saxon remains in T. Bateman's collection. An article in Fairholt's hand compares the BAA and AI congresses. It is accompanied by the manuscript of a paper on Jarrow by H. Macenery(7). The printed ephemera includes S. Isaacson's poem To T.J. Pettigrew, Esq., on the death of the Revd R.H. Barham.

The correspondence dates from 1844-5, and includes ten letters to CRS: A note from J.M. Webster covers a letter from C. Beauchamp about the Roman pavement at West Dean, Wilts. A letter from E.G. Walford concerns an "ancient British" glass bead from Chipping Warden. Two from Goddard Johnson concern a 2nd-century coin hoard from Beachamwell, and Bronze Age axes and scrap from Carlton Rode, Shrops. T. Insip reports Roman burials 6-7 miles from his house. A letter from C. Ade details his late Saxon coin hoard from Wilton Street, near Alfriston. Letters from W.B. Bradfield, J. Lindsay, J. Sydenham, D. Turner and J. Warren concern coins, including a British coin from Ixworth, the threat to Saxon barrows in Greenwich Park, and illustrations required of Fairholt.

One of two letters from CRS informs Fairholt about the discovery of Tudor frescos in Carpenter's Hall, London. It is accompanied by four ink and wash sketches of them by Fairholt.

The Third Congress at Gloucester, 1846

The clippings are accompanied by Fairholt's sketches of places and objects viewed during the week. These include Booth Hall, Gloucester, Goodrich Hall (2), the Gloucester Peg Tankard, and a medieval jug owned by Mr Groves of Gloucester. Other illustrations comprise: a water-colour by F.C. Lukis, of prehistoric artifacts from a cist in Guernsey; a water-colour by CRS of the female mosaic head from Finch Lane, London; and a pencil drawing by CRS of Saxon remains from Ozingell. Anonymous illustrations include a tracing of a Roman inscription from York, and drawings and water-colours of nine Irish annular fibulae and an Anglo-Saxon brooch. These are accompanied by a letter of 1851 from E. Clibborn to the Royal Irish Academy about an Irish gold brooch in their possession.

The remaining letters date from 1846-50. They include three to F.W. Fairholt from Lord Londesborough, about the purchase of a camera lucida to help Lady L. illustrate objects. Four letters to Fairholt from CRS concern illustrations and subscriptions for their Richborough volume; Smith's ill health, July 1848; and the departure of his assistant, Harris, Sep. 1848.
Letters to CRS (c. 16) are from: E. Benn, about the date of porcelain seals from Ireland; W. Bland, about the Hartlip villa and Roman pottery from Key Street; W.S. Fitch, about a fibula from a tumulus at Ottley, and a BAA meeting at Colchester in 1846; L.H. Forster, about a Roman mortarium (sketch) from Leckhampston Hill; Mr Herbert(?) of Lenton, accompanying a list of inscriptions requested by CRS, asking his opinion on them; M. Lower, requiring Fairholt to prepare illustrations; T.C. Neale about Mr Chancellor's excavations at Chelmsford; E. Peacock, enclosing impression of seal from Messingham; J. Penfold, asking CRS to examine a lead coffin from Croydon; E.B. Price (to CRS or Fairholt), about his resignation from the BAA council due to Pettigrew's behaviour, Mar. 1850; J.A. Repton and T. Lott about preparations for the Gloucester congress and other meetings; W.H. Rolfe about railway operations near Richborough and R. Freeman's Saxon brooch [the Amherst brooch]; C. Warne (prob. to CRS) about Medhurst's Roman burial excavations; C. Wellbeloved, about the excavation of a tumulus at Driffield; W. Wire, about his reason for not giving the provenance of urn finds, and a Roman pavement in Mersey Island churchyard. Topics common to several of these letters include antiquarian visits, the exchange of illustrations and preparations for publications.

A letter from H.B.H. Quelch to T.C. Croker concerns a Roman burial from Broadhinton, and was redirected to CRS. A note from Lord Northampton to T.C. Croker covers a letter from the Committee of the AI, which insists that they made no attempt to prejudice the people of Gloucester against the BAA, Sep. 1846.

London - British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings:
F.W. Fairholt, "Reports of Congresses held at Warwick, Worcester and Chester"


A large volume in uniform with the above, containing Fairholt's compilations relating to the fourth, fifth and sixth BAA congresses, and other BAA events. The contents are closely similar in character to the previous volume. The following are of special interest:

The Fourth Congress at Warwick, 1847

Here are sketches by Fairholt of Warwick antiquities, namely a wooden effigy of a bear over the entrance to the Beauchamp Chapel, St. Mary's Church; Guy's Tower; and a ring from the castle. The pamphlets include guides to various historic buildings in Warwick, and G. Isaacs Incotile [On early metallurgy] (Warwick, 20 July 1847). [5 pp.]
The letters date from 1847-50. There are two from CRS to Fairholt about irritations at the congress, and the Verulamium Roman theatre. A letter to Fairholt from S.W. Stephenson states his intention to ask CRS for the loan of casts of coins for illustration in his Dictionary, 1850.

The 17 letters definitely to CRS are from F.J. Baigent, about cremations etc. at Winchester; T. Bateman, about his Saxon helmet; W. Betham, about Etruscan (?) coins from Fullamore, King's County, Ireland; W. Fenwick (?), about hoard of stycas, some in Bateman's collection; G. Johnson, about a loan of Norfolk finds; E. Cresy, about alterations to Dartford Church; H. Diamond, about a wood sample; de Gerville, about his gift of Gallo-Roman medals; W. Horley, about antiquities from near Toddington; A.F. Sprague, covering the sketch of a vase from Stanway, Essex; J. Warren, about the fate of his collection and a spur from Ixworth; and from H. Vachill (?), about Roman cremations owned by S. Allen, and a tumulus excavation at Foulness. Others come from E.J. Artis, W. Black, F.C. Lukis, Captain W.T.P. Shorttt, C. Wellbeloved and concern the identification of antiquities, BAA affairs including the congress, and preparations for publications.

Letters probably to CRS are from R. Cooke, who offers to loan the BAA sketches of a Saxon stone in St. Dennis' Churchyard, York; W. Gomonde about the antiquity of an Irish brooch; J. King about Roman (?) finds near Abingdon; W.H. Quelch about antiquities near Marlborough, including Roman finds from Holly Hill; another from G. Utterley (?).

The Fifth Congress at Worcester, 1848

The only Fairholt sketches are of arms and armour in Worcester Town Hall and a urine bottle from Thebes.

The Sixth Congress at Chester, 1849

Here are Fairholt sketches of a silver dice owned by Mr Norris, the BAA congress museum, and BAA members barging on the Llangollen canal. Other illustrations comprise a pencil sketch by CRS (?) of the GENIO AVERNI altar from Chester, 1849, and water-colours of a gold torque owned by the Marquis of Westminster. The ephemera includes J. Mayer's Plan of Tilting Ground at Gawsworth, Cheshire, red and white ribbons worn at BAA receptions in Liverpool, and an engraving of the "mazea dish" presented to Lord A. Conyngham by the HSLC. There are prospectuses for the Roman wall pilgrimage of 1849, and for the first edition of J.C. Bruce's The Roman Wall.

Letters to Fairholt mostly concern arrangements for the congress and other antiquarian gatherings, his papers, the Hillier collection, and estimates and briefs for engravings. A letter from A.H. Burkitt invites Fairholt to join the Antiquarian Etching Club. The three letters from CRS concern
woodcuts for the congress museum catalogue, and of the Chester wall and a Roman hair-pin from Hartlip. They include news of antiquarians, the poor state of BAA finances, Smith's hectic life, and work for the Richborough volume.

There are letters to CRS from: J. Archer about the walls of Chelmsford; J.C. Bruce about his drawings of the Roman wall; C.P. Burney about an election; W. Crafter about a seal from Northfleet; H. Durden about a horseshoe from Hod Hill; J.G. Lowe about embankments at Verulamium; T.J. Pettigrew about BAA matters. Letters from J. Bell, J. Lee and T. Rankin concern the delivery and receipt of publications; there is correspondence from F. Baigent and J. Yates.

The above letters are mostly dated 1849, but towards the end of the volume are materials relating to BAA events from 1850-55. These include prospectuses for congresses, inspections of City antiquities and various non-BAA publications.

London - British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings: F.W. Fairholt, "British Archaeological Association Vol. 3 - Drawings of Engravings Etc. Executed for that Association"


Large volume bound in uniform with the two previous items, but containing proofs of woodcuts prepared for BAA publications including the Winchester and Gloucester congress volumes, together with original drawings, mainly by Fairholt. To these are added proofs from Wright's Archaeological Album (1845) and printed ephemera relating to Hugo's expulsion as BAA secretary.

One drawing depicts the Roman drain in Fish Street Hill, London, Dec. 1844. Others, captioned by CRS, depict: the Roman villas at Hartlip, 1848, and Chipping Warden; a gold ring sent by J. Moore of West Coker; a North African (?) water jug; and British coins owned by Goddard Johnson, from Weston, Norfolk, 1852.

London - British Museum, Department of Western Asiatic Antiquities: "Museum Correspondence, 1st Ser."

Official museum records.
Bound quarto volumes of mounted correspondence, alphabetically arranged, numbered in sequence. Nos. 4953-74 comprise letters to and from CRS, 1843-53.

There are eleven letters from CRS to S. Birch, and the copy of a reply. These letters concern antiquities, NS and BAA affairs, and complaints about abusive behaviour towards Smith's servant by the AI secretary, H.B. Lane. The six letters from CRS to E. Hawkins include a thank-you note for a gift of 35 coins from the Cuerdale hoard, which CRS imagines was given through Hawkin's influence. Others concern the publication without permission of some of Smith's Roman coins by J. Doubleday of the BM, and unanswered requests for information about a fragment of Egyptian sculpture which CRS sent for identification. There are prospectuses for Inventorium and CA III. Annotations on the latter explain why CRS resumed its publication.

________________________

**London - British Museum, Department of Western Asiatic Antiquities: "Museum Correspondence, 2nd Ser., Vol. 12"**

A bound quarto volume of correspondence, containing three letters from CRS, 1857-8 and undated.

A letter to E. Hawkins concerns a passage in the CA about the purchase of Smith's museum to which Hawkins objected. A letter to F. Hobler encourages CRS to publish his coins and comments on the stupidity of regarding "Billy and Charleys" as forged pilgrim signs.

________________________

**London - Chiswick Library: Letter from CRS, Nov. 1844**

Layton Collection, Autographs and Manuscripts section, Ref. 17427 Lo. I. Collection bequeathed to Brentford by T. Layton in 1911.

Letter to an unspecified person about the NS and the proposed exhibition of R. Hollier's Bacchante head from Nursling.

________________________

**London - Corporation of London Record Office: "Minutes of Committee for Establishing a Library at the Guildhall" and "Library Journal", 1841-56**

Include records of Smith's numerous contributions to the embryo museum, and his correspondence with the committee (the Library Journal comprises a fair copy of the Minutes).
Various letters from CRS to the Committee are preserved. Most are covering notes for donations of antiquities and publications, with requests that they should subscribe to various publications, and occasional acid remarks about the loss of antiquities on London building sites.

Minutes of meetings on 11 May, 15 June, 28 July and 14 Dec. contain details of Smith's claim for compensation for his eviction from Lothbury, and the award made by the Mayor's court on 18 July.

Original letters from CRS to the London Bridge Committee re. his claim for compensation. All three are fully quoted in the Committee Journal.

Q.WIL/1-612. Purchased for GLC members library c. 1950-60. Later transferred to London County Record Office.

Collection of letters (some from antiquarians), notes and autographs, mainly 19th century but some earlier, from Willis's print collection. It also includes a faded photograph of CRS by Mayall of Brighton, Mar. 1876. A cover note shows that CRS had sent this to J.W. Taylor.

Reg. Nos. 47696; 53492; unaccessioned, respectively. Origin unknown.
Sketches of Cheapside Cross in black ink and pencil on cream artists paper, watermarked with the date 1837. Also an anonymous and unregistered drawing of "Roman vase found near Lothbury 1835". Below the vase is sketched a pair of rusty pliers(?) - an early drawing by CRS(?).

London - Guildhall Library, Department of Prints and Drawings: Ink and sepia sketch of 48 Lothbury by J.G. Waller

Reg. No. 65188. Formerly part of Gardner collection. Purchased at Sotheby's, May 1924.

London - Guildhall Library, Department of Prints and Drawings: Sketches of Roman columns found on French Protestant Church site, Threadneedle Street, 1841

Shelf mark: Pr. 244/Fre(2). Origin unknown.

Two wash sketches by T. Charles, captioned in Smith's hand.

London - Guildhall Library, Department of Prints and Drawings: "Excavations in the City to 1843"

Reg. No. 69872. Origin unknown

Plan of Roman remains found in sewer trenches in Lad Lane, Wood Street and Maiden Lane. By "G[eorge] W[illkie]"; and in Smith's hand: "Prepared for C.R. Smith ... 25th January 1843"

London - Kensington and Chelsea Public Libraries: Two letters to CRS from J.O. Halliwell

MSS. 24514 and 24515. Mode of acquisition unknown.


Bound volume dating from the early years of the Society. Smith's name is appended in ink to a printed provisional list of the committee, and is found in a list of council members of 15 Jan. 1856.


Records Smith's rare appearances at early LAMAS meetings.

Museum of London - London and Middlesex Archaeological Society Library: "Minutes of the Provisional Committee" [of LAMAS, 1855]

Smith's name appears in a list of subscribers. The minutes also record a letter from Lord Londesborough, urging the Society to purchase Smith's museum.

London - Museum of London Library: "Phillip Norman Collection"

Ref. No. 6222. The letters to CRS about Roman London probably come from one of Smith's personal copies of Illustrations, which was later owned by Norman (see below).

A folder containing c. 150 mounted drawings, newspaper cuttings and letters on antiquarian topics. Contains eleven letters to CRS of 1857-1885 from J.G. Waller, F.W. Fairholt and W. Chaffers, concerning preparations for Illustrations, and from J.R. Price, F.W. Fairholt, W.M. Wylie, J MacPrigson and G.C. Ireland on antiquarian discoveries in London. Also clippings about the Roman "villa" in Lower Thames Street, London, a review of Illustrations from I, clippings from newspapers of 1884 about the destruction of Roman London wall, a list of samian stamps owned by W. Ransom of Hitchin, and a letter from J.G. Waller to P. Norman dated 1903 about Smith's views on Roman London.
Two letters to CRS from J.E. Price and F.W. Fairholt, dated 1864, have been published by P. Marsden
(1978).


Part of Lot 270 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by B. Quaritch, bookseller of London. Later owned by P. Norman.

Includes a proof engraving captioned by Smith, a pencil tracing by F.W. Fairholt of J. Conyers' illustrations of a Roman pottery kiln and pottery found under St. Paul's, and a water-colour of a Roman mosaic discovered in Cateaton Street, 1841. Marginal notes in Smith's hand include details of potters' stamps from Westwell, Kent, and Wilderspool. Letters in the "Phillip Norman Collection" probably came from this volume (see above).


Reg. No. 77.109. Part of Lot 270 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by B. Quaritch, bookseller of London. Lot 562 in the sale of F. Hendriks' library, which was purchased by "Shepherd" for 15s. Purchased from "Images" bookshop, 5 May 1977.

Contains letters, notes and drawings (the loose items now in separate folder). These include a series of documents of 1845, which relate to the "Royal Exchange affair". They comprise original notes made by Mr Booth, reporter, on remarks made by W. Tite before the RIBA about Smith's alleged misappropriation of antiquities from the Royal Exchange site, Smith's copy of his letter to W. Tite complaining of misrepresentation, Tite's reply, which makes additional allegations, and a draft of Smith's statement about the allegations to a public BAA meeting.

Other items include ten letters to CRS dated 1851-82 from J.A. Repton, Sir H. Ellis, T. Wright, Dr S. Birch, T.D.E. Gunstone, L. Jewitt, A. White and W.H. Overall. There are circulars (with annotations) asking for subscribers to Smith's works, and sketches of antiquities.
London - Museum of London Library: C.R. Smith
*Retrospections, Social and Archaeological Vols. I-III (1883-91)*


Includes letter of 1881 from CRS to his niece, Mary Anne Smith, offering thanks for some IOW dialect words, and describing one of his readings and a visit to Rochester theatre. It is accompanied by two clippings of reviews of *Retrospections* and H. Smetham's *To the Memory of Charles Roach Smith, A Tribute* (1891).

---

London - Museum of London Library: J. Collingwood Bruce *The Roman Wall* 3rd. Edit. (1867); C.R. Smith's copy with manuscript interleavings

Reg. No. 5121. Lot 209 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by B. Quaritch, bookseller of London. Obtained from HMSO, 7 July 1964.

Leather-bound volume, containing three water-colours of the Wall, with a list in Smith's hand of other sketches which he had made along the Wall. Other clippings, notes, sketches, and eight letters, 1852-67, relate to Wall discoveries and their publication. One letter is from C. Wellbeloved; the remainder are from J.C. Bruce.

---

London - Museum of London, Department of Printed Ephemera: "Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire - Soirée to the Members of the British Association" (reprinted from *Liverpool Mercury* 29 Sep. 1854)

Acc. No.: A 19220

Pamphlet; the reverse side bears a cover note from CRS (to an unknown person) respecting a parcel of printed items.
London - Office of Population Censuses and Surveys, General Register Office (St. Catherine's House, 10 Kingsway): C.R. Smith's death certificate

Sep. 1890, Vol. 2a, No. 280

Cause of death: "Disease of the Heart, and ascites, 9 months. Pulmonary Congestion, 5 days". Maria Smith not listed under this name.

London - Principal Registry of the Family Division, Somerset House, Strand: Wills admitted to probate since 1858

Proved 1866: F.W. Fairholt, in his testament of 9 Sep. 1865, makes CRS the principal beneficiary in a will valued at £6,000. The rents from his houses are to support his housekeeper during her lifetime, and thereafter are to belong to CRS. Various friends are left objects from his collections and money to buy a ring. The most valuable items from his collection are to be divided between various museums, and the remainder sold at auction.

Proved 1868: Major Henry Smith leaves most of his property to four nieces, making CRS and nephew Colonel J.H. Jolliffe the executors. CRS receives his watch, chain, seals and snuff box.

Proved 1874: Maria Smith, in her testament of 23 Aug. 1869, divides £550 between five of her nieces, and leaves the residue (total value <£2,000) to CRS.

Proved 1890: CRS, in his testament of 7 June 1889, provides for his "messuages, lands, tenements, real estate", and personal possessions to be sold or auctioned, and his library to be auctioned at Sotheby's. Total value: £1,740. The estate is divided more or less equally between eight favourite nieces and nephews. Nine other nieces and nephews receive sums of money from £20 to £200. His housekeeper receives £200, plus furniture to the value of £50, and her daughter receives £20. Five friends receive small sums of money from £20 to £50.

CRS is not named in Lord Londesborough's will, nor that of J. Mayer.

London - Public Record Office: Census returns since 1841

The following refer to Smith's household:
London - owned by Beth Richardson: Letter from CRS tipped into copy of *The Antiquities of Richborough, Reculver and Lymne* (1850).

History unknown; no clear association between letter and previous owners who inscribed their names in the volume.

Concerns a forthcoming trip to Silchester, and requests for historical references, Apl. 1845.


Official Society Records

Brief minutes of the Society's Council meetings, which were held monthly at 3 p.m. on Monday or Tuesday. Prior to the early 1840s their main purpose was to prepare messages of congratulations and condolence to the Sovereign, approve requests for withdrawal from the Society and the payment of tradesmen's bills, and other organisational matters such as improvements to the library. The meetings were usually followed by a "Committee of Papers" to determine which should be placed in *Archaeologia*. They included several by CRS, notably his account of the Strood cemetery, which was ordered to be printed without plates, May 1840 - a stipulation by no means unusual.

CRS attended council regularly during his years in office following his election in 1840 and 1844. His attendance does not appear to have revitalised proceedings until June 1843, when lobbied by Smith, the Society acted for the first time to assist the preservation of an ancient monument - the Roman wall at Tower Hill. The year 1845 saw reforms to the Society's financial management, although the role of the President (then confined to raising the Society's social status) remained a subject of debate.

Official Society Records, similar to the above.

CRS held office again for two years from 1849. Council meetings were now better attended and livelier, but otherwise the status quo prevailed.

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: "Election Book; 1819-49"


A wide octavo, vellum-bound notebook containing four kinds of records written in black ink on plain paper. The first comprises details of subscriptions received, and is followed by some basic accounts. The third section records nominees for election with names of supporters and that the person was elected (rarely was anyone refused). CRS was elected on 22 Dec. 1836 with the support of W. Betham, J. Buckler, W.H. Rosser, R. Taylor, G.R. Corner and A.J. Kempe. The final section comprises lists of "parcels booked".

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: "Society of Antiquaries Correspondence"

Official Society records, with some additional items.

Selected official correspondence, boxed by year, then alphabetically by surname. (See also group of four letters to CRS relating to J.Y. Akerman below).

Includes ten letters from CRS, of which eight were to the Secretary, J.Y. Akerman, 1849-52 and 1857. They concern requests for antiquarian information, arrangements for producing and distributing publications, and for antiquities sent for exhibition, including "British rings" from Woolmer Forest, Hants. In 1849 CRS donated flints found by E. Peacock on Manton Common near Messingham, and expressed the hope that the Society would form a museum of national antiquities.

A request for Smith's views on the Society's statutes from E. Hawkins drew a lambast against appointing officers on grounds of social status rather than ability, 1852. Later that year, CRS
nevertheless suggested that the King of Denmark should be enrolled in recognition of his efforts for Danish national antiquities. A letter to CRS from C. Watson at Wylie's behest sought information about a Roman villa near Winchester. It elicited a statement that he had already told Wylie why this could not be given, 1857.

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: Four letters to CRS concerning J.Y. Akerman

Society of Antiquaries Correspondence for 1873. From F. Hendriks' collection.

Four letters to CRS. In a small paper folder with a cover note in Hendriks' (?) hand. Three of the letters, of 1873-83, are from H.W. Diamond, and explain his dislike of J.Y. Akerman. They also contain personal news, and comments on Smith's Retrospections. The fourth is from Akerman - about his poor health and the place-name "Arundel".

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: "Architectural Remains"

Shelf 195H. Items collected and donated by Fellows during the mid to late 19th century.

Large bound volume containing drawings of architecture. Contains a letter to CRS from J. Brom, about sculptures in Sandbach Church, accompanied by drawings, 1847.

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: "Britannia Romana"

Items collected and donated by Fellows during the mid to late 19th century.

Four green portfolios containing prints and drawings, etc., of Romano-British antiquities.

Vol. I contains sketches by CRS of Roman pottery from the Strood cemetery owned by H. Wickham, 1838, and from Otterham Creek, owned by Revd J. Woodruffe.

Vol. II contains items captioned by CRS, and Basire's original drawings for Archaeologia of the Roman statuettes found in the Thames, 1837.
Vol. III contains Smith's drawings of samian found between Lothbury and London Wall, Sep. 1835, a samian vase from Newgate Street owned by W.D. Saull, moulded samian depicting gladiators in combat, and samian and mortarium stamps mentioned in Smith's paper in Archaeologia.

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: "Celts, Saxons, Lake Dwellers"

Shelf 306D. Includes items donated to J.Y. Akerman, CRS and J. Mayer. Compiled by F. Hendriks. Lot 186 in the 1909 sale of his library, which was bought by "Treguskis" for £2-6s. Presented to the Society by R. Griffin, FSA, May 1916.

Quarto volume, bound in half-morocco, containing engravings, tracts, clippings, one or two photographs, and drawings by J. Basire, F. Troyon and C. Lukis, etc. There are drawings of grave goods by J.Y. Akerman, and an inked-over pencil sketch by CRS of "La pierre couverte, near Saumur".

The seven letters to CRS are dated 1852-67. One from F.C. Lukis discusses French terminology for prehistoric monuments. Two in French from Dr. F. Keller concern the exchange of publications, Swiss archaeology, and Dr Meyer's visit to his museum. A notice of Dr. Keller's death, sent to CRS by Dr Meyer, was forwarded to J. Mayer. Two letters from G. Omerod discuss the writer's excavations in 1860 of Roman remains at Sedbury Park, Gloucester. Other letters are from W.H. Black and A. Pryer.

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: "Drawings and Engravings of Primeval Antiquities belonging to the Society of Antiquaries, 1846"

Shelf 195H. Items collected and donated by Fellows during the mid 19th century.

Bound folio volume. Includes drawing donated by CRS in Feb. 1851, of a flint implement owned by R. Fitch of Norwich.

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: Early Medieval Prints and Drawings

Shelf 195H. Items collected and donated by Fellows during the mid to late 19th century.
Large bound volume containing drawings of medieval antiquities. Includes a wash drawing of beads found at Stowting, captioned by CRS and perhaps by him. Drawings of Saxon weapons from the site also captioned by CRS are certainly not his work. Also captioned by CRS are drawings of ornamental pieces of metal riveted to the Saxon bronze bowl from Gilton.

---

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: "Inscriptions Vol. 1"

Items collected and donated by Fellows during the mid-late 19th century.

Large portfolio containing mounted drawings and prints of inscriptions. Includes rubbings, with transcriptions, of two early Christian inscriptions in the wall of St. Gereon's Church, Cologne, made by CRS, 13 Aug. 1851.

---

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: "Utensils and Furniture"

Shelf 195H. Items collected and donated by Fellows during the mid to late 19th century.

Large bound volume containing drawings and a few coloured engravings. Includes a pencil drawing, by CRS(?), of a decorated samian bowl from Ewell.

---

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: [County Portfolio for] "Essex"

Items collected and donated by Fellows during the mid to late 19th century.

Large, red bound volume containing drawings, water-colours and engravings. A wash sketch by E. Stock, dated 1844, of a leaden coffin found near Old Ford, is captioned in Smith's hand.

---

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: [County Portfolio for] "Kent L-R"
Items collected and donated by Fellows during the mid to late 19th century.

Red bound portfolio containing drawings, etc. It includes a plan of Richborough walls by Boys, with other plans and drawings of the site captioned by CRS, and presumably by Rolfe. They include plans, dated 1843, of angle bastions etc. and a Roman building found Sep. 1846, accompanied by sections of the amphitheatre, plans of a gateway, and elevations of the walls.

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: [County Portfolio for] "London L-O"

Items collected and donated by Fellows during the mid to late 19th century.

Large, red bound portfolio containing prints, drawings and water-colours. Includes a water-colour sketch by CRS of a drain captioned "Roman arch - London Wall".

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: [County Portfolio for] "Yorkshire A-K"

Items collected and donated by Fellows during the mid to late 19th century.

Large, red bound portfolio containing prints and drawings. Includes ink sketch by CRS of the supposed Roman bridge over the Coe at Grimston, with a detail of mason's marks on the South side. CRS added a caption to another view by F.W. Fairholt.

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: "Drawings by Waller, Claxton, etc. Architectural Detail, Wall Paintings, Glass, etc."


Bound volume of drawings. Includes pencil drawings by J.G. Waller of lamps and medieval bone skates and leatherwork in Smith's museum.
Top Solander A. From various sources. The BAA's official records were lost when its premises were bombed during the Second World War.

Portfolio of loose drawings, engravings etc. by various BAA members, including sketches by Fairholt in preparation for JBAA plates. Many are captioned in ink by CRS. Of note are drawings by CRS of a "Flint Celt" found at Hillyards, Shanklin, 1844, and a Bronze Age spear from the Thames, 1847. Two letters to CRS from T.F. Dukes, 1845, concern a facsimile of the Charter of Baldred to Glastonbury, Mr Wood's catalogue of coins from Wroxeter, and a post-medieval sword found at Oswestry, 1832.

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: C.R. Smith, scrapbook entitled "British Archaeological Association First Congress 1844"

Shelf 182j. Part of Lot 208 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by B. Quaritch, bookseller of London. Subsequent history unknown until purchased from Quaritch in the early 1970s.

First of six scrapbooks, prepared by CRS as mementoes of the early BAA Congresses, 1844-49. Brown card covers, brown calf quarter binding, gilt title, a home-made decorative frontispiece, and pages of thin brown paper. The third volume in the series contains a letter to CRS from E. Purland, 24 Jan. 1849, which suggests that Purland may have mounted some of the contents of this volume at least, and prepared the title page.

The scrapbook includes prospectuses, programmes, engravings (some from Wright's Archaeological Album), a very full series of newspaper and journal clippings, receipts, letters and ephemera relating to the 1844 Canterbury congress. There are several printed poems and a draft in manuscript of a dramatic interlude inspired by the proceedings. These are accompanied by Smith's ticket, jottings and printed notices about arrangements, a list of subscribers to the medal, and clippings and 18th and 19th century prints relating to places associated with the congress. Of particular interest are a prospectus of "The Archaeological and Topographical Institution of Great Britain ..." proposed in 1835 by J. Britton and E.W. Brayley, and list by W. Bromet of suggestions for the congress, dated 8 May 1844. There are original sketches of two Saxon graves in "Bourne Paddock", antiquities from Bourne Park, and "Antient works at Dymchurch. April 1845". There are two drafts of papers, one by M. de Gerville of Valognes.

The letters comprise apologies for non-attendance; requests for tickets, publications and/or congress medals; requests or thanks for enrolment in the BAA; letters accepting or declining invitations to serve on congress committees; promises and news of papers and exhibits; covering letters for notes, papers, and gifts or loans for exhibition; letters of thanks on their return or on receiving medals, suggestions for and offers of assistance with visits, and plans for publishing the congress.

Two letters from G. Faussett express fears about arrangements for viewing his collection. A letter from A. Way suggests he was frustrated by not being able to attend. One from the Duke of Wellington responds to Smith's complaint that the doors of the Dover pharos had been blocked, stating that the authorities had wanted to prevent dilapidation inexpensively. M.H. Bloxham promised to mention the matter in his proposed work on ecclesiastical architecture. Five letters are by J. Britton. One complains that he was unable to contribute to the congress. In 1856 he sought information about the BAA's origins for a note on the origin of the Wiltshire Archaeological Society.

After the congress, J.O. Halliwell and A.B. Hope were among those who wrote to congratulate Smith, but the Athenaeum and Pictorial Times gave bad reviews. W. Bergne, W. Masters, T. Wright and Lord A. Conyngham wrote to CRS expressing annoyance. A letter on the subject from T.C. Croker to T. Wright comments on Madden's dislike of the BAA.

A few letters are unrelated to the congress. These are from C.P. Brewry(?) about attempts to preserve frescoes at East Wickham, 1844, and from J.O.L. Jewitt, J.R. Planché (who discussed a steelyard weight), and W.H. Rolfe.

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: C.R. Smith, scrapbook entitled "British Archaeological Association Second Congress 1845"

Shelf 182J. History as for above item.

Bound in uniform with the above, with similar contents, but relating to the Winchester congress of 1845. They include part of the congress Transactions, and clippings of two advertisements of publications issued to coincide with the congresses. The newspaper clippings also concern Way's rival congress in September, which prompted correspondence in national newspapers from members of both parties, claiming for their respective bodies the pedigree of the Canterbury congress. Editorial in The Times favoured the BAA, and that their congress attracted the talent is confirmed by two letters to CRS from H. Moody, who attended both.


There are manuscript notes by persons who attended the congress with information not fully published in the Transactions. They include a report by J. Caporn on drawings of an altar piece found in St. Mary Magdalene's Church, Reigate; a memo from J.G. Comely about a road supposedly built over a crypt, and tumuli in Burghclere parish, Oxford; a letter from Lord A. Conyngham about a mound on Barham Downs which transpired to be "a cooking place"; a letter and memo from Revd A.B. Hutchins about a
gold Saxon ring from Bosington, a Roman mosaic pavement at Thruxton, Hants., the bad character of
H.P. Burt, and a list of his exhibits at Winchester. These included an ancient boat discovered in
the Rother, 1822, and a fibula from Idmiston Down. J.N. Hughes and H.S. Richardson also submitted
lists of exhibits. A letter from S.B. Meyrick concerns chain mail in Goodrich Court, previously used
by a rope maker to smooth ropes. "J.P." provided details of an inscription on a stone found at
Chichester in the 18th century.

There are pencil sketches of inscriptions on stone in Winchester cathedral, and of "remains of the
(so called) palace of Canute in Chain or Porter's Lane, Southampton", by G. Forder. A water-colour,
by CRS(?), depicts the base of a medieval jug found in Water Lane, Winchester, 1847.

The tracts include J.A. Barton's paper to the congress on A Descriptive Account of the late Convent
or Oratory of Barton, in the Isle of Wight (Winchester 1845). This was published after Queen
Victoria had expressed an interest in the paper. There are two copies of S. Isaacson's poem To T.J.
Pettigrew, Esq. on the death of the Rev. R.H. Barham. Other printed ephemera includes W.H. Rolfe's
Plan of the Remains of Silchester ... for ... Members of the Noviomagian Society, 1st July 1841.
There is a priced auction catalogue of W.B. Bradfield's coins and antiquities, 4 Dec. 1845, and a
Sotheby's catalogue of the sale of J.N. Hughes' collection, 15 Feb. 1848.

Other items include sketches made during the congress by F.W. Fairholt and J.G. Waller of (T.C.?)
Brown, Lord A. Conyngham, and W. Jerdan; signatures clipped from letters by J.A. Repton, R.
Sainthill, and I. Warner; clippings concerning T. King of Chichester, who died during the congress,
and a pre-printed invitation slip of the Union Lodge, Chichester, of which King was secretary. A
letter to CRS from R. Elliott describes King's last illness.

Letters concerning general BAA business include those of G. Atherley, D.H. Haigh (2), E. Hincks, T.
Rankin and C.D. Wallis(?). The congress encouraged new members, giving rise to correspondence from
G. Greenwood, L. Hill, G. Hunt, O. Lemonnier and Agnes Shedden. Afterwards there followed a brisk
debate about the next venue. D.H. Haigh preferred Norwich to Lincoln, which was not yet connected to
the rail system.

Letters on antiquarian matters include two from G. Greenwood about coins from the Bramdean villa,
Smith's interpretation of figures on the pavements, and captions for the benefit of visitors. Two
letters from W.J. Hesleden concern former investigations at Thornton College and his family history;
another from A.B. Hutchins concerns a tessellated pavement with inscription near Thruxton, Hants.
Three letters from S. Isaacson, May-June 1845, describe his excavations with T. Bateman. A.J. Kempe
wrote about a forged coffin plate of King Arthur and similarly inscribed letters in Smith's
possession. A letter from H. Jenkins, 1845, concerns his exploration of a supposed Roman road from
Southampton to Dover. A letter from H. Moody concerns a Saxon fibula from Hyde Abbey and a small crucifix from Wolvesley Castle, Winchester. J. Sydenham wrote about Dorchester Council's attempts to save Poundbury.

Letters to CRS of a more personal nature are from W. Betham about the sad circumstances of J. Dennett; from J. Dennett, about the fatal fight between W. Roach and R. Newman; W.H. Rolfe, about additions to his collection and plans to build a railway past Richborough; from E. Keet, giving his first impressions of Portchester Castle; and from A.J. Kempe about the attack on CRS in GM. They are accompanied by a clipping about the death of F. Roach.

---

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: C.R. Smith, scrapbook entitled "British Archaeological Association Third Congress 1846"

Shelf 182J. History as for above item.

Bound in uniform with the above volumes, although the contents are mounted on white cartridge paper and outlined in red ink. The contents are similar, but relate to the Gloucester congress. The 120 letters are almost all addressed to Smith.

The Gloucester venue was suggested by A.H. Burkitt during the Winchester congress in a letter to CRS. His reasons were the upstanding remains at Gloucester and its accessibility by rail. For the first time, this congress was hosted by a local archaeological society. This was awkward because the Gloucester Archaeological Society included members of the AI, who stressed in local newspapers that the Society was not affiliated to either national Society.

From the correspondence, this congress was not so well organised or successful as the previous two. Its date was changed at short notice due to the end of the Parliamentary session. Its closing moments were marred when W. Guise, president of the local society, complained about Pettigrew's behaviour. Whereas the latter had been high-handed, Guise had been over-sensitive, according to a note by T. Purland entitled "An Answer to Mr Guise". Nevertheless, the BAA's subsequent accusation that Guise wished to spoil the meeting due to AI sympathies is untenable, since Guise had facilitated Cresy's survey of Gloucester cathedral and had invited the BAA Committee to dinner (both letters survive here).

Other letters concerning arrangements for the congress, the publications of its Transactions, and congratulations on its success. They are from: C. Bailey, W. Beck, B. Poste, J. Brewin (2), J.

Several letters and notes on antiquarian matters were prompted by the congress. C. Baily's wrote the first page of a "Note upon the churches near to Gloucester visited after the Congress". T.F. Dukes corresponded about a manuscript in the Badminton Library entitled "Notitia Cambro Britannica" and his manuscripts relating to Wotton Underedge and Tintern Abbey. J. Lee described three Christian Syriac manuscripts which he sent for exhibition; J. Huxtable also provided a description of his exhibits. T. Rankin submitted a sketch-map and notes about a supposed Roman camp near Pocklington, and Roman urns from Millington. An anonymous letter suggests that the BAA should trace the Roman road from Gloucester to Cirencester, and describes local traditions about its route and remains near its course at Drays Court, etc. There is a description in French of a flint "celt" reputedly used in Druid ceremonies.

Original illustrations comprise a sketch map by T.C. Brown of remains in Cirencester; an ink and wash sketch by "B.W." of a copper gilt Saxon brooch from Yorkshire in J. Huxtable's collection; water-colours of stone pilae and a pillar from Wroxeter owned by W. Clayton of the farm, and of a painted window in Goodrich Court, Hereford. A page of sample colours was submitted by J.L. Williams to illustrate his paper on recipes in Way's Fabliaux. There are two photographs: of three Roman altars from Bisley, Gloucestershire, 1862, and of a male Roman statuette "discovered in 1863 on the property of Mr Lawrence at Wycomb, Andoversford".

A few letters concern ordinary BAA business, such as arrangements for meetings, and preparations for and the distribution of publications. These are from Lord A. Conyngham, H.H. Fryer, A. Lemmonier, T.J. Pettigrew and J.L. Williams. A letter to CRS from F.W. Fairholt is of a more personal nature.
M.C. Jones sought Smith's opinion on the identification of certain Roman inscriptions as milestones, and W. Hargrove sought his views on an altar from St. Dennis, Walmgate, York. Captain W.T.P. Shortt sent details of Exeter finds, accompanied by a paper on the Roman baths in Queen Street, Exeter. CRS notes that this was read at a public BAA meeting on 28 Oct. 1846. A letter from J. Buckman, 1850, shows that he sent CRS his Cirencester book in exchange for Smith's Richborough. He describes the wall at Cirencester and the Dyer Street baths, enclosing four water-colours of the wall.

The Printed ephemera includes: A Catalogue of the Museum formed at Gloucester during the Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland (Gloucester 1860); a Map of the Roman Stations, Roads and Buildings within XV miles of Woodchester; and T. Wiblet's The Handbook of Gloucester or Traveller's Chart... (Cheltenham 1846). The last was probably written for visitors to the BAA congress.

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: C.R. Smith, scrapbook entitled "British Archaeological Association Fourth Congress 1847"

Shelf 182J. History as for above item.

Bound in uniform with the above volumes. The cover title incorrectly reads "Fifth". The contents are mounted on brown paper and are similar to those of previous volumes, but relate to the Warwick congress. They include 159 letters, all but three to Smith, and one or two biographical items relating to participants. There are memos in Smith's hand about the organisation of meetings, and notices by CRS giving details of the arrangements. Again, the volume may have been arranged for CRS by Purland, as suggested by his letter of 6 Nov. 1847.

The local Institution gave every assistance, though most of its members belonged to the AI. BAA members were poorly represented, partly because the date was changed due to a general election. Strenuous efforts were made to obtain the support of local gentry, assisted by F.A. Skidmore and J.G. Jackson of the AI. Some refused to help the BAA, but others joined it; three letters concern the enrolment of P.O. Callaghan, W.P. Griffith and Lord Leigh. Lord A. Conyngham canvassed local nobility for support, but was too ill to attend. The congress was successful, but Wright and CRS were unhappy about certain aspects; they kept silent to avoid unpleasantness.

Most of the letters concern arrangements for the congress, the publication of its papers, and congratulations on its success. They are from: C.C. Adams, E.T. Artis (2), C. Baily, T. Bateman, M.H. Bloxham (2), C.H. Bracebridge (2), W.T. Bree, Lord Brooke, W.A. Chatterton, Lord Clarendon, J.

The BAA visit to Stratford boosted a local campaign to purchase Shakespeare's birthplace. There are engravings of the house, including an architects plan, with prospectuses of the committee who raised the appeal. After the BAA had pledged support, R. Phillimore promised a contribution, and W.P. Griffith intimated that the College of Freemasons of the Church would vote on whether they should support the campaign; another letter on the subject came from W. Wansey.

Several letters and notes on antiquarian matters were prompted by the congress: M.H. Bloxham described low tumuli near Hartlepool; W.H. Dyez provided a note on the Charlecote collection; H.B.J. Harris listed the brethren of the Hospital of Robert Earl of Warwick; J.G. Jackson described the history of Arbury; M.A. Lower wrote twice about a cast lead coffer (?) from East Willingdon, Eastbourne; M. Philips described a discovery of spears in earthworks at Welcombe; T. Purland reported the discovery of cists and weapons in the Norfolk family's vault, Arundel; T. Rankin noted an inscription over the door of Weaverthorpe Church; C. Warne sent notes on Warwick Chapel.

Three items of printed ephemera were prompted by the congress: Anon A Short Account of the Hospital of Robert Earl of Leycester in Warwick (Warwick 1847); Revd W. Drake A Guide to Kenilworth Castle and Church (Warwick 1847); and G. Isaac Incostile, which was rushed off during the congress.

A list of drawings exhibited by G.J.L. Williams at the 1846 congress mentions two silver cups in Cambridge - the "Poison Cup" of Clare Hall and another given by Mary of Valencia to Pembroke College. Other drawings are of a silver fire dog and 17th century chair in the Knole, Kent, a 15th century chair in a public house at Edenbridge, and the door of a cell in Bocarde prison, Oxford.

A few letters concern antiquarian matters unconnected with the congress: F.C. Lukis wrote of Worsaae's visit and his own antiquarian tour of Northamptonshire some years before; Revd B. Poste
asked Smith's opinion on coins marked TASCIO; J.J.A. Worsaae described his visit to Paris and Abbeville and requested news of problems in the SAL and the Commission on the BM; W.H. Rolfe complained of an influx of visitors due to the railway. The only original illustration is a watercolour and ink sketch, by CRS(?) of a "Pavement in chapel at Ripon".

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: C.R. Smith, scrapbook entitled "British Archaeological Association Fifth Congress 1848"

Shelf 182J. History as for above item.

Bound in uniform with the above volumes. The contents are mounted on cream cartridge paper and outlined in red ink. The subject matter is similar, but relates to the Worcester congress.

Despite clashing with the British Association's congress, this congress received much local support, mainly because it was initiated by the sheriff and supported by the mayor. The letters include two from J.O. Halliwell and two more from Wright, written from Worcester before the congress, which rejoice at the local committee's enthusiasm.


Several letters and notes on antiquarian matters were prompted by the congress: T. Bateman reported his recent barrow diggings; J. Couch(?) sent two letters with sketches, about an unworked stone with Latin inscription from Pyle, and casts of others in Swansea from Port Talbot, etc.; T.F. Dukes provided an ink and wash drawing and plan of Malvern Hill camp; L. Jewitt reported making casts of his antiquities in gutta-percha, also the discovery at Lincoln of skeletons, a chalice in a stone
coffin, and coins, including one of Vespasian, from near the Castle. J. Jones discussed a cross in
Nevern Churchyard; J.E. Lee sketched a gold watch reputedly of Ann Boelyn; F. Ledsam listed medieval
coins and small finds from Wooley Castle, exhibited during the congress; E. Llandaff gave
recollections of a small mosaic at Caerwent, now destroyed; M.A. Lower discussed the find spot of 45
Roman coins at Pevensey; F.C. Lukis described his exhibits, including bones from Guernsey cromlechs,
and sent an engraving of a pax from East Grafton. J.A. Repton described his father's restorations at
Worcester cathedral, enclosing a sketch of a capital in the choir. E.M. Rudd sent a tracing of a
Roman inscription found 1818, and W.J. Taylor listed dies and medals sent for exhibition. The only
water-colour is of a Roman coin mounted in a finger-ring, found at Ilchester, in J. Moore's
collection.

The printed ephemera includes a prospectus for Smith's Richborough of 9 Aug. 1848, which was
evidently circulated at the congress.

Following Smith's visit to Caerleon, G. Omerod sent sketches and four letters with constructional
details of its walls and buttresses and of Chepstow Castle. With them is a clipping of July 1848
about progress with Caerleon museum. Omerod and M. Steel also described a coin of Allectus found at
Chepstow Castle. In 1850 Omerod reported the discovery of 400 coins at Caerwent, and two letters of
1862 concern the find-spot of coins at Wollaston, notes and sketches of the Roman archway at
Caerwent, and details of a Roman coin from there.

A few letters concern ordinary BAA business, like the recruitment of new members and preparations for
publications. These are from A. Ashpital, J. Lee, J. Woake (2), T. Wright. On a more personal note,
L. Jewitt wrote asking CRS to be godfather, with F.W. Fairholt, to his son.

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: C.R. Smith,
scrapbook entitled "British Archaeological Association Sixth
Congress 1849"

Shelf 182J. History as for above item.

Uniformly bound with the above volumes, although the contents are mounted on thin cream paper. The
subject matter is similar, but relates to the Chester congress. Unlike the previous volumes, it
contains relatively few letters kept merely for their value as autographs. Instead it includes
materials unrelated to the congress, especially about Chester antiquities including the recurring
debate on the date of its walls. The congress transactions were not published, but the printed
ephemera here includes accounts of papers read at the congress from various local newspapers. They
are accompanied by a printed catalogue of the congress museum, and W.H. Massie's engraving of "Chester in 1850 ...".


Most of the manuscripts concern antiquarian information associated with the congress: W. Ayrton sent two letters (with sketches) about a Roman altar found at Chester; J.C. Bruce answered questions about the construction of the Wall, recalled visits to Corbridge, Risingham and Rochester, and urged CRS to join his 1849 Wall expedition (2 letters); F.W. Fairholt reported handmills from the river at Conway; J. Harrison sent measured pencil drawings of a stone lion from Wetherley, Cheshire; this was also mentioned by J. Hinklin, who made two reports about discoveries in Duke Street, Chester, and supplied a sketch of a cupid; G. Steeny sent an account of the discovery in 1816 of gold torques at Bryn Shon, near Hollywell.

A number of other antiquarian sketches are apparently by CRS. They comprise items owned by J. Brown, including a circular, bronze Saxon brooch found in 1802 at Ebnington, Campden, Gloucestershire, and Roman items from Springhead: two bronze bells in J. Silvester's collection, and a silver ring with intaglio. There are ink sketches by CRS of Roman inscriptions from Chester owned by F. Potts and J. Peacock.

The congress marked the start of Smith's association with J. Mayer (4 letters). Immediately thereafter, Mayer ingratiated himself by giving £5 towards the illustration of Chester antiquities and printing an account of the excursion to Liverpool (also here). This is accompanied by J. Stonehouse's Stanzas, suggested by seeing a chair, belonging to Joseph Mayer ..., and the engraving of Mayer seated in his Roscoe chair.

That CRS remained interested in Chester discoveries is evidenced by the newspaper clippings. He also continued to correspond with Chester antiquarians such as Revd W. Massie. His seven letters of 1849 concern an outbreak of cholera in Chester immediately after the congress; details of the BAA's tour of the Chester walls; details and sketches of recent Chester small-finds; a pig of lead and column found behind Commonhall Street; and an altar from Boughton.

A pencil sketch of a funerary relief from Whitefriars, Chester, 1851, apparently accompanied a letter to CRS from W. Ayrton, who asked what it was and if it could be moved. Another pencil sketch of a
Roman altar is dated 1862. During 1863, J. Peacock described and sketched recent finds, including a hypocaust, tessellated pavement, Roman masonry, late Roman coins, legionary tiles and a small bronze (2 letters). He also sent pencil sketches of a Roman bronze figurine and altar from Daniels Fields, Chester, 1864.

The volume concludes with a fairly complete collection of newspaper and journal clippings regarding the debate on the date of Chester's walls, 1883-87. They are accompanied by letters on the subject to CRS from the City Surveyor - M. Jones; from two excavators of the walls - G.P.L. Brock (2) and J.A. Picton (2); and from W. de G. Birch and T. Hughes (2). A printed circular by J.L. Derby of 1887 requested funds for further investigations. There are also a number of antiquarian sketches by J.H.W. of inscriptions found in 1887.


Bound octavo scrapbook containing newspaper clippings, leaflets, notes, prints, sketches, notes, autographs and letters illustrative of the first four congresses of the BAA. Each congress has a separate section marked by a title page.

Items relating to CRS include his signature and a list in his hand of some of the antiquarians who attended the Canterbury congress. A letter to CRS from W.P. Hunt urged that the BAA should purchase Burgh Castle, which was to be sold, Aug. 1846. Croker replied, saying that there would be insufficient support and the BAA's main aim was to spread a respect for archaeology.


Bound octavo scrapbook containing newspaper clippings, leaflets, notes, prints, sketches, notes, autographs and letters illustrating the fifth and sixth BAA congresses.
It includes a letter from CRS to T.F.D. Croker asking him to take charge of a plate for his father, 1851.

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: A.J. Dunkin
"MSS. and Correspondence upon the First Report of the British Archaeological Association"

Part MSS. 877. On permanent loan from BAA since 1982.

Bound scrapbook containing memorabilia compiled by A.J. Dunkin in preparation for editing A Report of the Proceedings of the British Archaeological Association, at the First General Meeting, held at Canterbury ... 1844 (1845). The contents are arranged alphabetically by writer, and comprise drafts of papers, and business correspondence with authors and subscribers.

Of particular interest is a letter from Dunkin to his father, written during the Canterbury congress, complaining of lack of sleep due to the heavy schedule and Smith's late habits.

Among the letters are 27 from CRS to A.J. Dunkin, Sep. 1844 to Apl. 1845. Most comprise advice about and information for Dunkin's work, the opportunity for which had arisen because the BAA Committee had decided not to publish the proceedings. In October, CRS advised that there could be no objection to republishing papers quoted verbatim in Canterbury newspapers, together with a summary of the remaining papers, Dunkin's own notes, and a list of those attending. The Committee nevertheless became nervous about the interest shown in the papers, especially when Stapleton reported that he had submitted his paper to Dunkin, rather than Archaeologia as recommended by the Committee, because Dunkin had implied this was Smith's advice. CRS was even more embarrassed and annoyed to learn that Dunkin had partly printed the paper against his advice, and when he asked Dunkin to return it, he did not comply immediately, Nov. 1844. CRS nevertheless helped Dunkin to compile a list of those who had attended the congress, and recommended subscribers. His letter of Nov. 1844 mentions that the BAA Committee was worried by plans for the publication of The Antiquarian and Archaeological Year Book for 1844, which helps explain their sensitivity about Wright's Archaeological Album.

Other topics include social events following the Canterbury congress; Smith's visit to the IOW, where he obtained a "celt" from Ellyards and excavated barrows, and his excavation of three rooms of a Roman villa at Bighton, near Alresford, Oct. 1844; his ill health due to BAA business, Nov. 1844; his preparations for publications; and the story of how he narrowly escaped a gas explosion.
A letter from CRS to Mrs Dunkin refused an invitation to visit on Christmas day, because of a family gathering, 1844. Another to CRS from R. Jobbins concerns the preparation of plates for Dunkin's volume, Feb. 1845. Other items include the printed account of Smith's speech on receiving a silver tea and coffee service from members of the Numismatic Association.


Part of MS.857. Lot 144 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by "Nattali" for £29. Later owned by Sir Thomas Neame. Purchased c. 1971 for the Society from Commin's Antiquarian Bookshop, Bournemouth.

Set of the CA bound in boards, with brown leather gilt quarter binding. Vols. 1 to 5 are interleaved, and many plates have been tinted, apparently by CRS. Many notes and sketches by CRS were added directly on the interleaved pages. Other items are mostly mounted or tipped in at relevant places; some are loose. The sketches - some by Fairholt - include originals of those published in CA but not listed below. There are many engravings and one or two photographs of comparanda, with cross-references to other relevant publications (notably Bulletin Monumental), and literary references to artifacts. The remaining material comprises letters, clippings including reviews of CA, offprints and annotated proofs.

Volume I

Of the seventeen letters to Smith, several concern current excavations and antiquarian discoveries: J. Brent described his excavation of Saxon graves at Stowting, 1866; F. Dixon, the excavation of a pavement on Lancing Down, Sussex, in the 1830s; J. Dixon reported Jackson's excavations of Doukerbottom Cave, near Kilnsey, 1856; T. Kent, the discovery of samian on Bodmin Moor, 1849. W.H. Haigh discussed his excavation of the Sarre Saxon cemetery, 1869, and a coin of Eupardus. J.W. Jones described the discovery of Saxon graves and grave goods near Warwick, 1875. G. Payne reported his excavation of a Roman villa at Barning, Kent, and E. Phillips sent drawings of pilgrim badges and an inscribed brooch and rings from the river Sherborne, Coventry.

The remaining letters mostly concern the derivation of place names, with personal news and antiquarian chatter. They are from J. Clarke, Captain W.T.P. Shortt (2), T. Wright (2), and W.M. Wylie. H.L. Long and A.F. Smythe disagreed with B. Poste's paper on Caesar's landing, 1852 and 1844 respectively. Another letter is illegible.
The notes include details of Roman potters' stamps from Bitterne, from around Boulogne (sent by M. Marmin), from Chester in F. Pott's collection, from Colchester in J. Bryant's collection, from Essex in King's collection, from Lancaster, from London in J.E. Price's collection, from Strood, and from Wilderspool, Lancs. Other interesting items include descriptions of four barrows on Breach Down, Kent, notes by CRS on Cissbury, and on his visit to Halinghen, 1842, accompanied by his unpublished etching of the church.

The pencil sketches include a Roman brooch in H. Durden's collection from Woodgates, Dorset, 1851, a bronze Roman figurine from Ambletearn, and "Cunobarras" on a leaden pan from Caistor, 1864.

**Volume II**

Of the twelve letters to Smith, probably the most interesting is from F.W. Fairholt about his German tour, 1857. It describes the fate of a Roman bas-relief in Augsberg town hall, which had depicted men stowing away wine. Two of three letters from W.M. Wylie, concern a monument to the dea matres found at Heddenheim, 1857, in Wiesbaden Museum; they are accompanied by a sketch. The third concerns Akerman's Saxon finds from Salisbury, and the Frankish situla published in Museum Schoeplini, which Wylie knew was wrongly identified as a crown but could not decide what it was. Another from J.A. Repton describes Saxon urns from Merkhall, Caistors. The remaining letters are from J.Y. Akerman, D.H. Haigh, Captain W.T.P. Shortt, S.W. Stevenson, and T. Wright (2). The latter recommended the use of old glosses to determine Saxon terms for artifacts.

Of the sketches, the most interesting are by CRS of the Roman villa at Hartlip (ink over pencil). Also noteworthy is a reference to "MS 1860 to 1866" - presumably one of Smith's missing manuscript books.

**Volume III**

Contains twelve letters on antiquarian matters, and a personal note from F.W. Fairholt.

Most of the inserted items relate to Roman antiquities. R. Blair described the destruction of roadside tombs near Bremenium, 1885. H. Crosthwaite corrected CRS on the provenance of a sword from Embleton. T.D.E. Gunstone sent a letter and pencil sketch of a marble Roman sarcophagus from Clapton, East London. H.E. Smith described his visit to Bentham in Craven and the discovery of Roman lead seals at Brough, Cumb., 1866. There are pencil drawings of 33 Brough seals, ten made from casts in the BM. Also present are pencil sketches are of a hipposandal from Vieux, near Caen, and notes on the wall of Lympne.
A few items concern Wroxeter. A letter from A. Way describes architectural fragments, including a column with a figure of Atys. H. Davies submitted a plan on tracing paper of a building opened 1860-67, and a water-colour of a Roman sculpture, 1870.

Three letters to CRS from H.S. Gill, 1874-8, include autobiographical details at Smith's request, and notes on Roman antiquities from Irchester, with a description of the "camp", the discovery of eight bronze bowls, stone and lead coffins, and a coin hoard and coins of Cunobelin from Chester House. A biographical sketch of Gill is provided in a letter to CRS from J. Clarke.

Several items relate to Saxon antiquities from Kent. A letter to CRS from J. Brent describes his 1869 excavation of a Saxon cemetery and his observation of "clinch bolts" around a shield. Another from J. Evans, describes weights in the Faussett collection and from Ozingell, 1855. It is accompanied by sketches of the weights and a child's lead coffin from Ozingell. There are ink sketches of grave goods from Rochester given by H. Wickham to J. Mayer, and a note by CRS about the auction of Lord Londesborough's Kentish Antiquities, 1879.

A letter from W.F. Wakeman describes the discovery of medieval finds in Dublin, 1854. A note of 1856 concerns finds from County Down, including armillae in glass and shale

Volume IV

The nine letters to Smith, 1853-71, mostly concern Roman antiquities. Several concern Roman antiquities from Nursling: J.N(?).M. Smart wrote about coins in Dr. Blackmore's collection. C.C. Priaulx described the discovery of a steelyard weight, 1874, and a note by CRS states that Priaulx had also reported indications of a Roman road from Bitterne to Romsey. There are pencil sketches of a Roman erotic samian vase from Nursling, 1877.

Two letters from J. Robson concern Roman pottery found near Warrington, an amphora stamp from Castle Field, Manchester, and the discovery in Manchester of inscriptions to the First Cohort of Frisians. W. Wire wrote about the discovery of the Colchester gladiatorial vase, 1855. An undated letter from T. Wright concerns the Roman precursors of fairies and night-mares, and preparations for his Wroxeter excavations. A clipping from a letter to T. Wright notes evidence for Roman iron furnaces in the Wear valley. The other letters are from J. Cleghorn, W.E. Flahertz and J. Warren.

There are ink and wash sketches of four Saxon(?) brooches from Canterbury in J. Brent's collection, and pencil sketches of four comparable brooches belonging to J. Warren, 1871.
Of particular interest is an outline programme by J.G. Waller, for his continental tour with Smith, 1858. It includes estimates of the costs of travelling between Paris and Nimes.

Volume V

The nine letters to CRS include three of 1873 from Revd R.C. Jenkins, which describe and sketch what his excavations beneath Lyminge church of what he supposed was a Roman villa.

Three letters from W.M. Wylie, 1870-76, are of particular interest. One discusses radiate brooches from Kerch in the Crimea. The others concern forgeries which had been published by CRS as genuine: a monument to the matronae in Lyons museum and the inscribed Saxon urn from Norfolk in Mayer's collection. With them are notes by CRS about other Latin inscriptions on Roman pottery, such as the Newington urn.

Two letters from T. Wright concern vulgar behaviour at the Chester congress and the Latin term for "cat". Another from Fairholt accompanies a note in his hand about a Roman bas relief at Dijon representing an oil and wine shop, and his sketch of the guard house at the gate of Pompeii.

There are two clippings from French journals about the walls of Dax affair.

Volume VI

There are fourteen letters to CRS as follows: J.N(?).M. Smart wrote about vases from Chester in T. Hughes' collection and altars from Chester, 1876. Related items include a photograph of a monumental stone from Chester, and a pencil sketch by CRS of the figure on another. J.C. Bruce sent a photograph of a sculpture found at Carlisle, 1862. A. Way wrote about lead objects from the river Bug, Lithuania, which he thought might parallel the Roman seals from Brough. Related items include pencil drawing of Roman lead seals from Laires, S. Shields, six more in H.E. Smith's collection, 1874, and another from Coombe Down, near Bath. G. Payne described the discovery of a tumulus at Bex Hill, Milton; there is a sketch of a gold ring from that site. R.P. Coates (2), E. Pretty, B. Thorpe and T. Wright (2) sent references to medieval horticultural practice, especially the cultivation of the vine, 1864-6. There are notes by CRS on the same subject.

A number of letters relate to CRS and Fairholt's continental visits. There are pencil and ink sketches by Fairholt of a sculpture in Dijon Museum, and a leaden cistern and liquid measure from Pompeii, in Naples museum. CRS made ink and wash sketches of Roman murals and an inscribed storage vessel from Lillebonne, in Rouen museum; another sketch by CRS is of a "draught mule. South of France".
Some unpublished drawings by Fairholt depict Roman terracottas of men in erotic postures. CRS(?)
drew some published examples of others. H.M. Scarth sent a drawing of a Roman clay-pipe cat(?)
figurine. Other sketches are of a Roman glass gladiator beaker from Leicester in A.H. Paget's
collection, 1877, and a Roman fibula from Carlstadt, in Croatia. There is a note about the [forged]
tile stamped DNVOC from Cannon St., London.

The volume reflects Smith's growing interest in biography. There are newspaper obituaries about T.
Barton, A.J. Dunkin, Revd D.H. Haigh, Eliza Meteyard, Revd J.L. Oldham, Mr Shipp of Blandford, and
Alderman S. Wood. Here also is a list of plays by F.W. Fairholt, and a copy of a letter to Fairholt
from T. Tompom about his lectures at Lewisham, 1839. Two drafts of a letter from Fairholt complain
of an unjust personal attack.

Volume VII

The two letters to CRS are from G. Joslin, about Roman potters kilns at Colchester, and from J.
Kendrick, about a lead object from Wilderspool, 1877-80.

---

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: Remnant of
C.R. Smith's "Kentish Collections. Richborough, Reculver
and Lymne Antiquities"

MS. 857/7. The collection was sent by CRS to J. Mayer, and formed Lot 150 in the sale of Mayer's
autograph letters which was purchased by "Arnold" for £2-6s. It formed Lot 255 in the sale of F.
Hendriks' autograph letters. At this stage it included matter relating to the brasses at Cobham, and
was described as two quarto portfolios containing about three hundred views, some by Fairholt,
engravings, woodcuts, letters from antiquaries, papers, cuttings, etc. This was purchased by W.
Daniell for £4-10s. The collection was subsequently broken up, the present portion having been
bequeathed to the Society in 1961 by W.P.D. Stebbing, FSA. The materials relating to the Cobham
brasses are missing, and the number of items is reduced to just over one hundred.

A quarto paper folder containing what CRS described as "artistic & literary material" relating to The
Antiquities of Richborough, Reculver and Lynne containing "many fine sketches & drawings by F.W.
Fairholt, F.S.A., proof woodcuts and autographs of much interest". CRS labelled the folder as "No. 1
of two parcels". A second folder inside the first, also labelled by Smith, bears a note in Hendriks'
hand that the collection contained "several hundred" items.
The contents mostly relate to Richborough, and include twenty drawings by Fairholt, at least half laid out as if for publication. They depict views of the fort; the shoreline nearby; Sandwich viewed from Richborough; Richborough's walls and West entrance; fragments of Roman wall-painting and pottery (including a water-colour of the "ornamented pottery"); Saxon brooches and other artifacts. Some of the drawings provide additional information, such as the date of discovery. Other pencil sketches, by CRS, show a plan of Richborough, a Saxon buckle, "Coptic" bowl, and other antiquities in Rolfe's collection.

One or two items relate to the other sites covered by Smith's book: Fairholt's tracing of a 17th century survey of Reculver, and his pencil sketches of a wall excavated at Lympne. Another, by CRS, depicts Roman metal objects found there.

There are three proof plans and views of Richborough, two of Lympne, and 41 proof woodcuts, all from Smith's book, with part of a corrected page proof. There are several clippings: four from earlier works on Richborough and Thanet; two from reviews of Smith's book; and a printed receipt for it given to Captain J. Harvey R.N.

The 17 autographs date to 1843-83. Four are from W.H. Rolfe to Smith, the most interesting of which concerns Richborough's walls and Solly, the tenant (1849). Mention is made of Boys' research on Richborough, Roman coins from Lympne, a projected visit from C. Warne, society affairs, W.D. Saull, the purchase and distribution of publications, and personal matters.

Three letters from CRS to W.H. Rolfe, 1843-50, concern preparations for publications, including Smith's initial plans for CA; Lord A. Conyngham's first visit to Smith's museum; the projected sale of Rolfe's coins; Smith's intended visit to examine Batteley's finds, 1849; his continental trip of 1850; W.D. Saull's illness; and reactions to the Richborough volume, including a letter from Revd L.J. Burtch of Lydd about his excavations there in 1822. A letter from F.W. Fairholt to W.H. Rolfe concerns coins found at Faversham, 1848, and a die from Richborough (sketched). Of three letters from CRS to F.W. Fairholt, 1849-50, the most interesting concerns Smith's visit to Dymchurch, Lympne and Sandwich accompanied by J. Elliott. Other topics include a visit to Reculver, preparations for publications, and BAA matters. Three letters from CRS to J. Mayer, 1850-82, concern Mayer's visit to Lympne; a batch of continental antiquities, 1861; M. Tudot's drawings; publications; Evans' purchase of Rolfe's coins; and Smith's new ideas on the Roman coin hoard from Deal.

A letter to CRS from F.C. Lukis concerns a Roman face pot from Richborough, 1848, Smith's ideas on the date of Bronze Age swords, and the BAA split. A letter to CRS from A. Way, 1864, concerns "Billy and Charley's, Faussett's excavations at Richborough, Flenley's attempt to sell his Japanese
acquisitions, and the intaglio of a personification of nature, from Bemerton. Other letters to CRS are from F.W. Fairholt and M. Dorman.

A few items unrelated to the Richborough volume include a sketch plan by W.H. Rolfe of the Saxon cemetery at Ozingell, and a pencil sketch of Coleshill by F.W. Fairholt.

---

**London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: Manuscripts relating to the Richborough amphitheatre**

History unknown; perhaps from Smith's "Kentish Collections" (see above). In an envelope addressed to R.F. Jessup, so possibly donated by him.

Three letters from W.H. Rolfe to CRS (one copied in Rolfe's hand) describing the Richborough amphitheatre as revealed by Rolfe's excavations, and problems with visitors, 1849-50. These are accompanied by ink sketches by W.H. Rolfe of the plan of the amphitheatre (on tracing paper), and what looks like a stone bridge abutment at Sandwich, 1850. With them is a clipping from a corrected proof of Smith's Richborough.

---

**London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: "Roach Smith Pamphlets on Kent"**

Part of MS. 857. Compiled by J. Clarke, the volume was purchased from F. Edwards with a large parcel of odds and ends by F.W. Cock, FSA. After his death in 1943, they passed to Sir Thomas Neame. He died in 1973, shortly after which they were purchased by the Society from Commin's Antiquarian Bookshop, Bournemouth.

Octavo volume bound in vellum, containing autographed offprints by CRS and numerous manuscript additions. Of particular interest are annotated catalogues of the sale of Smith's household furniture and effects and his library, the latter giving names of purchasers and prices paid. There are manuscript notes by CRS on antiquities and Way's role in founding the AI, and a corrected proof. The letters date from 1875-85. Two are to CRS from J. Clarke and T.J. Ford, (the latter a poem addressed to Smith). The remaining three are from CRS to J. Clarke, and concern the funeral of Smith's uncle, J. Roach, events at the Strood elocution class, and the Medway floods. A letter from H. Wickham to J. Clarke of May 1891, states that Smith's property fetched a good sum at auction.
London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: Envelope of manuscript materials relating to Smith's excavations at Pevensey, 1853

Part MS. 857. Apparently from the collection of F.W. Cocks, and purchased by the Society together with the volume of Kent pamphlets (see above).

Detached pages and covers of a sketch-book containing ten water-colour sketches by CRS of his Pevensey excavations. A note by him inside the back cover records that the editors of Sussex Collections had published a "long and illogical paper on Anderida (Pevensey)" without any reference to his excavation report, 1881. Other materials include a printed list of subscribers to the excavations, two letters from CRS to W.H. Brooke concerning illustrations for the report, six proofs of the plates, and a photograph of Pevensey Castle by Dr. H.W. Diamond, FSA, who was appointed honorary photographer to the Society in 1854. A note on the back in Smith's hand reads "This is one of Dr. Diamond's first efforts". A letter from CRS to C.D. Levy, Strood, concerns elocution classes etc., and another of Nov. 1928 from H. Smetham to Dr. Cocks expresses thanks for being allowed to examine the manuscripts.

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: Collection of ephemera relating to CRS and other antiquarians

Part MS. 857. Probably originally from the Mayer collection, and part of Lot 260 in Sotheby's sale of his autograph letters, which was purchased by F. Hendriks. Probably part of Lot 257 of the Hendriks manuscript sale, which was purchased by Maggs for £4-12 s, and afterwards split up. The present collection passed through the hands of J.A. Jacobs and C. Franklin, FSA, before being acquired by the Society in 1976.

Includes two letters and printed notice from J.B. Bergne to W.H. Rolfe, 1844, about the Numismatic Society's proposed testimonial to CRS. Two letters to CRS from E. Purland mention Smith's visit to Rome, 1871. Seven letters from CRS to J.A. Jacobs, 1875-1888, concern preparations for and the exchange of publications, antiquarian excursions, the death of relatives and friends, the organisation of the Strood Elocution Class, Smith's health, the gift of a wine cup from J. Mayer, and his proposals for a jubilee coinage in 1887. A number of letters to CRS, 1853-80, are from Lady Otho Fitzgerald, Ll. Jewitt, the Duke of Northumberland, and D. Turner. They are primarily concerned with preparations for and the exchange of publications, Fairholt's illness, and various invitations. Also of interest is the printed notice of a public reading by CRS and two letters from CRS to unknown
persons, dated Apl. 1875 and Jan. 1889, in which he refers (respectively) to his public readings, and the sale of a collection of letters to him from Lieut. Waghorne.

A letter from J. Mayer to W.H. Rolfe, Sep. 1857, reveals Smith's role in arranging for Mayer to buy Rolfe's collection. In a letter to J.A. Jacobs dated Oct. 1890, G. Dowker enclosed a copy of his poetic epitaph for CRS, and a sketch of CRS made at Sandwich.

---

**London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: Letter from G. Eastwood to CRS, June 1858**


Concerns Eastwood's reasons for believing that the leaden badges found at Shadwell [i.e. Billy and Charley's] were genuine.

---

**London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: J.G. Waller's grangerized copy of C.R. Smith Illustrations of Roman London (1859).**

Bequeathed to the Society by J.G. Waller, 1905

Contains many of Waller's original pencil sketches and watercolours.

---

**London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: C.R. Smith (Ed.) Inventorium Sepulchrale (1856) - containing original drawings.**

Probably sent to J. Mayer by CRS. Lot 167 in Sotheby's sale of Mayer's collection of autograph letters, which was purchased by "Jackson" for £6-17s-6d. It passed into the hands of A.W. Franks, who bequeathed it to the Society.

Elaborately bound copy containing original drawings by Fairholt and Hardman, and both tinted and untinted copies of the plates made from them. Includes an original sketch of the Kingston Down barrows by CRS, 1855.
London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: T. Crofton Croker "1852 Daily Remembrance"

MS. 751. History unknown.

Small (c. A5) pre-printed diary, the former property of T.C. Croker. It notes his movements, expenditure, letters received and sent, meetings and dinners attended, with sketches of the seating arrangements. Newspaper cuttings mentioning him are tipped in. CRS is often mentioned as Croker visited him about once per fortnight. Unlike T. Wright, F.W. Fairholt and Croker himself, it is apparent that by 1852, CRS had largely withdrawn from social aspects of London antiquarian life.

London - The Society of Antiquaries of London: J.J.A. Worsaae The Primeval Antiquities of Denmark (1849) and other tracts.

Shelf 306D. Lot 486 in the sale of F. Hendriks' library, 1909, which was purchased by the London bookseller "Maggs" for £2-4s. Purchased by the Society c. 1960.

Three tracts bound in half red morocco, with over fifty drawings of Anglo-Saxon and other antiquities by various artists, including J.Y. Akerman, F.W. Fairholt, E. Pretty, and A. Way. Includes a letter from J.J.A. Worsaae to CRS, written while staying in Dublin, Nov. 1846. It details his movements and requests full size colour drawings of antiquities from Kent, especially Lord A. Conyngham's collection, for his museum.

London - Southwark Local Studies Library: Letters written to H.S. Cuming, 1850-80

Acc. Nos. 4565 (surnames from A-K) and 4566 (surnames from L-Z). Mode of acquisition not recorded; perhaps transferred from Cuming Museum.

Letters on antiquarian subjects and signatures cut from letters. Letters from T. Bateman mention CRS, 1846 and 1856, and comment on the Billy and Charley forgeries, 1858. Four from CRS, dated 1844-8, advise against canvassing Lord Aberdeen about national antiquities, offer to propose him for the BAA, and cover a gift of antiquities for his museum.
London - University College London, Manuscripts Room: 
Papers of Lord Brougham, two letters from C.R. Smith

Brougham Papers, Refs. 25069, 23790

One invites the recipient to subscribe to proposed Medal of Mehemet Ali, 1841. The other, of 24 June 1843, was written when no reply to the first was received (pers. comm. G.M. Furlong, Archivist).

London - University of London Library, Department of 
Palaeography: Three letters from J.O. Halliwell to CRS

AL.262/1-3. Purchase in 1959 from P. Dobell, dealer.

Dating to 1867-75, they concern F.W. Fairholt's letters, which CRS sent to Halliwell in 1868, and Smith's plans (eventually aborted) for writing a posthumous biography of Fairholt.


Mode of acquisition unknown.

Contains copy of letter of receipt for the catalogue from W.C. Ewing to CRS, and a reply from CRS thanking him for payment, July-Aug. 1854.

London - Victoria and Albert Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings: "Collection of drawings of British antiquities, etc. by F.W. Fairholt"


Two bound volumes containing 434 mounted drawings, mostly on small sheets and in pencil, although a few are inked over, and one or two have a colour wash. They demonstrate Fairholt's interest in virtually every conceivable field of British antiquarian studies, and include sketches of Church
monuments, antique furniture, historic artifacts in private collections, copies of objects taken from old drawings, and facsimiles of manuscripts. A high proportion are of historic clothing, presumably made for his book Costume in England (1846). These are taken from Church monuments and brasses, private collections of dress items, statues, and old books.

Of particular interest are drawings of archaeological objects from the City of London, Rouen and other French sites, of the excavation of the Roman bath-house in Lower Thames Street (II, pp. 44, 45, 55, 57, 58), and Roman buildings found at Lyminge Church, the latter made on 2 Aug. 1860 (II, p. 66). The sketches include samian, Castor ware and other items in W. Chaffers' collection (I, pp. 92 and 108; II, p. 94), and numerous items in Smith's collection (II, p. 3; possibly also I, pp. 107-8). Some were published in Smith's Catalogue, namely Roman footwear (II, p. 71), the lid of a coffer in cuir-bouilli (II, p. 64), a giant bronze hand from the Thames (II, p. 92) and the statue of Atys from Bevis Marks (II, p. 93).

Other items relevant to the present study are sketches of W.H. Rolfe's excavations at Ozingell (I, p. 96) including two ink sketches made on 6 July 1846, of interments with grave goods in situ (I, p. 97), and water-colour and pencil sketches of Lord Londesborough's antiquities from Kentish Graves (I, pp. 101-2).

---

London - Victoria and Albert Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings: "Collection of drawings of topographical views, details of architecture, etc. by F.W. Fairholt"


Two bound volumes, containing 520 mostly topographical pencil sketches, with an emphasis on Churches, Church furniture, ancient city walls, urban Skylines, facades of old buildings, street views containing old buildings, decorative architectural details, interiors of houses, and excavated structures. They show that Fairholt travelled widely throughout the British Isles, excluding South Wales and Highland Scotland.

Of particular interest are sketches of two buildings associated with Smith's early life: Arreton Manor (I, pp. 84-85), and Landguard Manor (I, p. 86), both IOW. Other relevant items include sketches of Burgh Castle, Suffolk (II, pp. 29-32), of Smith's excavations at Pevensey (II, pp. 101-2; 125- 6), and Londesborough, Yorks. (p. 219). Other sketches of archaeological excavations, include the Roman theatre at St. Alban's (I, pp. 98-99), the floor of a Roman villa at Bignor (II, p. 110), and a Roman building at Aldborough, York, Sep. 1851 (II, p. 216).
London - Victoria and Albert Museum: "Gibbs (Wm) Bequest File"

Registry File No. 86.

Folder of papers relating to the receipt of the Gibbs collection in 1870, and its transfer to the BM in 1893. Several documents mention CRS in passing. They show that he was unknown to C.A. Price, the curator responsible for receiving the collection. CRS appears to have been consulted on advice from W. Gibbs' solicitor, who thought that he might be able to provide further background information about the collection, which was poorly documented. A 37-page inventory by C.A. Price was clearly not used by CRS when preparing his published catalogue.

Machynlleth - R. Deeley Esq.: Letter from CRS

Purchased by a relative in a sale lot of miscellaneous autographs

CRS thanks an anonymous correspondent for information about a Roman wall mosaic, and comments on the vandalising of another at Wroxeter, 1880.

Maidstone Museum and Art Gallery: C.R. Smith (Ed.)
Inventorium Sepulchrale (1856) with manuscript insertions

Formerly the property of Charles Warne, evidenced by a named receipt and the mention of a visit to Brighton in Smith's letter of 1871.

Contains letter from CRS to C. Warne. It reveals Smith's misgivings at visiting Rome with J.H. Ball, and his displeasure at the low fee paid to him by the S. Kensington Museum for cataloguing the Gibbs Collection, 1871. An undated letter from J.M. Kemble to CRS argues that only pagan Saxons interred their dead.

Maidstone Museum and Art Gallery: C.R. Smith Collectanea Antiqua, with manuscript insertions
Formerly the property of Charles Warne. Later history unknown.

Seven letters to and from CRS, tipped in at relevant places in CA IV-VII. Five are from CRS to C. Warne, 1862 to 1879. They concern antiquarian excursions, news of publications and friends, the exchange of antiquarian information, and the floods at Strood, 1874. Smith's letter of June 1871, written towards the end of his tour of Italy with J.H. Ball, partly explains why CRS published so little about this trip. A letter from W. Bell, of Mar. 1855, concerns Latin inscriptions. Another of Oct. 1878 from R. Blair describes a tomb found at South Shields. An invoice from F.W. Fairholt charges CRS 25s for engraving a leather coffer.

Maidstone - Centre for Kentish Studies: Manuscripts relating to C.R. Smith

From the collections of the Kent Archaeological Society

[The existence of this material is confirmed by the present curator of Maidstone Museum and one of his predecessors. On contacting the Society in 1989 I was advised that it was not possible for me to examine the material as it was in storage in the home of Mr. Harrison, a member of the society, but that it was destined for the Centre for Kentish Studies. The Centre has been receiving material from the Society at intervals, but on enquiring in September 1992, it had still not received any materials relating to C.R. Smith. It is possible that the manuscripts perished in the fire which damaged the Society's library in Maidstone Museum some years ago.]

Maidstone - Centre for Kentish Studies: Journal of Revd J. Woodruff, Upchurch, 1851-6

Ref. p377/28/34

On 1 Aug. 1851, he records writing a letter to CRS, informing him of new discoveries in the locality. The entry for 22 Aug. 1851, records Smith's expedition by yacht to Otterham Creek, with eleven other antiquarians, in search of Roman pottery.

Manchester - Central Library, Archives Department: Collection of letters to John Harland, antiquarian
MS f091 H15. Purchased from Miss Harland, 1906. No. 98 is from CRS.

Brief, undated letter to J. Harland, asking him to recommend his works to public libraries.

Manchester - Central Library, Archives Department: "Correspondence of Manchester Literary Club"

M.L.C. On loan from Manchester Literary Club. No. 59 is note from CRS to Charles Hardwick.

Dated July 1867, it mentions Smith's imminent trip to France.

Manchester - Central Library, Archives Department: "Stanley Withers' Autograph Collection"

Acquired on collector's death in 1927.

Includes two letters to CRS: W923.21 is from Sir R. Inglis, who hoped to visit CRS soon, Apl. 1850. W923.2B records Baron C.K.J. Bunsen's thanks for Smith's publication on Mayence and Trèves, 1851.

Melkesham, Wilts. - owned by Humphrey Roachsmith: Roachsmith family papers

Collected by various descendants of C.R. Smith's brother, Richard Smith.

Includes the family bible, inaugurated by C.R. Smith's grandfather, Richard Smith, with details of his descendants. There are notes on family history, letters, a journal by Smith's brother Henry, c. 1810-20, and a letter from him to CRS, 1847.

An incomplete set of CA and papers by CRS contain interesting dedications. There are articles and newspaper clippings about CRS with memorabilia such as a Dax medal and a silver cup. An inscription records that the cup was presented to CRS by J. Mayer in 1882, in gratitude for proposing him for the BAA, for his work on *Inventorium Sepulchrale* and for his friendship of many years. There are proof editions of *Illustrations* (the paper being cut on all sides), *Retrospections*, and "Isle of Wight Words ..." (which apparently went through four sets of proofs).
Of particular interest is a letter from CRS to his nephew and namesake, dated 1876. Six letters from H. Norris to CRS, 1885-8, concern Somerset discoveries and coins, including the Ham Hill hoard which CRS was studying. A letter from CRS to J. Thorp, 1888, accompanied a manuscript notebook about the Brading villa entitled "Captain John Thorp's Memorandums No.3" (now transferred to IOW Record Office).

Melkesham, Wilts. - owned by Humphrey Roachsmith: Diary of C.R. Smith for 1827

Not in the Sotheby's sale catalogue of Smith's library; perhaps considered unsuitable for sale. It eventually passed to Captain Roach Smith, R.N., of Sawbridgeworth (Smith's nephew), and thence to his grandson, H. Roachsmith. Published in abridged form in Smetham's C.R.S. and his Friends (1929) 17 and 235-52.

A small ninety-page booklet, bound in red morocco. The margins are pencilled in. To the left of the journal entries are written the date, the day of the week, and details of the weather. A set of accounts at the back were meticulously kept as they closely match the preceding entries.

This journal covers the end of Smith's stay in Chichester, illustrating his life as a chemists' assistant, and his move to London. His employer's impending bankruptcy must have been a powerful motivation. The entries are short, and comprise records of Smith's movements, with a few interesting comments of philosophical nature. They reveal an unsophisticated 19-20 year old - a reader and observer who participated little in the life of the family he dwelt with.

Newcastle - Museum of Antiquities: "Robert Blair Sketch Book 5"

Donated by the artist to the SANUT, and transferred by them to the museum.

Sketch-book of antiquities, views and personalities, June 1886-Jan. 1889. Includes sketch of CRS, presumably made at a meeting of SANUT during Smith's visit of July 1889.

Newcastle - Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle-upon-Tyne: "Correspondence Vols. V, VI, VII"
Bound volumes of letters to the Society.

Contain twenty letters from CRS, most written in his capacity as secretary of the NS and BAA. They consist primarily of thank-you notes and covering letters relating to the exchange of publications, and occasionally antiquities.

Of special interest are letters of 1848 thanking the Society for electing him as a member, labels from a parcel of antiquities which CRS sent in 1848, and four letters from CRS to J. Adamson, 1851 and 1853, which stress the importance of publishing and of corresponding with continental societies.

Newcastle - Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle-upon-Tyne: "Letterbooks 1 - 4"

Bound volumes of stencils of letters sent by the Society.

They contain 23 letters to CRS from R. Blair, 1883-90. These mostly comprise acknowledgements for publications donated by CRS, and for woodcuts and plates loaned by him. Some touch on coins and inscriptions, and two concern measures to avert the threatened destruction of Roman tombs on the Wall, Nov. 1886.

Newcastle - Northumberland County Record Office:
Correspondence between J. Bell of Gateshead and CRS, 1844-54.

ZAN.M.20/4/1-36. Unaccessioned. From a much larger collection made by J. Bell of Gateshead, and later acquired by J.O. Halliwell-Phillipps. In the posthumous sale of Halliwell-Phillipps collection, and acquired by Dr. Burman of Alnwick, who published extracts (Burman 1909-17, esp. VII, 187-8). At this stage, the collection contained over 126 items. It was subsequently auctioned and acquired in whole or part by Winifred Myers, manuscript dealer of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, who split the collection. The present items were purchased from her by the SANUT and were deposited by them in the Record Office for safe-keeping. She donated a few other items to Durham University Library (see above). The rest of the collection is still missing (see Appendix 2b).

Author's copies of 21 letters from J. Bell to CRS, with twelve of Smith's replies, 1844-54. Along with items now missing (see Appendix 2b), the collection illustrates the collaboration between Bell and Smith. A BAA correspondent, Bell remained loyal to Wright's party after the split, and obtained
for Smith an honorary membership of the SANUT, 1848. Despite his limitations as an antiquary, Bell was active in sending drawings and objects for BAA meetings. These included drawings of stones with crosses from Virgin Mary Hospital, Newcastle, and Roman altars from Ribchester. Bell kept Smith well informed on the destruction of other inscriptions found at Risingham. In return, Smith met Bell's requests for coins and medals, and donated samian, wall-plaster and other finds to him and the SANUT. Smith also assisted in identifying objects, including a set of ivory spillikins. The men also collaborated in the exchange of publications.

From 1847, Bell's health began to deteriorate and in 1848 he decided to move to a smaller house in Newcastle. It was suggested that he should live in the castle, but he had reservations. Bell was consequently obliged to dispose of his library and antiquities, and sought Smith's assistance in valuing and selling them.

The men also exchanged antiquarian news, mentioning the election as FSA of Sir J. Swinburne, and the death of J. Hodgson, both 1845, C. Newton's visit to Newcastle, an attack upon Wright and Halliwell by the BM clique, and the extreme religious views of D. Haigh and his blackballing by the Antiquaries, all 1848. When Smith censured the SANUT for failing to publish, Bell tried to make excuses. He nevertheless gained no sympathy from Smith, especially after the society's banquet to mark the completion of works on the castle.

Newport - Isle of Wight County Record Office: Bound volume of letters and other matter entitled "Reception of C. Roach Smith in the Isle of Wight. August 28 & 29, 1855"

Acc. B4/55. From Smith's library (his coat of arms inside cover). Transferred from the Sandown-Shanklin Free Library. Perhaps donated to this library by members of Smith's family, as not included in Smith's library sale.

Bound collection of letters, clippings, and other matter, compiled by CRS as a souvenir of the dinner and conversazione in his honour. 280 light blue pages, 217 X 168 mm, green leather quarter binding, gilt, paginated.

Smith's tract from CA about the festivities, with official invitation cards, letters of invitation from G. Hillier, and the bill of fare for the dinner at the Bugle. Ten newspaper clippings recount the proceedings. The bulk of the volume comprises mounted letters. Of these, eighteen concern arrangements, including several to CRS from G. Hillier (who instigated the proceedings). They reveal the politics behind the event, and indicate that CRS and others were unenthusiastic about the
proposals. There are seventeen letters of acceptance, mostly to G. Hillier, including one from Tennyson, the Poet Laureate. The largest group (fifty) are polite refusals; several complain about the impossibility of attending at such short notice. Many make generous and revealing remarks about CRS. A further nineteen letters congratulate CRS on the success of the occasion; others thank him for the sending his pamphlet about the reception.

Of particular interest are a collection of newspaper cuttings concerning a subsequent controversy (involving Smith) arising from Hillier's action in selling the Chessel Down antiquities to Lord Londesborough, thus removing them from the IOW.

---

**Newport – Isle of Wight County Record Office: Pedigree of Smith Family**

BRS 414. Given by John Smith to his niece, Frances Chevertom of Apse. Mode of acquisition unknown.

Drawing of tree on which is superimposed the Smith family tree.

---

**Newport – Isle of Wight County Record Office: "Smith Family File"**

FAM/89.

File of information about the Smith family compiled by the Record Office. Includes Smith family tree and copies (?) of letter to CRS to F. Roach, 9 Feb. 1882, regarding family history.

---

**Newport – Isle of Wight County Record Office: "Roach Family File"**

FAM/90.

File of information about Roach family, compiled by the Record Office. Includes Roach family tree and copies of letters to CRS from F. Roach, undated, and J.A. Barton, 1863.
Northampton - Property of P.I. King, Esq.: Wetton's Guide to Northampton (Northampton 1849)

Presented to CRS by E. Pretty; contains undated letter from Pretty, asking CRS to arrange reviews of the book.

Northampton - Northants Public Library: "Dryden Collection"

Presented by his daughter, Alice Dryden.

Large collection of antiquarian drawings, notes, letters, offprints, and occasional photographs, arranged by county, made by Sir Henry Dryden, Bart. of Canons Ashby (1818-99, active from early 1830's). They include drawings made during the Wroxeter excavations of 1854, also a letter from CRS and clippings relating to the walls of Chester affair, 1887-9, but not the substantial quantity of materials implied in the catalogue (Northampton Museums 1912, vii).

Northampton - Northamptonshire Record Office: Four letters from CRS to Revd C.H. Hartshorne

Hartshorne Collection, E.444-7

Dated 1864, they concern requests for information on early references to vineyards, Saxon pottery and cemeteries from Northamptonshire, with remarks on vine-growing experiments, and publications.

Norwich - The Castle Museum: Goddard Johnson "Letters Vol. 3"

Part of 76.94. From the Fitch Collection, donated in 1894.

One of three octavo volumes with leather quarter-binding, which contain letters to G. Johnson from 59 writers, dated 1841-60, mostly about coins. The letters are arranged alphabetically by the writer's name. Vol. 3 includes 42 letters from CRS with prospectuses for CA III and illustrations. Setting aside a letter of 1845, the correspondence is dated 1853-9. Like the correspondence of J. Bell of Gateshead, it illustrates Smith's generosity in assisting antiquarians of limited ability.
Some letters include comments by CRS on coins submitted by Johnson. These were mostly common types, with the exception of a gold coin of the Constantine family, which the BM wrongly dismissed as a forgery; CRS later published it. CRS also advised Johnson on the value of coins and books, and the proposed sale of his collection, 1856. He once offered to clean a coin. In return, CRS sought information about Roman and Saxon burials and coins of Carausius and Allectus.

Other topics include Johnson's subscriptions for CA and Smith's attempts to gain subscribers. Although he refused to publish one of Johnson's articles in CA, CRS urged him to publish, and in 1854 pressed him to excavate at Caister-on-Sea. They men exchanged publications, coins and tokens, and news about numismatists and friends, such as D. Turner. CRS kept Johnson au fait with the sale of his collection, his plans to leave London, the Billy and Charley affair, and grumbled about the attitude of nobility to antiquities. The letters also illustrate the unreliability of the post: a coin and postal order went missing.

**Norwich - Norfolk and Norwich Archaeological Society:**

**Letters from CRS to R. Fitch**

Society Records.

61 letters from CRS to R. Fitch, 1841-88. Many concern coins of all periods, including some from Felixstowe, and the exchange of casts. There is information about coin hoards from Belchamster, and from Norfolk and Hampshire in general and the exchange of casts.

The men also discussed various small antiquities including Boutell's brasses, a flint tool, from Caistor, a Roman inscription from Hexham, a Roman leaden coffin, an inscribed urn from Colchester, a mirror, a bronze phallus, a medieval purse stretcher, a Walsingham pilgrim badge, and brewer's marks.

Other comments concern Roman sites such as Brancaster, Hadstock, Pevensey, the bastions of Burgh Castle, and excavations there, 1851, at Caistor, 1853-7, and Ashill, 1874, and on the discoveries at North Elmham. CRS also explained his views on county museums and the affairs of various societies, including BAA, SAL, and the Suffolk Institute. Various controversies are discussed, such as Lord Londesborough's purchase of Hillier's collection in 1855 and the BM's reluctance to purchase Smith's museum.

Non-archaeological topics include Shakespeare, autographs, his preparations for publications, and Smith's departure from London. Mention is made of a portrait of Captain Manby by W.H. Brooke, and there is news of J. Boucher de Perthes, D. Turner, and H. Gurney (pers. comm. T. Mollard).
Norwich - Norfolk Records Office: "Dawson Turner Letters"

MS 5287 T 139F. The main collection mostly comprises letters sent by CRS for J. Mayer's collection and probably included in Lot 260 at the 1887 sale of Mayer's autographs. This was purchased for £5-17s-6d by Hendriks (his annotations occur here). Probably part of Lot 257 in the 1910 sale of Hendriks' library, which was purchased by Maggs Bros. for £6-12s and split up. The present collection was probably donated to Norwich by W.R. Dawson, whose letter of 1934 to the deputy librarian suggests dates for some of the correspondence. The first five letters in this volume were given by Dawson in 1958.

Volume of letters, mounted on quarto paper and bound after 1934. It includes three collections. Two are irrelevant, comprising five letters from D. Turner to A. Keily of London, and loose photocopies of three letters of D. Turner in the John Rylands Library. The main collection comprises 95 letters to CRS, the majority from D. Turner. With them are a letter from J. Gunn to W.S. Fitch which was forwarded to Smith; two letters from CRS to J. Mayer; notes in Smith's hand; two letters from D. Turner to H. Gurney(?), 1842; and a letter to J. Hendriks, 1888.

Turner's letters to CRS fall into two date groups: Feb. 1844 to Oct. 1846 (15 letters) and June 1851 - June 1855 (36). During the earlier period, Turner was still active; the letters mention his collection, subscriptions for and the circulation of publications, and his antiquarian visit to Normandy.

CRS was Turner's main source of news concerning the BAA split and other antiquarian matters. As an impartial observer, Turner's views are interesting, especially his advice to CRS to distance himself from the acrimony and not to publish the story. A letter from G. Johnson (see below) shows that due to the split, the Norfolk Architectural Society chose to be autonomous when it was founded in 1845, although it supported the AI's 1846 Norwich congress. Turner and CRS also exchanged portraits and news of mutual friends, including H. Gurney, whom Turner intimated would refuse Smith's suggestion of a medal.

The antiquarian information comprises details of drawings submitted by Turner to the SAL, including an urn and pax from Burgh Castle, a Roman brass implement from Hedringsflet, and a wooden shield from near Lowestoft. Turner also remarks upon the sale of Burgh Castle, 1846.

The later group of letters date from after Turner's stroke and after his wife had developed epilepsy, covering his move to Barnes, 1852, and Old Brompton, 1853. Whenever possible, CRS accepted Turner's
repeated invitations to visit, but this was not as often as Turner wanted. CRS loaned Turner manuscripts and books and, despite poor health, Turner continued to subscribe to publications and to discuss possible manuscript purchases with Smith, although he worried about the fate of his manuscripts. Having visited Tréves in the 1830s, Turner had advised CRS to go there in 1846, and later urged him to publish his observations. When in 1851 he complied, Turner allowed CRS to dedicate the volume to him and donated an illustration.

The letters also mention Smith's attempts to get subscribers for Ducagne's medal, work on publications, Mr Sainsbury's museum, mutual friends such as W.H. Brooke and T. Wright, the death and funeral of T.C. Croker in 1854 (at which Smith's absence was noted), and the adverse effect on Smith's business of Dr Gosset's death, 1855.

From Feb. 1856, CRS discussed Turner's declining health with H.S. Brightwen, one of Turner's daughters, and Turner's second wife, Matilda (7 letters on this and other topics). Turner died in 1858. In August 1857, the latter visited CRS at Strood to discuss her delinquent son, Simon. CRS saw him, but was seemingly unable to help. In 1854 CRS had effected a reconciliation between the Turners and another son, G. Balls, who wrote a letter of profuse thanks.

Letters from Matilda Turner and H. Gurney describe how Matilda, her son, and CRS were tricked out of Turner's will, details of which were provided by J. Wilkins. Revd F.C. Husenbeth confirmed to CRS that he had been mentioned in Turner's first will. Letters from W.S. Fitch and G. Johnson explain the root of the trouble (see below).

Seven subsequent letters to CRS are from Turner's daughter, Miss M. Turner, 1858-62. They concern the payment for publications ordered by her father, the sale of his collections, and Smith's concern that a memoir about him should be published, which presented unspecified difficulties. In 1858 Miss Turner sent CRS a ring as a memento of her father.

Other letters mention D. Turner or have other Norfolk connections. Six from W.S. Fitch discuss Simon Turner's behaviour, the Turners' peculiarities and inappropriate marriage, the sale of his own illustrations and Suffolk manuscripts, societies and mutual friends, 1855-6. Three to CRS from G. Johnson concern Norfolk's local antiquarian society, Stevenson's paper on a coin hoard from Easton parish, urns discovered at Drayton, coins from Melton, 1851, and the sale to Eastwood of his gold coin of Helena, 1858. A letter from E. Taylor describes his discovery of walls and coins at Caister-on-Sea, 1856.

Two letters from CRS to J. Mayer, 1858-9, concern the gift of autograph letters and pilgrim signs, the proposed sale of Warren's collection, a visit to Ixworth and Ipswich, a dinner with the
Noviomagians, the illness of W.S. Fitch, and mention that D. Turner had broken a promise to pay CRS £600 for cataloguing his collections. Other letters to CRS are from C. Gill (2), D. Gurney (3), H. Gurney, Sir W.J. Hooker, and J.G. Waller.

In 1882, T.F.D. Croker sent CRS biographical details of his father, W.S. Fitch passed to him a letter from J. Gunn containing biographical details of D. Turner and his sons, and W.(?) Gurney sent biographical notes on H. Gurney. Two letters to CRS from H. Stephenson (1868 and 1882) include biographical notes on Anna Gurney and family, and mention his father's Dictionary of Roman Coins. A note by CRS explains why he stopped work on this.

Norwich - Norfolk Records Office: Miscellaneous Letters to CRS


Collected by George Lambert, FSA. A bookplate shows that they were later owned by N. Kevan of Deal. In March 1922 the Signet Library, Edinburgh, purchased them from G. Harding, 64 Great Russell Street, London (Acc. Nos. 25441-7), at which stage they included eighty letters from CRS to G. Lambert. They were presumably sold at one of eight Sotheby's sales of 1959-79 by which the Signet Library was reduced to a working library for solicitors (its original function), or in the 1960 sale by Dowell's of Edinburgh. In 1981, Nottingham University purchased them from the Wimbourne bookshop for £375. By this time only four manuscript letters remained, all bound in place; the missing letters had presumably been loose.

---

63 pers. comm., A. Russell.
The letters date from 1872-8. They concern publications and the purchase of Smith's *Collectanea*.

Oxford - Ashmolean Library: C.R. Smith *Collectanea Antiqua* (printed for the subscribers, London 1848-80) with manuscript additions.

Shelf mark 520 S.54. Originally owned by F. Hobler. Later in F. Haverfield's library (his bookplate), and bequeathed by him to the Ashmolean Library.

Manuscripts include two letters from Smith. That of 1843, to F. Hobler, reveals how he financed CA I; an annotation by Hobler, dated 1858, explains how he met Smith. That of 1888, presumably to F. Haverfield, concerns figures of Christ attached to books or reliquaries.

Oxford - Ashmolean Library: F. Haverfield's "Notes on Roman Sussex"

Haverfield Archive, Notebook 29. Bequeathed to the library by F. Haverfield.

Quarto notebook, in paper boards, containing information about Sussex arranged by site, often on scraps of paper which have been pasted in.

Includes letter from CRS to F. Haverfield about Roman roads in Sussex, Roman inscriptions in Chichester, and tips on reading them, 1889.

Oxford - Ashmolean Library: C.R. Smith *Retrospections*, Social and Archaeological I-III (1883-90) with manuscript insertions

Possibly Lot 451 in the sale of F. Hendriks' library, which was bought by Dobell for 15s. This is suggested by the presence of Smith's drawings of Roman monumental stonework in France and manuscripts of W.M. Wylie, which occur also in the collections to illustrate Smith's *Retrospections* in Liverpool Central Library, which were definitely owned by Hendriks. The presence of Wickham's sketch of the 1885 Strood floods, which is too late to have come via Mayer's collection, suggests that the books may have been one of Lots 148-50 of Smith's library sale, although there is no record that they included manuscripts. These lots were purchased by "Breach", "Wattali" and "Wattali" for £1-4s, £1-
Contains letters, drawings and water-colours of artifacts, proof engravings, the odd site plan, marginal notes, clippings and printed ephemera, such as slips advertising the CA. Some items are fixed to pieces of paper which were then tipped in; others are tipped in directly, usually at appropriate places. There are two letters from Smith, 1851 and undated, and eight to Smith, from five different correspondents, 1848-60. There is a copy in Wylie's hand of a letter from Smith, 1851.

Vol. 1

Includes Smith's description of a Roman "clasp knife" from Colchester in a letter copied by Wylie, 1851, and Wylie's pencil sketches of clasp knives from graves at Hallstatt, Austria and Vindonissa, Switzerland.

One of the two letters from CRS is to J.J. Wilkinson, about "gun metal" coins of James I, 1851. The three letters to CRS from J. Clarke, 1849-54, concern the loan of objects for etching, an inscription from a ditch in Colchester, found 1764 (sketched), a London exhibition of antiquities from Linton Heath, personal news and news about acquaintances. J. Taylor Jnr. wrote about pottery found at Colchester, 1849, and J.G. Waller about their trip to Germany, 1858.

There are several water-colours of items in Mayer's collection, including an enamelled heraldic horse pendant, ex. Faussett collection, a Frankish bird-head cloisonné ornament given by M. Hertz, 1857, and a knife and scabbard from Mainz. Other water-colours are of an enamelled stud from Gracechurch Street, London, 1837; a horn sword sheath from London, 1846, in W.S. Cumings's collection; an altar from Ebchester; a mosaic from Lion Inn Yard, Colchester, 1858; and a sketch map, drawn from memory by J. Clarke, of the Bartlow Hills, Essex, showing their position relative to a Roman villa excavated in 1852. W.H. Rolfe's water-colour of a fallen wall at Lympne is accompanied by a measured plan of the Roman building found within the walls. The inked-over pencil sketch is of bronze objects from Bremenium.

Vol. 2

This contains letters to CRS in French from C. Dufour, about pottery, 1848, and medals commemorating the peace of Amiens, and J.E. Jamie(?), about the exchange of publications, 1860. Two letters to CRS from Captain W.T.P. Shortt concern Roman oculist stamps and preparations for publications. Smith's business card is a particularly unusual item.
The illustrations include sketches by Fairholt: in water-colour and pencil of Roman antiquities from York, and in pencil of medieval pottery from Scarborough. Illustrations by CRS include an inked-over pencil sketch of Lillebonne from within the Theatre, and pencil sketches of inscribed pottery from Silchester. A pencil sketch of a Roman drain by the East Gate, Colchester, is by J. Parish.

Unattributed illustrations include a water-colour of a bronze object found with Roman pottery at Aldborough, Yorks., and pencil sketches of a samian sherd and Roman pipes and tiles from London, in Smith's museum, an inscribed Roman object from Colchester, Roman columns from Wroxeter, a bust of Bacchante from Nursling, and fibulae from Boulogne.

Vol. III

This includes over a dozen pages of inked-over pencil drawings by Smith, one on tracing paper, of Roman sculptures and monumental stonework at Sens, Autun and Vienne, inscriptions with measurements from Sens, Roman stonework in the walls of Sens, a monumental arch at Autun, and Roman architecture at Arles. These are accompanied by ink drawings by J.A. Barton: of washerwomen in the square at Dax, and Saxon antiquities from Faversham, Kent. A pencil sketch by H. Wickham shows the height of the 1885 Strood floods.

Oxford - Ashmolean Library: Scrapbook - "Roman Villa. Brading"


A blue folio volume of chronologically arranged letters, photographs, maps, clippings and other printed matter relating to the 1880-1 excavation, by J.E. Price and F.G. Hilton Price, of the Brading Roman villa. The photographs mostly come from the official series published by Messrs. Briddon of Ventnor. The printed items include a catalogue of the Morton estate, auctioned in 1882. There are four letters to, and 21 from Smith. Two are to Hilton Price, the remainder to J.E. Price.

The collection reveals much about the background to and progress of the excavations. CRS assisted, advised, and actually visited the excavations in June and Oct. 1880, and Sep. 1881. A letter from J.E. Price to Smith, dated May 1880, asks him to persuade Lady Oglander to permit excavation, which CRS did through his cousin, F. Roach. CRS subsequently advised the Prices concerning their squabbles with two local worthies: C. Nicholson and Captain Thorp (which they partly ignored). He also advised on publicity, fund raising, and the need for preservation. He identified the coins,
describing some in his letters, suggested an interpretation of the mosaic cock-headed figure, recommended improvements to the official guide, and published comments in The Antiquary and Isle of Wight Advertiser and Ryde Times. CRS was a named member of the excavation committee, but thought attendance at meetings unnecessary.

Items mentioned by CRS in passing include J. Lock's excavation of a Roman villa at Combley, IOW, coins from Freshwater, G. Dowker's Roman villa excavation at Wingham, a jasper pommel from Colchester, his walk to Bokerley Dyke and the Via Iceniana, and the destruction of the Bramdean pavements.

The three remaining letters to CRS are from B. Barrow and C. Nicholson, about Smith's IOW visit of June, 1880, and from J. Thorp, covering a second edition of the official guide. Other letters are from J.W. Fardell, N. Lauciani, Lady Oglander, F.G.H. Price, J.A. Webster and H.M. Westropp.

---

**Oxford - Ashmolean Library: Smith's bound volume of his publications on Saxon Shore forts, entitled "Richborough, Lymne. Pevensey. Reculver" with manuscript additions**

Shelf mark 530.18 A.9. Lot 262 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by B. Quaritch, bookseller of London. Later in the library of F. Haverfield which was bequeathed to the Ashmolean Library.

Smith's grangerised copy of his *Antiquities of Richborough, Reculver and Lymne* (1850), bound with his *Report on Excavations made on the Site of the Roman Castrum at Lymne, in Kent, in 1850* (1852) and *Report on Excavations made upon the Site of the Roman Castrum at Pevensey, in Sussex, in 1852* (1858). The manuscripts concern Saxon shore forts and comprise letters, notes, sketches, clippings and a prospectus for excavations. These are stuck to interleaved pages or end-papers, or are loose in an envelope tipped to one of the end-papers.

The eleven letters to CRS are dated 1843-83. That of Revd R.C. Jenkins is the first of their long correspondence. It concerns the identification of "Lymenga" in a charter and his excavations at Lyminge. A badly spelt letter from labourer J. Gurr describes his observations when excavating Pevensey Castle. The other letters are from G. Dowker about his Richborough excavations (undated); from J. Elliott Jnr.; J. Evans about Parker's excavation near Oxford and an onyx from Richborough, 1883; W.H. Rolfe about his Richborough excavations, 1843, a gold coin of Nero found there, and a penny of Coenwulf in Mr Trimmell's collection, 1858; from J.B. Sheppard about Roman roads at Wingham and elsewhere in Kent (2, dated 1880); from T. Wright about Anglo-Saxon references to Lympne for
Smith's Richborough; and from W.M. Wylie about a Roman clasp knife from Sittingbourne and Revd R.C. Joyce's visit to Italy, 1883.

The pencil sketches, some inked over, are of a Roman round enamelled brooch and bone buckle from Richborough in W.H. Rolfe's collection; a silvered bronze Roman artifact from Richborough, 1852; a clasp knife found in 1872 with a Saxon burial at Sittingbourne in G. Payne's collection, with W.M. Wylie's sketch of a parallel from Heddernheim, near Frankfurt; a silver Saxon coin in E. Gent's collection; a bronze key found in 1878 in Lewes, in C. Ade's collection; and coins from Pevensey.

Notes in Smith's hand include details of samian stamps from Ozingell in G. Dowker's collection, Dowker's discovery of subterranean masonry at Richborough, 1885, a bequest of 1509 to the Chapel of Richborough, PED. CL. BRIT. inscriptions, his talk on Studfall Castle to KAS, 1888, the derivation of its name, C. Ade's discovery of a Roman road from Pevensey to Lymne, and the provenance of coins found by C. Brooker, 1840.

Oxford - Ashmolean Library, Haverfield Archive

Letters, notes and drawings collected by F.J. Haverfield (1860-1919) and bequeathed by him to the library. After his death, they were added to by his former assistant, Miss Taylor. The several letters from CRS detailed below were either sent to Haverfield, or are probably derived from the Brading villa scrapbook (see above).

Oxford - Ashmolean Library, Haverfield Archive: Miscellaneous Correspondence

Includes letter from CRS to J.E. Price about a hoard from Netley, and a proposed excursion to London in 1881.

Oxford - Ashmolean Library, Haverfield Archive: Miscellaneous Correspondence - Letters from CRS to J.E. Price
Four letters of 1880, in which CRS advises on the organisation of the villa excavations at Brading, and describes a walk from Dover to Richborough, mentioning plans to excavate there.

Oxford - Ashmolean Library, Haverfield Archive:
Miscellaneous Correspondence - Chichester, Sussex

Includes an ink sketch copied by CRS from his notebook, of an inscription in the Bishop's Garden, Chichester, said to have been found there in 1885.

Oxford - Ashmolean Library, Haverfield Archive:
Miscellaneous Correspondence - Eastbourne, Sussex

Includes a letter from CRS to J.E. Price about preparations for a report on the Brading Villa, 1880.

Oxford - Ashmolean Library, Haverfield Archive:
Miscellaneous Correspondence - London. Roman Walls, Aldgate to Bishopsgate

A collection of cuttings about Roman excavations in London, 1900-5. With them is a letter from CRS to J.E. Price about the date of London's Roman wall, and his reservations about the Committee for the Preservation of the Morton villa, Brading.

Oxford - Ashmolean Library, Haverfield Archive:
Miscellaneous Correspondence - Sussex General

Includes seven letters from CRS, two to J.E. Price, 1880. The remainder, to F. Haverfield, 1888, provide interesting evidence of contacts between the old and young masters. They provide information on Roman remains in Sussex in preparation for Haverfield's paper, which won Smith's admiration.

Specific topics include the location of Portus Adurni, Smith's excavations at Bramber Castle, the Roman road from Ewell to Chichester, the walls of Chichester, which CRS considered almost wholly Roman, coins hoards from Earnley, the Chichester canal and Cakeham, and Smith's attempt to trace a hoard of late Roman coins from near Chichester, 1870s-80s. Other comments concern the walls of Chester controversy, and errors in Smith's Richborough due the Richard of Cirencester forgery.
Oxford - Ashmolean Museum, Heberden Coin Room Archive:
Volume of tracts entitled "British Coins. Coins of Cunobelin"

Lot 126 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by "George W" for 11s. Later owned by P.D. Pranker, then in 1904 by E. and E. Heron-Allen. No record of how it was acquired by the Ashmolean.

Quarto volume containing Revd B. Poste The Coins of Cunobeline and of the Ancient Britons (1853), bound with eight other papers on numismatic subjects, one by Smith, in brown calf quarter binding. With them are two proof plates and eleven letters to CRS dated 1849-53.

Eight letters are from Revd B. Poste, and concern the loan of coins and casts of coins, preparations for publications, a coin of Dubnovellamies, a viewing of J. Gurr's discoveries at Pevensey, coins of the Iceni, and attacks on him in the Athenæum. The remaining letters are from J. Evans, about an unpublished coin of Carausius in Lord Verulam's collection; and G. Johnson (2) giving the provenance of a hoard of British coins from Weston, Norfolk, coins of the Iceni, and NS meetings.

---

Oxford - Ashmolean Museum, Heberden Coin Room Archive:
Miscellaneous Letters and Papers of J. Evans


Several hundred letters, mostly to Evans, from forty different correspondents, arranged by author in three box files. The 27 letters from CRS, 1871-89, mostly concern coins.

British coins mentioned by CRS include those from Springhead, a gold Cunobelin from Borden, Gill's coins from Irchester and Kettering, and Willett's collection of gold coins from Sussex. While the BM showed little interest in cataloguing coin hoards, CRS made every effort so to do, discussing hoards from Havenstreet, 1874, from Norfolk, from Coventina's fountain, 1877, from near Eastbourne, 1879, and from Hamdon Hill, Somerset, 1888. Other Roman coins mentioned by CRS include E. Gent's collection from Richborough, coins from Blackmoor, near Alton, a coin of Allectus from Poitiers, and the coins of Carausius. He also mentions a coin of Alfred owned by Mr Jacobs of Sandwich.

Other antiquarian information relates to Roman villas in Hampshire; the destruction of the Bramdean pavement; the derivation of "Castor"; a Roman vase with Chi-Rho monogram from Lincoln, in the Duke of
Northumberland's museum; a cremation burial(?) at Richborough, 1858; J. Warren's collection of fibulae; a Roman quern of Anderval lava from Harty; and T. Barton's Norfolk(?) excavations.

CRS kept Evans au fait with his antiquarian endeavours, including the preparation and circulation of publications, his lectures at Leicester and Sheffield, 1873, and his visits to Alnwick and Bebington, 1877; Itchen Abbas and the Devil's Dyke, Sussex, 1878, and East Kent, 1880. Other comments reflect upon current antiquarian affairs, including the Chester walls controversy, and a repulse to Evans at St. Albans.


The blank notebook was given to CRS in 1846 as a birthday present from W.H. Rolfe. Purchased by the museum from R.T. Gunther who acquired it at a sale among a miscellaneous lot of papers.

Plain, octavo, manuscript book with a green morocco cover. Only the first 15 pages are used, mostly for drawings of weapons, military costume and figures depicted on Roman coins. They are accompanied by a few references and notes.

The only details of provenance are for a brass of Antoninus Pius found in Norfolk, in J. Clarke's collection; a coin of the younger Constantine found at Plymouth by L. Jewitt, 1849; and a silver Roman coin found at Cobham, Kent, 1883.


Bought from R.T. Gunther. Earlier history unknown.

Quarto Solander box, containing pencil drawings and proofs of plates of coins, mostly of Carausius and for Smith's publications. Some by Fairholt include drawings of gold Iron Age coins from near Augsburg, and a knife and shears from Saxon graves in Nordendorf, all in Augsburg museum. With these are a rubbing or tracing of a Roman(?) coin in a six-sided mount, and a letter from A. Duranof to Smith, 1853, about the circulation of publications, the nature of his collection, and D. Cuff's coin sale.
The illustrated British coins include items in J. Clarke's collection; from Comley, Hants., in D. Cuff's collection; in Eastwood's possession; in Revd H. Jenkin's collection; and from near Southampton, in C. Warne's collection.

The illustrations of Carausian coins are often accompanied by their weight in grains. The only gold Carausius was in C. Warne's collection. The silver coins include one from Corfe Castle owned by Mr Hall; from Hams, near Bath, owned by H.L. Tovey; and from Richborough, in W.H. Rolfe's collection. Those of copper include coins from Berkshire; from Farley Heath; from Dorchester, Ilchester and Somerset, in Mr Hall's collection; from Wroxeter, in T.F. Dukes' collection; and in C. Warne's collection, some from Wiltshire. Three unprovenanced coins belonged to Mr Kenyon, to Saffron Walden museum, and CRS himself.

---

Oxford - Bodleian Library, Department of Western Manuscripts: Miscellaneous Autograph Letters


Large collection of 19th-20th century autograph letters. Includes letters from CRS to F.W. Fairholt (4, 1846-57), W.H. Rolfe, 1843, and J. Mayer, 1863. Those to Fairholt include news of J.C. Bruce, W. Chaffers, G. Hillier, Eleanor Smith, and C. Warne. CRS asks his opinion of a "sword of Tiberias" and tells of his fear of sea-sickness. That to Rolfe concerns Rolfe's seal matrix and coin and a visit to Strood.


Some letters contain scraps of archaeological information: G.B. Anworth(?) described archaeological visits in Northern France, 1872. R. Blair wrote of a forged(?) intaglio, the entymology of
Coventina, the bilingual tombstone and a jet object from South Shields, which with others suggested a local jet industry, 1878. W. Bromet described a Roman lead coffin and other antiquities in St. Honorat's church, from Eliscamps cemetery, near Arles, 1844, and sent his transcript of an article in Mém. Soc. Antiqs. Normandy. E. Brown asked CRS to identify a coin belonging to W.H. Jacob, 1870. T. Brown described a Roman (?) altar and earthwork at Kirkhampton, Cumberland, 1845. T.C. Croker told of Lord Londesborough's purchase of an ivory baton of the Electors of Germany, and described gold from the Caves of Cloyne, arrowheads from North America, and a Roman bronze object from the Royal Exchange Site, London (3 letters, 1851-4). With these are a sketch and proof engraving of the Roman statuette of a standard bearer from Cologne. Other sketches are by R. Fitch, of a seal in his collection, 1857, and Ll. Jewitt, of bronze objects from Little Chester and a bone object from Derby, 1856. J.E. Price described Roman excavations in London, 1869, and J.G. Rokewode wrote of a coin of Marcus Aurelius owned by M. Lambert, 1840. W. Wire reported a sepulchral inscription from Colchester, 1850.

Other useful snips of information concern the background to antiquarian research. W. Bromet wrote about the sale of Archaeologia and the future of AJ (two letters, 1844-5). W. Wire described social prejudice against him in the local society, 1850. In 1851 CRS resigned from the BAA eliciting a cold letter of acceptance from T.J. Pettigrew. By contrast, Lord Londesborough, undated, offered to build CRS a retirement cottage. In 1869, W.W. King criticised Collingridge for permitting an attack on CRS in the City Press. He also offered to photograph Silchester, and infers that CRS had injured his arm. Other letters are from J. Clarke, about Mayer's failure to raise funds for a hospital, 1872, and a new curator at Saffron Walden Museum, 1881; from J. Thompson about discoveries at Jewry Wall, Leicester, 1874; E.W. Braybrook about a memorial to T. Wright, 1878; and from J.C. Bruce about progress in identifying coins from Coventina's fountain, 1878.

---

Oxford - Bodleian Library, Department of Western Manuscripts: R.C. Nichols Memoir of the late John Gough Nichols, FSA (Westminster 1874) with manuscript insertions

MS. Eng. misc. e.145. For letters to Smith, see fols. 41-42 and 65-66. Bought from Rollings by F. Hendriks, who inserted the manuscripts. Lot 523 in Hendriks' library sale, which was purchased by the London bookseller "Dobell" for 17s.

Includes four letters and other papers relating to J.G. Nichols (79 leaves). Two letters from Nichols to CRS concern a possible wreath on a Roman statue from Lillebonne, payments for Smith's contributions to the GH, preparations for its publication, and the Faussett collection, 1854.

576
Oxford - Bodleian Library, Department of Western Manuscripts: Miscellaneous papers

MS. Eng. lett. c. 783. For letters to and from Smith, see fols. 26-27, 48-49, 136-7 and 143-8.
Probably from Mayer and Hendriks' collections as Hendriks' pencil annotations occur on some letters.
Given by Katherine Tillotson in 1970.

Collection of miscellaneous papers, including letters and articles by N. Ault and articles by Tillotson. Includes letters to CRS from J.C. Bruce, A.J. Dunkin and J.E. Price (Somerset Herald), dated 1866-81. Bruce's letter mentions a sculpture from Ambogiana, now at Rockcliff near Carlisle.
Of the three letters from Smith, one to H.G. Adams refuses an invitation to speak, Dec. 1860; the others are to unnamed correspondents, 1876-9.

Oxford - Bodleian Library, Department of Western Manuscripts: Autograph album of William Spence


Collection of c. 300 18th and 19th century letters (610 leaves), originally in card boards. Includes pre-printed letter from CRS to Lawton, informing him that he has been enrolled as a BAA member, 1845.

Oxford - Bodleian Library, Department of Western Manuscripts: Letters to William Jerdan


One of two groups of letters to W. Jerdan, editor of LG 1817-50, arranged alphabetically by name of writer. Includes letter from CRS about plans for a BAA congress at Lincoln, the ease of election to the BAA and his attempts to get subscribers for the LG, 1846.

Oxford - Bodleian Library, Department of Western Manuscripts: Phillipps-Robertson Manuscripts
The topographical collections, correspondence and papers of Sir Thomas Phillipps, Bart. (1782-1872), whose library is said to have contained the greatest collection of manuscripts ever compiled by one man. Those portions of the collections which contain materials relating to CRS are described separately below.

Given to the Bodleian Library in 1958 by Lionel and Phillip Robinson.

Oxford - Bodleian Library, Department of Western Manuscripts: Correspondence of Sir Thomas Phillipps (1809-72)

MS. Phillipps-Robinson. Smith's letters are at the following shelf-marks: c.496, fols. 122-3; d.158, fols. 84-85; d.159, fols. 106-7; c.538, fols. 69-72; c. 544, fols. 142-7; d.167, fols. 12-13; b.159, fols. 218-20; b.164, fols. 135-43; b.166, fols. 49-50; c.574, fols. 124-5; b.168, fols. 56-58; b.175, fols. 94-100; c.601, fol. 137; b.180, fols. 117-26.

Sir Thomas Phillipps correspondence, arranged by year.

[Visit not undertaken due to lack of time, and because it was considered that this collection would contain little of relevance to the present study. It is more likely to be concerned with Shakespeare and medieval literary references to horticulture]

Oxford - Bodleian Library, Department of Western Manuscripts: Letters Books of Sir Thomas Phillipps (1809-72)

MS. Phillipps-Robinson. Smith's letters are at the following shelf-marks: e.389, fol. 7; e.391, fol. 68; e.392, fol. 136; e.394, fol. 99; e.399, fols 5 and 48; e.406, fol. 108; e.417, fols. 19-20 and 37-38.

Sir Thomas Phillipps leather bound letter books, arranged by year.
Oxford - Bodleian Library, Department of Western Manuscripts: Sir Thomas Phillipps "Papers relating to manuscripts and books"

MS. Phillipps-Robinson. A letter by CRS may be found at shelf-mark c.355, fol.167.

Collection of papers (35 leaves) relating to 17th and 18th century state papers, other manuscripts and books.

Oxford - Bodleian Library, Department of Western Manuscripts: W. Stukeley "Letters relating to coins"


An interleaved set of plates from Stukeley's *The medallic history of Marcus Valerius Aurelius Carausius, emperor of Brittain* Book II (1759), with Stukeley's notes and drawings.

Includes a letter from CRS to an unknown correspondent (n.d.) about circulation of *Inventorium* (f. 199).


Offered for sale by John Wilson, Feb. 1988

Five letters from CRS to R. Spence, 1865-78. They concern Spence's subscriptions to Smith's publications and Smith's plans for further works such as Fairholt's memoirs, which were delayed by lack of financial support, 1870.
Oxford - John Wilson (Dealer in Manuscripts): Letter from CRS to an unknown correspondent (Feb. 1852)


Thanks for inscriptions reprinted from Horsley. He is making a collection for a second edition. His health has been good since leaving the BAA. His visit to Mr Fitch, Ixworth and Bury.

Oxford - John Wilson (Dealer in Manuscripts): Letter from CRS to Dr. Leitch, n.d.


Thank-you note following a visit.


Requests him to subscribe to Illustrations.

Rochester - Guildhall Museum: "Autographs of George Payne's Colleagues and Friends"

Unaccessioned. Deposited by G. Payne, first curator of the museum.

Small leather-bound autograph book, gilt lettering, with small brass catch, containing signatures cut from letters and a few autograph letters by antiquarians and Kentish worthies, and short biographical notes added by Payne. The principal source of the autographs was CRS, whom Payne describes here as "My archaeological Godfather".

Includes a letter from T. Wright to CRS, 2 Dec. 1857. It concerns the receipt of publications, object names recorded in the Anglo-Saxon vocabularies, and news of J.C. Bruce.
Rochester - Guildhall Museum: George Payne notebook, entitled "Ancient Kent. Sepulchrae, British, Roman, Saxon and Lecture on Antiquities"

Unaccessioned. Deposited by G. Payne, first curator of the museum.

Several coverless notebooks bound together in purple buckram, with black leather quarter binding and red leather title panels with gilt lettering. Contains hand-written notes and essays on sepulchral remains, with letters stuck in place.

Among the letters are two from CRS to G. Payne, Feb. 1887. They concern jealousy aroused by a Roman lead coffin found in Plumstead and a misinterpretation of the find.

Rochester - Guildhall Museum: George Payne notebook, entitled "Biographies".

Unaccessioned. Deposited by G. Payne, first curator of the museum.

Volume of papers bound in purple buckram, with black leather quarter binding and red leather title panel with gilt lettering. Contains hand-written notes and biographical essays, some on individual sheets, others on white foolscap sheets, folded and bound in sideways.

The first biography comprises the draft of Payne's obituary of CRS (Payne 1890).


Unaccessioned. Deposited by G. Payne, first curator of the museum.

Quarto lined ledger, rebound in red buckram and lettered in gilt, containing signatures and notes, with clippings and letters tipped in. Having begun life as the visitor book for Payne's museum, the volume was then used as a scrap book relating to Smith and Payne's attempts to find a suitable home for the museum. After the sale, it was used for clippings relating to Payne, with lists of his papers, details of his membership of societies, etc.
The volume begins with biographical details and an engraving of CRS, with a note by Payne to the effect that it was Smith's idea that he should start a visitors book, and that the collection had been formed under Smith's guidance. The following pages of signatures record visits by CRS on 20 June 1877, together with Edith and Augustus Bros and William Law, on 11 June 1879, 13 Apr., 19 May and 7 July 1880 (the latter occasion "en route to Teynham", 15 June 1881, 19 July 1882, 23 May and 8 Oct. 1883.

A series of clippings and letters of 1881-33 reveal Smith's part in finding a home for the collection, which was eventually purchased for the BM in Nov. 1883. It includes letters to CRS from W.M. Wylie, who wanted Payne to deposit it in the Ashmolean Museum, and from Mr. Welby and F. Harian, who wanted to discuss its possible transfer to Canterbury and Sittingbourne, respectively, and from A.W. Franks and C.H. Read, who arranged for its purchase by the BM. A letter from CRS to Payne expresses his pleasure at the sale. Wylie's letter also discusses some "unfinished blades" (Iron Age currency bars) from Hod Hill.

---

Rochester - Guildhall Museum: "Archaeological Journals of George Payne"

Unaccessioned. Deposited by G. Payne, first curator of the museum.

Two volumes bound in red buckram, with gilt lettering, containing a series of lined notebooks in which Payne kept his antiquarian journal. Volume 1 is small quarto and Vol. 2, large octavo. The journals comprise primary records of Payne's archaeological ventures, including excavations, antiquarian notes, sketch plans, notes on historic sites, reminiscences, photographs of Kentish worthies and etchings of buildings, etc. CRS evidently regarded Payne as an emissary, and sent him any information about Kent which came his way, including pages from his own notebooks, which Payne cut up and tipped in.

**VOL. 1**

The letters include two to CRS from A.J. Dunkin, 1852. They concern preparations for publications, the possibility of archaeological finds in a brickyard on Kemsley Down, samian from Brink fields, Sittingbourne, held by the landlord of "The Dredging Smack", and a visit to East Kent, where he saw W.H. Rolfe and Mr. Elliott. A letter from W. Bland to CRS concerns the excavation of a Roman mosaic in a villa(?), 1.5 miles N.E. of Greenstreet, in a field belonging to J. Lake. A note added by CRS records that he visited in on 30 Jan. 1884. A letter from CRS to G. Payne, Nov. 1879, concerns
excavations(?) at Sandown, and Roman burials in Mr. Smeed's field, Emley or Umley Ferry, and Merstone Court Field, Sittingbourne. Smith includes sketches of pottery and other finds.

Other antiquarian notes by CRS include a sketch of a bronze sword pommel found at Hoo, 1879, impression of a Roman intaglio and ring found with Saxon interments at Milton, together with notes on the coins and pencil sketches of other antiquities from the site owned by Mr. Shilling and sketched by Mr. Shilling, Jnr., Oct. 1889.

A series of entries relate to Roach Smith's death. They include a clipping of G. Dowker's "An Epitaph", a jotting recording a humorous ditty which Smith related to Payne on his death-bed, the telegram by which Payne learnt of Smith's death, and a note recording that Payne's obituary of Smith in the JBAA was requested by the BAA council.

A letter to Payne from Mrs. Loftus Brock is accompanied by an anecdote about the lady's disgust at Smith's "disreputable" appearance when he visited her as an old man.

Vol. 2

A note by Payne records that he used this volume for particulars of discoveries outside the Sittingbourne area.

A partial transcript of a letter from Rev. J.J. Vine to CRS, May 1883, describes the excavation of a Saxon cemetery at Bifrons, and a note from CRS to G. Payne complains about Mayer's sale of his correspondence.

The principal evidence relating to Smith comprises numerous sketches and notes cut from Smith's letters, and notes copied by Payne and CRS from Smith's notebooks for the periods 1839-42, 1848-52, 1859-67, and 1884-9.

The notes are mainly concerned with Roman finds. Many relate to burials, mostly cremations, with records of discoveries at Wickham in 1800, Chart in 1839, Key Street, Woolwich in 1852, Buckland by Dover in 1859, Lullingstone, as held by Mr. Lawes, the Slay-hills, Upchurch in 1864, as secured by H. Wickham in 1889, at Gillingham in 1867, and near Preston in 1882.

Mention is made of a number of possible Roman sites: at Castle Hill, Folkestone, which Mr. Walker thought to be a British Camp, at Crayford, as represented by tile in St. Paul's Cray church, 1840, at Higham, represented by a causeway of tiles, at Charing Heath, 1824, and a Roman building at Eccles near Aylesford.
The principal categories of Roman artifacts are glass and pottery vessels. There are sketches of designs and marks on Roman glass bottles, including one marked FELIX FECIT, another held by Rev. L.B. Larking, and another from Allington Church, in the Charles Museum, both 1861. Details of a mosaic glass vessel were communicated to Smith by Mr. Hills of Ramsgate, May 1889, although Smith doubted the authenticity of a glass vessel from Quarry Farm, Frindsbury. The reported finds of pottery relate to samian stamps from St. Martin's Hill and from Rochester, near the bridge, 1888, amphorae from Goodwin Sands, 1867, and coarse wares from the Upchurch Marshes, from Shorne, and from the White Hart Inn site, in Cuxton.

Other notes on Roman finds concern Roman coins found in the sand at Deal, military diplomas found on Sydenham Common, 1806, a ring from Rochester, 1839, iron objects found with Roman pottery in Romney Marsh, 1859, an iron acus from Farningham, 1880, and an oolite statue dug up in Dover market place, 1884.

Non-Roman finds include celts found at Cobham, 1842, Saxon remains from Lympne held by Mr. Hill, curator of Chichester Museum, 1848, and a lead token from Minster.

---

**Rochester - Guildhall Museum: [Photographs of] "Home of C. Roach Smith, Strood"**

Unaccessioned. Presumably donated by H. Smetham.

Two photographs, each mounted on a piece of card, showing front and back views of Temple Place, with etchings of other houses associated with Smith cut from the frontispiece of *Retrospections* II. Notes on the back in H. Smetham's hand state that they were taken c. 1885.

---

**Rochester - Guildhall Museum: "Letters on Kentish Archaeology, Etc. to G. Payne F.S.A."**

Unaccessioned. Deposited by G. Payne, first curator of the museum.

Payne's correspondence from 1869 to 1905. Mounted in chronological order in 14 quarto volumes, bound in dark purple cloth, with black leather quarter-binding, and red leather title panel with gilt lettering.
They contain approx. 300 letters from CRS on all manner of topics connected with Kentish archaeology.

[Not catalogued due to lack of time and funds. They were given a low priority for cataloguing because they date from after the period covered by the thesis.]

---

**Rochester - Guildhall Museum: "Charles Roach Smith, Correspondence [with Rev. Canon Scott-Robertson]"**


Envelope containing 43 loose letters from CRS to Rev. Canon Scott-Robertson, starting in 1874.

Since Scott-Robertson was editor of *Archaeologia Cantiana*, it is no surprise that the majority concern preparations for *AC*, Smith's *Retrospections*, and the exchange of published works and antiquarian information, about which Smith was frequently critical. The letters are generally short, and in many cases, it is impossible to tell which antiquarian discoveries are referred to.

Antiquarian finds referred to include: bronze implements from Harty, c. 1872-3, Roman coins from Borden and the Cobham hoard, Roman foundations on Stone Street near Maidstone, the Frindsbury wall paintings, 1883, and documents relating to Winchelsea family, held by G. Find of Barley-on-the-Hill, 1875.

Smith also makes mention of Roman walled "stations", the Roman road from Canterbury to Richborough as traced by Mr. Sheppard, his visits to Stone Chapel, Lympne, Richborough, and the Dover pharos in 1875, and Mr. Irvine's drawings of Roman remains at Stone Chapel and Lieut. Peek's of the pharos, H. Wickham's rediscovery in the BM of vessels from Hoo, 1874, Smith's visit to St. Martin's Church, Canterbury, in 1882, and medieval church frescoes.

Other topics include J. Evans' acquisition of a Saxon coin hoard, attempts to engage Mr. Irvine for KAS, a projected visit to Dr. Pritchard at Faversham for surgery, the new Belgian Commission of Art and Archaeology (which he hoped would exchange publications with KAS), all 1874, Smith's work towards a map of Roman Kent and his failure to organise the immediate publication of archaeological discoveries, the poor quality of Mr. Smythe's records of the Lockham finds, Mr. Mackeson of Hythe, Mr. Faussett's ideas on *Duroleum*, floods at Strood, 1875, the failure of English antiquarians to give sufficient recognition to Cochet, and G. Payne's research on Lord Conyngham's Saxon collection, 1882.
Rochester Reference Library: "Charles Roach Smith (various notes and correspondence)"

VFI ROC 920/SMI; source unknown, probably from Henry Smetham's collection.

Small collection of notes, pamphlets, cuttings, and letters. Includes the manuscript draft (writer unknown) of a review of CA III, Pt. 1, a numbered, printed receipt for Mrs Dunkin of Illustrations, and ten letters. Six are from CRS and his sister Maria to Mr and Mrs A.J. Dunkin, 1852-9, and concern social visits and requests by CRS for copies of newspapers containing review of his works. A letter from CRS to an unknown correspondent refers to the Billy and Charley trial. Another to H. Smetham concerns arrangements for the Strood Institute Elocution Class. Of particular interest is a letter of condolence from the Revd R. Jenkins of Lyminge to H. Smetham, 5 Aug. 1890, which refers to Smith's illness as a "long trial", and the excellence of his private life.

Saffron Walden Museum: Letters to C.R. Smith from Joseph and T.P. Clarke

Archeological correspondence, folder 49. Donated to the Museum in 1906 by George Paine, who states that the letters were given to him by CRS.

Thirty-three letters from J. Clarke to CRS, together with three more from his brother, T.P. Clarke. Apart from two, all date from 1886-90.

A letter of 1857 concerns casts of items in Hon. R.C. Neville's collection, a chimney fire at the Roos, Eckroyd Smith, and of the death of the Marquis of Northampton. Another of c. 1879 concerns a Roman lead coffin in Saffron Walden Museum, another from near Melbourn, Cambs, the fate of the remaindered stock of Sepulchra Exposita, Mr. Gibson's illness, and Smith's work on the fruit committee of the London Horticultural Society.

The remaining letters from J. Clarke are those of an old man, and after the summer of 1888 are difficult to read because of his cataracts. The only antiquarian notes concern Dane holes, an earthwork near Codford church, and plants mentioned in works on the Bartlow Hills. There are occasional remarks about the doings of the Essex Archaeological Society, but the letters are otherwise filled with news of country life, gardening and farming, the receipt of books, the effects of age and illness, and the death of friends and acquaintances, who included E. Charlesworth, G.S. Gibson, H.W. King, H.E. Smith, J.O. Halliwell-Phillipps and W.T. Watkin.
In the autumn of 1886, we learn that Smith suffered a fall, and at the beginning of 1890, that J.E. Price's daughter Emma, suffered a serious arm injury. The sale of H.E. Smith's natural history collections is outlined, as is Clarke's attempt to trace Smith's antiquarian correspondence following the Mayer sales, both 1888.

T.P. Clarke's letters pursue similar themes. They contain information about Cooke of Micheldever, and news of J. Clayton, H. Faussett, and the death of two of Clarke's brothers early in 1990. The writer's strongly Protestant view of history is also strongly manifest.


Purchased new from CRS by J.Y. Akerman, on evidence of a receipt. Later acquired by J.S. Smallfield, and on 29 June 1882 by R. Marsham. Acquired by Sandwich Borough Library, and passed by them to the museum.

Contains three ink on pencil sketches by CRS of the inhumation overlying a wall of the Richborough amphitheatre, giving measurements, and showing position of skeleton, a coin, and the wall in cross section. With a letter from CRS to Revd B. Poste, Mar. 1860, concerning an introduction to a neighbour, Mr Whittaker, Wickham's excavation of a Saxon grave containing an angon, and Revd L.B. Larking's health.

Sheffield City Museum: Bateman Papers - "Thomas Bateman Antiquarian Correspondence" Vols. I - V

Part of a bulk purchase of Bateman's local material, bought in the 1893 sale of his collection.

Five quarto volumes with leather quarter binding, containing letters to T. Bateman on antiquarian matters, arranged alphabetically by correspondent and by date.

The letters from CRS may be found in Vol. III(i) (240 letters of 1844-53) and Vol. V (48 letters of 1853-58). Among the most important collections of Smith's correspondence, they concern plans and preparations for and the exchange of publications, the exchange and loan of antiquities, news of Smith's excursions, excavations, and recent discoveries in London and elsewhere, discussions on
antiquities and antiquarian discoveries, particularly barrows, Smith's views on Treasure Trove, and much about BAA affairs, especially "the split" and arrangements for its congresses at which Bateman made the occasional rare appearance; also occasional news of mutual friends and family matters.

Of particular interest are brief details of Smith's visit to York and Worsaae's visit to England in 1846, complaints by CRS after 1848 of his treatment by the BAA and his reasons for resigning. A number of letters reveal Bateman's interest in purchasing the Faussett collection. Others contain interesting information regarding the Shadwell affair and Smith's reasons for moving to Strood. Also included are some printed circulars by CRS requesting subscriptions to his publications and excavations.

The collection confirms that CRS and Bateman were on good terms, not least because CRS was instrumental in advancing Bateman and his publications. He was also active in purchasing antiquities for Bateman's museum, which he obtained from London workmen, dealers, auctions, and as purchases from other antiquarians. CRS also sent Bateman bundles of collectable autograph letters. In return Bateman bought pharmaceutical supplies, and occasionally made donations towards archaeological causes. In Oct. 1858 he obtained Smith's permission to nominate him for a civil list pension.

Sheffield City Museum: Bateman Papers - "Antiquarian Correspondence (Charles Roach Smith)"

Letters saved by CRS for Bateman's collection of autographs. They were forwarded in batches between 1839 and 1851, and are mentioned in letters from CRS to Bateman in the Bateman Antiquarian Correspondence (see above; e.g. Vol. III, letters of 19 Sept. and 23 Dec. 1851). One of the two accompanying notes from CRS advises Bateman to burn any unwanted letters. The collection was acquired by the Museum at the Bateman sale of 1893, when it was included in a bulk purchase of local material.

Quarto volume, with leather quarter-binding, containing 342 autograph letters, arranged alphabetically by writer's surname, then by date. Occasionally interspersed with portrait engravings of the authors, and prospectuses of their publications. Apart from two letters to T.J. Pettigrew (one from S.V. Hall, the other anonymous), a letter to S.W. Stevenson from H. Harrison, and another to E.B. Price from J.H. Palins(?), the letters are all to CRS. Most are unimportant and were kept solely as autographs. They are concerned mostly with NS and BAA administration, such as problems with subscriptions, the receipt and non-receipt of publications, arrangements for meetings and BAA congresses, including apologies for absence, the loan of books and exhibits, notes on antiquities, and preparations for publications. They convey some impression of the immense amount of
administrative work generated by the BAA. They also occasionally include personal details and
remarks on the health of mutual acquaintances, their current activities, the sale and purchase of
antiquities, plans for antiquarian excursions, invitations, and comments on the BAA, various
antiquarian squabbles, and current affairs.

Of greater interest is a letter from J. Brent dated Sep. 1849, urging CRS not to resign as BAA
secretary; a letter from J. Berque, reproving CRS for intemperate remarks about a fellow antiquarian,
1847; a letter from W. Chaffers about the hypocaust in Lower Thames Street, London; three from G.
Corner about a medieval bridge discovered in Kent Street, Southwark, 1848; an undated letter from
Fairholt, commenting on his friendship with W.H. Rolfe; three from Captain H. Smith, 1847-9, which
provide some idea of how he spent his later years; two from A.F. Smythe, 1847, in which he asks CRS
to help him to acquire an Egyptian mummy; a letter from W. Wire describing his periodic bouts of
depression, 1848; and the original printed notice of February 1840, which gave CRS six months notice
to quit his premises at 48 Lothbury.

The collection include letters from the following writers (if more than one letter this is stated in
Barton, W.H. Barton(?), J. Basire (1), W. Bell (2), J. Bell, Revd W. Bennett (2), J.B. Bergne (5), W.
Brooke (4), J. Brown (3), T.C. Brown, J.C. Bruce, J. Buckland, J. Buckler, A.H. Burkitt (2), H.
Clarke, R. Cole, Lord A. Conyngham (4), G.R. Corner (4), J.R. Coulthart, W. Crafter (2), E.
Frye (?), B. Gordon(?), W. Gourd, W.P. Griffith (3), Miss A. Gurney, J. Gwilt, W. Hargrove (2), W.
Harrison, W. Hawkins, Revd J.S. Henslow, W.J. Hesleden, J. Heywood, E. Hicks, Revd A. Hume (2), J.
Hunt, R.H. Inglis, G. Isaacs, J.E. Jackson, Revd H. Jenkins (2), W. Jerdan (2), C. Moore Jessop, L.
Jewitt (4), Goddard Johnson, J. Cove Jones (9), E. Keet (2), A.J. Kempe, J. King, C. Knight, Baron
Koller(?), T. Kip (?) (2), Mr Laines (?), Revd J. Layton, Col. W.M. Leake, J.E. Lee (2), R. Lejoindre,
M.A. Lemonnier (2), J. Lindsey, L. Loewe (2), H.L. Long (2), T. Lott (2), R. Grove Lowe (2), M.A.
Lower, F.C. Lukis (6), Viscount Mahon, Captain C. Manby, W. Calder Marshall(?) (2), W.J. Mannsells(?)
H.A. Mereweather (2), J. Mayer (2), Sir S.R. Meyrick (2), W. Meyrick (2), G. Milner (5), P. Murray,
Nightingale, H. Norris, M. O'Connor(?), J. Lane Oldham, Hon. Col. M.V. Onslow, G. Ormerod, Revd J.
(3), P.B. Purnell, J. Puttock (3), T. Rankin, J.A. Repton (2), G. Roughierd(?), Dr J. Rigolot, W.G.
Rogers (4), W.H. Rolfe (6), J. Russell, Baron von Ruthin(?), R. Sainthill, W.D. Saull, J.J.

Southampton University Library: Autograph note from CRS to Mrs Stuart Hall

History unknown

Inside offprint of article on Southampton by E. Kell; dated 20 Apl. 1842 (Pers. comm. G. Hampson, Sub-Librarian).

South Shields Central Museum: J. Collingwood Bruce The Bayeux Tapestry Elucidated with interleaved letters.

Ref. No. 48.154(50). Part of J.C. Bruce collection, donated to Tyne and Wear County Council by Gainsford Bruce (son of J. C. Bruce).

Includes a letter from CRS about the receipt of publications and the financial state of the SAL, 1855.

South Shields Central Museum: Volume of documents relating to research on Hadrian's Wall by J.C. Bruce, 1848-53.

Ref. No. 48.154(145). Ex. J.C. Bruce collection (see above).

Includes six letters from CRS to J.C. Bruce and a letter from C. Kroll to CRS, 22 Apl. 1851, which CRS passed to Bruce. They concern BAA affairs, and reveal ways in which CRS assisted Bruce to publicise his work.
South Shields Central Museum: Folder of papers entitled "Mural Controversy"

Part of Ref. No. 48.154; from J.C. Bruce Collection (see above)

Includes letter from F.W. Fairholt to CRS, 1857, commenting on the amount of spite exhibited towards Bruce by his clerical opponent.


Ex. J.C. Bruce Collection (see above)

J.C. Bruce's specially bound edition of this work, which contains two etchings of Birdoswald by F.W. Fairholt, sent by CRS to Bruce, with a dedication saying that they were made in his company.


Shakespeare Memorial Autographs, pp. 54-5.

The recipient is thought to have been C.E. Flower, chairman of the Governors of the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre, or possibly his brother Edgar (pers. comm., D. Flower, Director).

[Visit considered unjustified, as likely to concern Shakespeare]

Winchester - Hampshire Record Office: Will of Henry Roach

Archdeacons Court 1815, Henry Roach of Arreton

Dated 7 Aug. 1812, the will was modified by a codicil of 13 Nov. 1814. Among its provisions, Roach's daughter Ann was to receive the interest on £ 2,250, which on her death was to be divided equally between her children (including CRS).
REPUBLIC OF IRELAND

Dublin – Royal Irish Academy: Manuscripts of J. Windele, 1801-65

Purchased in 1866.

A collection of manuscripts in 130 volumes. Unindexed, but known to contain some of Smith's letters (e.g. CRS to J. Windele, 3 Sep. 1859, about subscription to Illustrations).

[Visit not possible. The collection is said to be available on microfilm from World Microfilms Publications Ltd., but proved impossible to obtain through inter-library loan]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

[The information below has been obtained mostly from published catalogues and correspondence, grants being insufficient to permit a visit to the States]

Cambridge, Massachusetts – Houghton Library, Harvard University: Miscellaneous Autographs

Autograph file. Material from various sources. The Noel Paton letters are from E.J. Wendell's bequest, 1918.

Includes three letters to CRS, 1859-65. Two are from Sir J. Noel about subscriptions for Illustrations. Another from J.W. Baily concerns a forged dagger. A letter from CRS to an unknown correspondent concerns a missed opportunity for fund-raising at the KAS meeting at Sandwich, 1864.

Cambridge, Massachusetts – Houghton Library, Harvard University: Upcott-Evelyn-Pepys Collection

Three, bound quarto volumes, half-morocco gilt, containing letters, papers and prints of W. Upcott. There are many letters between W. Upcott and J. Mayer, with those of other antiquarians and collectors, some of whom were concerned with the first publication of the diaries of Pepys and Evelyn. There are also water-colours by Schnebbelie and sketches by O. Humphrey.

Includes a letter from CRS to J. Mayer, 1853, about his Upcott collection, and letters to CRS of 1846-7 from J. Britton and A.J. Kempe (2). These mention sepulchral chests from Avisford and Rougham and a Roman baths(?) at Bletchingley. They mostly concern the A's loss of communications to the AI and JBAA, and fears that members of the SAL hoped to appoint a partisan secretary to replace W. Carlisle.

New Haven, Connecticut - The Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University: Letters to T.J. Pettigrew

Osborne 18661 (Pettigrew short list). Acquired in 1971 from Winifred Myers, dealer in autographs.

Eighteen boxes of letters to Pettigrew, dated 1815-63, from a variety of correspondents, about medicine, Egyptology, and the affairs of societies, including the BAA, AI and SAL.

Six letters to Pettigrew from CRS concern arrangements for BAA meetings and congresses; its rivalries with AI; an illness; and his visit to Germany, 1846. Another to J.G. Nichols concerns the BM's refusal to buy the Faussett collection, 1854; it encloses a note about S.W. Stevenson. Another advises an unnamed correspondent on etching, 1856. A letter from T.C. Croker to T.J. Pettigrew included a copy of a letter from CRS about the threatened Greenwich tumuli, 1844. Croker expresses concern about Smith's method of proceeding. CRS is also mentioned in letters from Sir W. Betham to T.J. Pettigrew and from T.J. Pettigrew to T.C. Croker.

The ten letters to CRS include correspondence from Bishop G.H. Law, in response to an invitation, 1836; from H. Hatcher concerning his essay on Roman roads, 1845; from H. Christmas announcing an NS meeting, 1846; from Earl W.F.B. Fitzhardinge (2) and Bishop J.H. Monk about preparations for the 1846 BAA congress; from C. Wellbeloved, 1849, and Sir H. Ellis, 1851. A kindly letter from J. Britton advised CRS against buying a cottage, 1856. Two letters from J.G. Nichols concern preparations for publications, 1857. They are accompanied by a receipt for Smith's CA from the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland.

Thanks for publication on behalf of the NS. 64


Sold at Sotheby's in Nichols sale of 1874 to "Pratt", book dealer of Guildford, for £12. He sold it to Dr. T.N. Brushfield of Budleigh Salterton. He in turn sold it to H.C. Folger of Brooklyn, who passed it to the Folger Library.

Bound interleaved run of editorial file copies of the magazine commenced by J.B. Nichols and maintained by his successors, chiefly Bowyer Nichols. It comprises 213 volumes covering the period 1731 to June 1863. When a half year's numbers had accumulated, they were sent to the binders with indexes and prefatory matter, and the family subsequently annotated them and tipped in manuscript letters, proofs and original illustrations (Kuist 1962).

Contains evidence that CRS authored a number of otherwise unattributed papers (detailed in Appendix 1a).


Sold by the Nichols family at Sotheby's in 1874 in a series of lots (Kuist 1962, vii).

Approximately 6000 items, mostly of the first half of the 19th century, collected by J.B. and J.G. Nichols whilst editing the GM. They mainly comprise loose letters, illustrations and publications, some in boxes.

Boxes 7a, 27, 28b and 29 include 43 letters from CRS, one to Mr Gavell, 1835, the remainder to J.G. Nichols, dated 1840-54. They concern offers of articles and preparations for their publication, and requests that various items should be published, including a note about the Pacha medal, a letter by Gibson, and obituaries of members of Smith's family and others. Other letters relate to BAA

64 Catalogue of Manuscripts in the American Philosophical Society Library (Westport, Connecticut, n.d.).
meetings, W. Tite’s accusations against Smith, 1846, and notes on antiquities, including coins, pilgrim badges, and the Roman pavement on the French Protestant Church site, London. Also, Smith’s pencil and ink sketch of a penny of Eadred, which accompanied his first published article in 1836 (see Appendix 1a; Kuist 1962).

---

**Washington D.C. - Folger Shakespeare Library: Letters of Shakespearean interest from J.O. Halliwell(-Phillipps) to CRS and others, 1841-83**

Call No. C.b.16-17. Part of Lot 256 in Hendriks’ sale of 28 Feb. 1910, which was purchased by Dobell for £2-6s. The Folger Library purchased this from Maggs in 1912.

Two bound volumes containing 248 letters from J.O. Halliwell(-Phillipps), mainly to CRS but including ten to J. Mayer (scattered throughout both volumes) and 25 to F.W. Fairholt (Folger Library 1971). Also printed prospectuses concerning Halliwell-Phillips’ Shakespeare and other publications. Vol. 1 contains letters of 1841-65; Vol. 2 contains letters of 1866-83.

---

**Washington D.C. - Folger Shakespeare Library: Shakespeareana. Autograph Letters of Shakespearean Interest" [to CRS]**

Call No. C.b.18-20. Part of Lot 256 in Hendriks’ manuscript sale of 28 Feb. 1910, which was purchased by Dobell for £2-6s. Folger Library purchased this from Maggs in 1912.

Three thick quarto volumes, bound c. 1911-12, containing c. 300 letters on Shakespearean topics, mainly to CRS. With these are 67 letters from CRS to J. Mayer and seven to unidentified persons. Also a few uncatalogued programmes and other printed trifles. The letters are arranged chronologically as follows: Vol. 1, 1837-69; Vol. 2, 1870-4; Vol. 3, 1875-90.

---

**Washington D.C. - Folger Shakespeare Library: C.R. Smith’s interleaved copies of his The Rural Life of Shakespeare 1st and 2nd edits. (1870 and 1874), bound with other published works and manuscript additions**
Call No. W.a.81-82. Probably incorporates parts of Lot 69 and Lot 271 in Smith's library sale, which were purchased by T.J. Reeves and "Madden" respectively. Lot 271 was described as a collection made for a new edition. The collection in its present form was compiled by F. Hendriks in 1891. Lot 447 in Sotheby's sale of Hendriks' library, 1909. This was purchased by the London dealers, Messrs Maggs, for £25-10s, and immediately sold to the Folger Library via the London dealer, A.H. Mayhew of 54 Charing Cross Road.


The remaining letters are by Stratford-upon-Avon celebrities such as Merriman and Wheler, and Shakespearean commentators such as Bruce, Douce, Gilchrist and Sir F. Madden. Also included are many portraits, drawings, privately printed papers, and a manuscript fragment of a play of Shakespeare's time.


Call No. W.b.67-69. Probably incorporates Lot 239 of J.G. Nichols' library sale of 1879, purchased by "Lawrence". Also incorporates material from the Mayer sales and miscellaneous Shakespeareana. The Folger Library purchased these volumes from J. Pearson and Co. in 1915.

Three, morocco-bound, folio, royal quarto and octavo volumes of 19th century Shakespeareana. Vol. 1 contains c. 120 autograph letters, etc. to J. Larpent (Inspector of Plays, 1778-1824), J.G. Nichols, and CRS; Vol. 2 contains prints and articles; Vol. 3 comprises a list of contents.

Washington D.C. - Folger Shakespeare Library: "Letters Addressed to Halliwell-Phillipps entirely on Shakespearean Subjects, 1879-89"


Nearly 700 letters in 8 volumes, many accompanied by draft replies from J.O. Halliwell-Phillipps. They include eighteen letters from CRS to J.O. Halliwell-Phillipps, and seven of his letters to E.E. Baker, dated 1885-89.

Washington D.C. - Folger Shakespeare Library: "A Series of 62 ... Water Colour Drawings by "Sem" of Famous Theatrical and Literary Characters ..."

Call No. W.b.94. Evidently collected by T.F. Dillon Croker. Purchased by the Folger Library in 1925, from Maggs of 34-5 Conduit Street, London.

Includes a sketch of CRS in King Lear. A letter from CRS to Croker concerns plans for a 3rd edition of Shakespeare's Rural Life (Maggs Bros. 1925, item 1977).

Washington D.C. - Folger Shakespeare Library: Miscellaneous English manuscripts on Shakespearean topics

Call No. Y.c.490. Purchased by the Folger Library prior to 3 Mar. 1910.

Includes a letter from CRS to W. Chaffers (1874) about the punctuation of a passage in Shakespeare's Comedy of Errors.

Washington D.C. - Folger Shakespeare Library: Letter from T.F. Dillon Croker to CRS (1882)
Part of Call No. Y.c.675. Offered to the Folger Library by Maggs in 1919, and subsequently purchased.

Washington D.C. - Folger Shakespeare Library:  
"Miscellaneous letters to CRS from J.O. Halliwell-Phillipps"

Call No. Y.c.1281. Purchased individually from various sources from 1915-86 (includes Holmes 1986, item 103).

Thirty-six letters on Shakespearean topics, including the possible setting of King Lear in Roman Britain, and Furnivall's attack on Halliwell. In an undated letter Halliwell promises CRS that he will pay certain debts.

Washington D.C. - Folger Shakespeare Library:  "Smith, Charles Roach ... Letters to Various People"


A letter to CRS from the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, 1874, with six from CRS; one to an unidentified recipient. A letter to Mrs Blackett concerns arrangements for her visit. Two to J. Mayer concern a proposed commemoration of Garrick's Jubilee at Stratford-upon-Avon, 1868-9. A letter to T.F.D. Croker speaks of a performance by CRS of King Lear at Strood, Jan. 1889. Another to A.L. Hunt answers his query about the implication of a coin of Augustus from Caistor St. Edmunds.

Washington D.C. - Folger Shakespeare Library:  "J. Payne Collier Shakespeareana Correspondence"

Call No. Y.d.6. Offered to the Library by James Tregahis and Son. in Jan. 1934, and subsequently purchased.

Collection of over 225 letters, nearly all addressed to J.P. Collier (1789-1883). Includes one letter to Collier from CRS, 1881.
Part b: Details of missing manuscript collections

Unless otherwise stated, all published works were issued in London.

Information has been obtained from the following sources:
- Various annotated Sotheby's sale catalogues, as listed under "London: British Library"
- Smith's Retrospections
- References in Smith's manuscript notes
- [Untitled auction catalogue of the local portion of the Mayer Collection, date of sale: 15 Dec. 1887] (Branch and Leete, Auctioneers, Liverpool 1887).65
- Taylor's "The Humours of Archaeology ..." (Taylor 1932).

J.Y. Akerman An Archaeological Index ... (1847), with manuscript additions

Lot 5 in F. Hendriks' library sale, which was purchased by "Dobell", bookseller of London, for 9s.

Octavo volume, half bound in yellow calf, gilt, with archaeological drawings and letters by the author and others such as W.S.W. Vaux, Sir H. Ellis, CRS, T.C. Croker, and T. Wright.

J.Y. Akerman Descriptive Catalogue of Rare and Unedited Roman Coins (1834), with manuscript additions

Lot 1 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by Howell, bookseller of Liverpool, for 14s.

J.Y. Akerman, Correspondence on Numismatic Subjects, 1833-40

Item 15553 in sale catalogue of Quaritch (1887, 1558). Priced at £10.

65 MP, unlisted.
Three octavo and three quarto volumes, half calf, containing several hundred letters from various authors including CRS.

**J.Y. Akerman** Coins of the Romans relating to Britain (1844), with manuscript additions

Part of Lot 3 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by "Reader" for 10s.

**J.Y. Akerman** Tradesmen's Tokens current in London, 1648 to 1672 (1849, large paper edition), with additions.

Probably Lot 12 in Fairholt's library sale, which was purchased by CRS for 5s-6d. Lot 190 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by W. George, bookseller of Bristol, for 8s.

"Antiquarian Essays" chiefly in French

Lot 5 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by W. George, bookseller of Bristol, for £1-12s.

A collection of tracts relating to primeval and mediaeval antiquities, by Abbé Cochet, Lelewel, Lecointre, J.J.A. Worsaae and others, bound in eight octavo volumes with numerous letters.

**J. Bell of Gateshead, Correspondence with C.R. Smith, 1843-57**

Collected by J. Bell of Gateshead. Later acquired by J.O. Halliwell-Phillipps and in the posthumous sale of his collection. They were acquired by Dr. Burman of Alnwick, who published selected extracts upon which this note is based (Burman 1909-17, esp. IV, 187-8). At this stage, the collection contained at least 126 items and may be as many as 238 (based on the proportion of the surviving letters which Burman published). The collection was subsequently auctioned and acquired in whole or part by Winifred Myers, dealer of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. She sold at least 33 of the letters to SANUT, who later deposited them in the Northumberland County Record Office (see entry under this heading). She later donated a further six items to Durham University Library (see entry under this heading). The rest of the collection is still missing.
The missing portion of the collection comprises the J. Bell's copies of 42 of his letters to CRS, with 42 of Smith's replies, 1843-57. Along with the surviving items (see above), the collection well illustrates the collaboration between Bell and Smith.

A BAA correspondent by Smith's invitation, in 1844 and 1848 Bell obtained for Smith an honorary membership of the SANUT. Despite limitations as an antiquary, Bell was active in sending drawings and rubbings of stones and inscriptions for BAA meetings and for Smith to identify. These included stones found in taking down the chancel of St. John's, Westgate St., stone crosses from Virgin Mary Hospital, both Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Roman inscriptions from Risingham, Sandcoe and Chesters, and altars from High Rochester. In 1852, Smith commented that Dr. Surridge's reading of an altar from Rochester was mistaken, but condemned an attack on Surridge as ungentlemanly.

Bell also sent information for Smith's articles on the Wall, and complied with a request for penny histories and ballads for J.O. Halliwell. In return, Smith met Bell's requests for coins, tokens and medals, sent impressions of the same, and donated London finds to Bell and the SANUT, including samian and Roman wall-plaster. He hoped these would encourage them to establish comparative collections, 1844 and 1848. Smith also assisted in identifying objects, including a hoard of Roman coins marked PLON from cutting of Alstone Branch of Newcastle and Carlisle railway, a "British" spindle whorl, an inscribed bell, ivory spillikins, and a seal die referring to "the Union".

The men swapped antiquarian news, including news of publications, which they collaborated in exchanging. In 1843, Smith warned that a forger of Saxon coins was heading for Scotland. He also discussed a Roman inscription from Hartlepool, legionary tiles, and Yates' "disappointing" paper on German wall. Bell described the loss in 1845 of manuscripts relating to Hexham riots of 1760, the destruction of "Robin of Risingham", and the activities of the Shanks family who owned the site, which he feared they would destroy for building stone, 1845-9. Smith advised appealing to their pockets. The Newcastle Corporation's decision in 1844 to destroy a church also evoked comment. Bell also reported the discovery of a well or cistern at High Rochester and J.C. Bruce's discovery of an aqueduct at Great Chesters, 1850, while Smith reported W.H. Rolfe's excavations at Ozingell, 1845, his own visit to wall, and the Duke of Northumberland's excavations at High Rochester, both 1853.

The men also exchanged news on society affairs. Smith described developments at the SAL, the reasons for the BAA split, the Way party's attacks on the BAA prior to the Winchester congress of 1845, Mr. Gibson's adherence to the Institute, and Parker's rift with it, 1849. Bell did not like the Institute, especially after they managed to lose items belonging to himself and others at the York congress, 1846. Smith commented that he thought congresses injurious to science. In 1851, he wrote
of his desire to establish links between English and continental antiquaries, but in 1853 indicated that Bell should resign from the BAA, due to the treatment he had received.

Bell described the SANUT's restoration of the castle and their move into it, 1849. A banquet held by the Society in 1848 drew criticisms from Smith in view of their failure to publish regularly. Way scored a victory by visiting the SANUT prior to Smith, and was elected in 1850. The members immediately requested a joint Institute and BAA meeting, but Smith explained that the Institute would never agree. The Institute nevertheless met at Newcastle in 1852. The Duke of Alnwick was bored with them, but Bruce enjoyed the attention. Bell had a particular dislike of J.C. Bruce and others who joined c. 1846-9, whom he called the "Wise Ones".

Various antiquarian friends are mentioned. Bell reported the death in 1845 of J. Hodgson, the Sotheby's sale of Leigh's coins, the destruction by fire of J. Adamson's library, both 1849, and visits from J.G. Nichols and T. Hugo, 1852. Smith described the accusations against Halliwell, 1845-6, and provided news of D. Haigh, 1846, and the death of H. Stothard, 1847. In 1846, Smith wrote a letter of introduction for J.A.A. Worsaae, and Bell showed him around the museum.

Bell kept Smith informed as to his professional and antiquarian activities, including his work surveying coalfields, and his long illness from 1854-7. He also mentions the outbreak of cholera and an explosion in Newcastle, 1854. In 1849, Bell described his collection of clippings about the railway King, Hudson, which drew sneers from Smith about the flattery Hudson received. From 1847, Bell sought Smith's assistance in selling his library, which Smith advised putting to auction. Smith nevertheless wrote to the SAL to see if they would buy Bell's scrapbook relating to the Wall, but they declined, 1851. It was eventually purchased for the Bodleian Library by Dr. Bandinel, 1852.

---

C. Boutell Arms and Armour in Antiquity and the Middle Ages (1874), extra illustrated with manuscript additions.

Lot 42 in sale of Hendriks' library, which was sold to "Treguskis" for £3-16s.

Contains letters of antiquarians, including CRS.

[Illustrations of] "British Antiquities"
Lot 207 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by B. Quaritch, bookseller of London, for £21-10s.

Five, thick, bound quarto volumes containing many hundreds of engravings, drawings in water colour, pen, and pencil; manuscript letters from antiquarians, tracts, printed matter, etc. illustrating the antiquities of Britain, collected by CRS.

British Archaeological Association Meetings at Chester, 1849 and 1854

Lot 188 in Branch and Leete's auction of Mayer's local collections, 15 Dec. 1887. Perhaps compiled by T.C. Croker (see under C.R. Smith, below).

Comprises letters, papers, etc. and must include correspondence from CRS, who was secretary to the 1849 congress.

British Archaeological Association Minute Books, 1843-1852

When R. Bagster became the Association's treasurer in 1910, it is said that he could not obtain any of the papers or minute books (Taylor 1932, 220).

J. Britton Memoir of John Aubrey F.R.S. (1845), with manuscript additions

Referred to by Smith (1886, 91).

Includes letter from J. Britton to CRS about SAL affairs, 1850.

J.C. Bruce The Roman Wall (1851), with manuscript additions

Lot 25 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by "James" for £1-4s.

Stated to contain drawings and other additions.
J.C. Bruce *The Roman Wall* (1853), with manuscript additions

Lot 26 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by W. George, bookseller of Bristol, for £1-9s.

Stated to contain letters from several antiquarians.

---

J.C. Bruce *The Wall of Hadrian* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne 1874), and other pamphlets, with manuscript additions

Lot 11 in F. Hendriks' library sale, which was purchased by "Treguskis" for £2.

Bound together in half red morocco, with autograph letters of J.C. Bruce, J. Clayton, J.O. Halliwell, Dr. Kendrick, J. Mayer, J.G. Nichols, CRS, T. Wright, etc.

---

J.C. Bruce *Lapidarium Septentrionale* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne 1875), with manuscript insertions

Lot 305 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by "James" for £4-10s.

---

J.H. Burn *Descriptive Catalogue of the London Traders, Tavern and Coffee-House Tokens current in the Seventeenth Century ...* (1855), with manuscript additions

Lot 66 in sale of F. Hendriks' library, which was purchased by "Treguskis" for £5-12s-6d.


---

W. Chaffers *Hall Marks on Gold and Silver Plate* (1863), with manuscript insertions

One of two volumes sold as Lot 80 in sale of F. Hendriks' library, which was bought by "Treguskis" for £1.
Bound in half red morocco. Includes autograph letters of the author and CRS.

L'Abbé J.B.D. Cochet La Normandie Souterraine (Paris 1855) and Sepultures Gauloises, Romaines, Franques et Normandes (Paris 1857), bound with additional matter.

Probably Lot 43 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by W. George, bookseller of Bristol, for £1-1s. Lot 84 in sale of F. Hendriks' library, which sold for 11s to Vyt.

Quarto volume, bound in half calf, with original drawings and autograph letters of the author, J.Y. Akerman, L. Delisle, Francisque-Michel, Boucher de Perthes, etc.

[Collection relating to] "Coins, Medals and Tokens"

Lot 85 in sale of F. Hendriks' library, which was purchased by "Treguskis" for £1-8s.

Quarto volume bound in half red morocco, containing tracts, newspaper clippings, portraits, engravings and autograph letters about coins, medals and tokens. Includes letters from J. Adamson, J.Y. Akerman, W.H. Brockett, O. Jewitt, B. Pistrucci, B. Nightingale, R. Sainthill and CRS.

T.C. Croker, Scrapbook of ephemera relating to the first BAA Congress

Compiled by T.C. Croker. After his death in 1854, it seems to have passed to T. Wright. It was purchased from Wright's niece by E.A.B. Barnard, FSA, who sold it to the BAA in 1928 (Taylor 1932, 183). Probably lost when the BAA's premises were bombed during the second world war.

Contains newspaper cuttings and other documents relating to the first BAA congress, with letters from antiquarians concerned with its promotion. Described by Taylor (1932).

T.C. Croker, Ephemera relating to the BAA Congresses at Worcester and Chester, 1848-9
Compiled by T.C. Croker. After his death, the material passed into the hands of T. Wright, who offered it to J. Mayer.66

T.C. Croker A Walk from London to Fulham ... (1860), with autograph letters inserted

Lot 92 in sale of F. Hendriks' library, which was sold to the London bookseller "Rimell", for £3-17s.


Descriptive Catalogue of Ancient British and British Roman Coins (Amsterdam 1820), with manuscript additions.

Part of Lot 294 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by J.G. Waller for 15s.

Charles Dickens, letter to C.R. Smith, 27 June 1857.

Lot 205 in sale of Hendriks collection, Feb. 1910, which was purchased by "Treguskis" for £3.

Among a small collection including letters by members of Dickens' family, clippings etc.

Grangerised volumes of A.J. Dunkin (Ed.) A Report of the Proceedings of the British Archaeological Association, at the first General Meeting, held at Canterbury, ... 1844 (1845), and British Archaeological Association Transactions of the British Archaeological Association, at its Second Annual Congress, Held At Winchester ... 1845 (1846).

Lot 49 in F. Hendriks' library sale, which was purchased by Thorp for 14s.

66 TW: L, TW to JM, 8 June 1860.
Two octavo volumes, with illustrations and autograph letters of well known antiquarians, including CRS.

---

**F.W. Fairholt Tobacco: its History and Associates, with manuscript additions**

Lot 133 in the sale of F. Hendriks' library, which was purchased by "Burt" for £2-14s.

Bound in half calf, gilt, with extra illustrations and autograph letters, amongst others, from the author, W. Chaffers, T.F.D. Croker, H.W. Diamond, J.O. Halliwell-Phillipps and CRS.

---

**F.W. Fairholt, Original Drawings, Correspondence, Manuscripts, Engravings, etc.**

Among material which CRS sent to J. Mayer for safekeeping. Lot 124 in the sale of Mayer's collection of autograph letters, which was purchased by H. Southeran, bookseller of London, for £37.

Manuscript materials arranged loose in 26 quarto portfolios, comprising "a large and most important collection of original drawings, autograph letters to and from Fairholt and his friends; original manuscripts, engravings from his works", etc. It included letters from CRS and Fairholt's "Journey Book" of 1849, which describes visits with CRS to IOW and Sandwich (Smith 1883, 218-9).

---

**F.W. Fairholt, Sketch books**

Part of archive of materials relating to Fairholt (see above). Lot 125 in the sale of Mayer's autograph letters, which was purchased by Howell, the Liverpool bookseller, for 19s.

Twenty-six sketch books "filled with his drawings and journals".

---

**F.W. Fairholt, Water-Colour Drawings**

Lot 324 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by E. Parsons for £4-15s.

Fifty water-colour drawings, chiefly of the environs of London.
T. Fisher *History of Rochester* (Rochester 1772), with numerous additions

Part of Lot 141 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by "Robinson" for 19s. This may have been G. Robinson of the Strood Elocution Class (Smith 1879b).

---

**Tracts etc. relating to "Foreign Antiquities"**

Lot 226 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by A.W. Franks for £2-10s.

Two quarto volumes, bound in half calf, containing a collection of tracts, chiefly French, illustrated with plates and drawings, manuscript letters, etc.

Four French tracts dedicated to CRS, with a letter and drawings, may be found in the BM's Department of Medieval and Later Antiquities. They are bound in a volume of tracts of c. 1835-1940 entitled: "Pamphlets. Foreign Teutonic Mixed". If the tracts are from Lot 226, this must have been broken up, and the remainder could be anywhere within the BM or BL.

---

**J.O. Halliwell Dictionary of Archaic and Provincial Words ... (1865), with inserted letters**

Two of five volumes which formed Lot 156 at the sale of F. Hendriks' library, 1909. These were purchased by "Blackburn" for £1-1s.

Bound in half calf, gilt, with letters from the author and CRS.

---

**Manuscript by F. Hayward entitled "Remarks (with notes and delineations) on the Vases, Cinerary Urns, and other earthen Utensils found in the Turf Bogs between Dunkirk and Bruges ... 1818"**

Lot 161 in the sale of F. Hendriks' library, which was purchased by Edwards for 9s.
Bound in half calf with numerous pencil and ink illustrations. Presented by CRS to J. Mayer.

F. Hendriks, [Collection relating to] "Topographers, Antiquaries, Printers and Literati"

Lot 240 in the sale of F. Hendriks' manuscript collection, 1910, which was purchased by "Treguskis" for £3.

Large collection of letters, papers, cuttings, etc. illustrated with drawings, portraits and views. Likely, but not certain, to contain material relating to CRS.

F. Hendriks, [Collections] "Theatrical and Musical"

Materials compiled by Hendriks, chiefly from the collections of J. Mayer and CRS. Lot 248 in sale of Hendriks' manuscript collection, which was purchased by B.F. Steves for £11-10s.

Two portfolios containing a "large collection" of portraits, views of theatres, some coloured, and letters, including those of J. Barham, D. Garrick, J.O. Halliwell-Phillipps.

Work by G. Hillier, with manuscript additions by C.R. Smith

Mentioned as being included in a Sotheby's sale in 1870.67

F. Hobler Records of Roman History ... as Exhibited on Roman Coins (1860), with manuscript additions

Lot 262 in the sale of F. Hendriks' library, which was purchased by Dobell, bookseller of London, for 5s.


L. Jewitt The Wedgwoods ... (1865) with autograph letters inserted

Lot 337 in the sale of F. Hendriks' library, which was purchased by "Shepherd" for £1-19s.

Included letters from the author, S. Birch, W. Chaffers, F.W. Fairholt, Eliza Meteyard, F. Palliser, J.A. Repton, CRS, A. Way, H. Wedgwood, etc.

R. Langton The Childhood and Youth of Charles Dickens
(Manchester 1883), with additional matter.

Lot 116 in the sale of F. Hendriks' library, which was purchased by Dobell, bookseller of London, for £3-5s.

Octavo volume, in half red calf, with additional illustrations and manuscript letters about Dickens from various writers, including F.W. Fairholt, Sir J. Lubbock, J. Maas, CRS and T. Wright.

J.E. Lee Isca Silurum. Catalogue of the Antiquities at Caerleon (1862-8), with additions

Part of Lot 91 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by "Morgan" for £1-13s.

W.R. Lethaby, Manuscript items relating to F.W. Fairholt

Previously owned by W.R. Lethaby (1923, 146 and 185-6).

A small number of manuscript items, including F.W. Fairholt's drawing of the Bacchante mosaic found under the Excise Office, Broad Street, 1854, and a letter from CRS to F.W. Fairholt about the inscription from St. Nicholas Lane, London, c. 1856-9, with Smith's sketch of the same.

Lord Londesborough [Collection of Autograph Letters of] "Authors"
Lot 268 in the sale of Lord Londesborough's autograph letters and historical documents, which was purchased by "Bennett" for 5s.

"Interesting letters of John Britton, C.R. Smith, Archdeacon Coxe, Sir Henry Ellis, G. Chalmers etc. - a parcel."

Lord Londesborough Recollections of Old Christmas, a Masque performed at Grimston (privately printed, 1850) and Index to the Exhibition at 144 Piccadilly (ib. 1850), with manuscript additions

Lot 245 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by A.W. Franks for £1-1s.

Bound together in a quarto volume, containing etchings on India paper, pencil and pen and ink drawings.

C.W. Martin History and Description of Leeds Castle, Kent (1869), with letters and cuttings

Lot 307 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by "Bull" for 8s.

J. Mayer, Various Tracts on pottery, etc.

Part of Lot 11 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by W. George, bookseller of Bristol, for 19s.

Bound in an octavo volume with a portrait and other additions.

J. Mayer (attrib.) Memoirs of Thomas Dodd, William Upcott and George Stubbs (Liverpool 1879), with manuscript additions

One of four volumes which comprised Lot 50 in F. Hendriks' library sale. Sold to Dobell for 17s.
Included autograph letters of F.W. Fairholt, Lord Londesborough, J. Mayer, CRS, etc.

E. Meteyard The Life of Josiah Wedgwood ... (1865), with manuscript additions.

Lot 379 in the sale of F. Hendriks' library, which was bought by "Shepherd" for £1-16s.

Two octavo volumes bound in red morocco, gilt, including seven autograph letters of the author, and others from J.C. Bruce, F.W. Fairholt, J. Mayer, J.A. Repton, CRS, A. Way, and E. Walford.

Museum of Classical Antiquities (1851-53), with some additional matter

Part of Lot 112 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by W. George, bookseller of Bristol, for 7s.

R.C. Neville Antiqua Explorata (Saffron Walden 1847-8) with additional matter.

Lot 116 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by Ridler for £1-1s.

J.G. Nichols, "Autograph Letters" including transcripts of Cole's Letters to Horace Walpole

Lot 122 in sale of Nichols' library, which was purchased by "Bayley" for 15s.

Comprised a parcel of letters including some of C.R. Smith.

J.G. Nichols, "Autograph Letters ... with contributions for Gentleman's Magazine"

Lot 151 in sale of Nichols' library, which was purchased by "Bayley" for 13s.
A parcel of letters, some by CRS.

J.G. Nichols, "Autograph Letters, chiefly with articles for Gentleman's Magazine, Archaeologia etc. ..."

Lot 176 in sale of Nichols' library, which was purchased by "Daniell Sen." for 16s.

Bundle of 150 letters, some by CRS.

Sir F. Palgrave History of the Anglo-Saxons (1876), with additional matter.

Lot 401 in the sale of F. Hendriks' library, which was purchased by "Owen" for £2-12s.

Bound in half red calf, gilt, with portraits and many autograph letters from Anglo-Saxon scholars, including the author, J.O. Halliwell, J.M. Kemble, Sir F. Madden, CRS, B. Thorpe (including fragments of his autobiography), and T. Wright.

J.O. Halliwell-Phillipps, "Shakespearean Collections"

Halliwell-Phillipps chief Shakespearean collections were destined for Stratford-upon-Avon until he had a difference with the Corporation of that town in 1884. After Birmingham corporation had refused to purchase them, they were auctioned as a single lot in 1897, and purchased by Marsden J. Perry, of Providence, Rhode Island, USA.

They are likely to contain correspondence with CRS.

J.R. Planche Extravaganzas, with author's letter inserted

Lot 124 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by "Dove" for 15s. This may have been W. Dove, who was on the committee of the Strood Institute Elocution Class (Smith 1879b).

E.B. Price "Journal" [for 1841, etc.]
Referred to in E.B. and J.B. Price's "Antiquarian Diary" for 1841-62. In 1882 it was still in the possession of his son J.E. Price. With other papers belonging to E.B. Price, its whereabouts is unknown.

[Tracts relating to] Roman Britain

Lot 135 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by W. George, bookseller of Bristol, for £2-16s.

Collection of over fifty tracts by various authors relating to Roman antiquities in Britain, bound in three volumes, with calf quarter-bindings, authors letters inserted.

[Tracts relating to] Romano-British, Saxon and other Early Antiquities in England

Lot 136 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by W. George, bookseller of Bristol, for £1-18s.

Collection of tracts by various authors, bound in four volumes, with calf quarter-bindings and authors letters inserted. A volume of "Select Antiquarian Tracts and Autographs" in Durham University Library might incorporate material from these.

C. Seymour Survey of Kent (1776), with numerous manuscript additions

Part of Lot 141 in C.R. Smith's library sale, which was purchased by "Robinson" for 19s (see above).

G. Sim, Collection of Pamphlets chiefly on Numismatic and Antiquarian Subjects, with autograph letters of the authors

Collected by G. Sim. Lot 404 in the sale of F. Hendriks' library, which was bought by "Thorp", bookseller, for £1-15s.

68 In BM:DMLA.
69 MP, JEP to CRS, 21 May, 1882.
Seven octavo volumes bound in half calf. Likely, but not certain, to contain letters by CRS. Perhaps the same as "Select Antiquarian Tracts and Autographs" in Durham University Library (see above).

Autograph letters by members of the "Society of Antiquaries"

Lot 224 in the sale of Mayer's collection of autograph letters, which was purchased by "Barker" for £12-12s.

Twenty-one quarto volumes containing c. 2,100 letters and portraits, etc. of members of the SAL during the 18th and 19th centuries. This is likely to have contained materials relating to CRS, who may have been involved in its compilation.

C.R. Smith The Antiquities of Richborough, Reculver and Lymne (1850); Report on Excavations made on the Site of the Roman Castrum at Lymne in 1850 (1852), with additional matter.

Lot 564 in the sale of F. Hendriks' library, which was purchased by the bookseller "Thorp" for £1-5s.

Bound together, in half brown morocco, with numerous extra illustrations and autograph letters, including some of F.W. Fairholt, F. Hobler, CRS and W.H. Rolfe.

C.R. Smith, Collection of materials relating to "Chester"

Lot 215 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by A.W. Franks for £1-4s.

Quarto portfolio of letters, printed matter, newspaper cuttings, etc. relating to the antiquities of Chester.

C.R. Smith Collectanea Antiqua Vols. I-VII (printed for the subscribers, 1843-80) with manuscript additions
Compiled and bound by J. Clarke of Saffron Walden. Lot 18 in the sale of his library, which was purchased by B. Quaritch, bookseller of London, for £18-5s.

Seven volumes bound in eight, and illustrated with "a great variety of drawings, manuscript additions, plates, and printed matter inserted by the late Jos. Clarke".

C.R. Smith Collectanea Antiqua Vols. I-VII (printed for the subscribers, 1843-80)

Owned by Sir John P. Boileau. Sold by Howes Bookshop, Trinity Hall, Braybrooke Terrace, Hastings, East Sussex, during latter part of 1986. The bookshop could not recall to whom they had sold the set.

Volume VII contains three autograph letters by CRS, one being a receipt for Sir John's subscription fee.

C.R. Smith, Collections relating to Faussett's Inventorium Sepulchrale (1856)

Lot 291 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by F. Hendriks for £1-15s. Lot 248 in the sale of Hendriks' library, which was purchased by the bookseller "Thorp" for £1-2s.

Four portfolios containing several hundred engravings and letters from CRS, F. Moreau and many others, relating to Anglo-Saxon and foreign antiquities. The Hendriks' sale catalogue suggests that a copy of Inventorium in two volumes, was sold with them.

C.R. Smith's Correspondence

Approximately 20,000 letters, by Smith's own estimate, which he sent to J. Mayer for safekeeping. Included letters of thanks for the second edition of his Remarks on Shakespeare. Lot 260 in the sale of Mayer's collection of autograph letters, in which it was described as two large cases containing "many thousands of autograph letters, principally from antiquarians, and all on interesting subjects, the original autograph manuscript of his Retrospections is also added, together

70 BL, MS. 41496, f. 196, CRS to SGP, 6 Jan. 1888.
71 MP, CRS to JM, 11 June 1878.
with the printed copy, and photographs of himself, his house, etc." It probably also included CRS correspondence illustrative of the history of the BAA.\textsuperscript{72}

The collection was purchased by F. Hendriks for £5-17s-6d. He rearranged it, and incorporated some of it into his collection of extra-illustrated books. At the 1910 sale of Hendriks' manuscript collection, the remaining correspondence was sold as three lots:

Lot 254 comprised the portfolios relating to Smith's Retrospections, which were purchased by W. Daniell for £5-2s- 6d. The bulk of these collections are now in the Liverpool Central Library Records Office.

Lot 256 was described as: "Original sketches of Roman Antiquities in France, letters respecting his collections, manuscript Journey book in Fairholt's autograph, pamphlets, engravings, autograph letters of antiquarians, other of J.O. Halliwell-Phillipps on Shakespearean topics, F.W. Fairholt, etc. ... in 7 portfolios." Purchased by "Dobell", bookseller, for £2-6s.

Lot 257 comprised the bulk of the correspondence and was described as numbering "several thousand" being contained "in about 33 boxes and parcels". Purchased by Maggs, bookseller of London, for £ 4-12s. The collection probably included Smith's letters from J.R. Planché.\textsuperscript{73} It may also have included Smith's correspondence with W.H. Rolfe about Kentish antiquities and BAA affairs,\textsuperscript{74} and with T.C. Croker about the BAA. This had passed through the hands of T. Wright, who offered it to Mayer in 1860.\textsuperscript{75}

Lot 257 presumably included "the extensive correspondence which arose from the [London] collections" which Mayer had "mounted and bound in forty volumes (Smith 1886, 188). When CRS was sorting these items prior to sending them to Mayer, he records that he had retained 500 letters dated 1851 and 700 of 1852.\textsuperscript{76}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{C.R. Smith "[Manuscript] Notebooks, containing Sketches and Notes made by Mr Roach Smith, during his Travels inspecting Antiquities"}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{72} THC III, CRS to TH, 22 June 1869.
\textsuperscript{73} MP, CRS to JM, 3 Nov. 1881.
\textsuperscript{74} LOA 79/19, CRS to JOH, 30 Dec. 1861.
\textsuperscript{75} TW:L, TW to JM, 8 June 1860.
\textsuperscript{76} LOA 217/5 and 189/2: CRS to JOH, 14 and 30 Apl. 1875, respectively.
Lot 151 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by "Nattali" for £2-15s. Nattali seems to have split the collection. According to the catalogue of Smith's library, Lot 151 contained 31 items. The following located items may be from this Lot, although some could be from Lot 311:

"Notes on Antiquities found in the City of London and in its Vicinity [1830-5]" This was acquired by A.W. Franks who left it to the BM:DMLA.

"1836: Vol. II. Notes on Discoveries in London, and also on private matters" This has a similar history to the above.

"From May 1838. Vol. III" History similar to the above.

"Vol. IIII. 1840 & 1841" History similar to the above.

"1842. Vol. V" History similar to the above.

"Notes 1842. 1851 etc." History similar to the above.

"Notes. 1839 to 1842". This found its way into the collection of F.W. Bourdillon, which was sold by his executors to the National Library of Wales (MSS. 5119B)

"Notes Archaeological [1854]". This found its way into the library of T.W. Brushfield, then that of F.W. Bourdillon (see above). Now in the National Library of Wales (MSS. 5123C).

"[Book of] Sketches of Roman Pottery etc. found in London, and formerly in the Museum of C. Roach Smith, now in the British Museum". From the collection of A.W. Franks (BM, Department of Prehistoric and Roman antiquities.

The following five sketchbooks are also from the collection of F.W. Bourdillon (National Library of Wales Mss. Part 5126B), and may or may not have been included in Lot 151:

"Chesters, Rochester, Housesteads, & Birdoswald. August, 1853"

"Embleton [1854]"

"1867"

Two sketchbooks labelled "France 1876"
Assuming that the above all belonged to Lot 151, another seventeen items have yet to be located. Among these are presumably the manuscript notebooks entitled "Notes 1857" (cited by CRS in his interleaved copy of his Catalogue of the Museum of London Antiquities, now in the possession of Dr. D.V. Clarke, Edinburgh) and "MSS 1860 to 1866" (cited in SAL, Smith's own copy of CA II).

C.R. Smith Report on Excavations made upon the Site of the Roman Castrum at Pevensey, in Sussex, in 1852 ... (1858), with manuscript additions

Lot 563 in the sale of F. Hendriks' library, 1909, which was purchased by the bookseller "Thorp" for £1.

Bound in half red calf, with extra illustrations, a 76-page draft in Smith's hand of an unpublished(?) paper on "Roman pottery found in Flanders", and autograph letters of W.A. Lower and CRS.

C.R. Smith, Collection of tracts by various authors entitled "Romano-British and other Early Antiquities in England"

Lot 136 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by W. George, bookseller of Bristol, for £1-18s.

Stated to be bound in four volumes, half calf, gilt, with plates and author's letters inserted. The collection may have been split by F. Hendriks; a volume of tracts owned by Smith, with manuscript insertions from Hendriks' collection is held by Durham University Library.

C.R. Smith, Collection of Illustrations relating to "Roman London"

Lot 81 in Sotheby's sale of J. Clarke's library, which was purchased by B. Quaritch, bookseller of London, for £10.

"A collection of many hundred drawings, plates and other illustrations of Roman London made by C. Roach Smith".
C.R. Smith, "Visitors' Book"

Still in Smith's possession in 1886, since he quotes from it (Smith 1886, 151; Smith 1883, 14). Not in his library sale.

Described as "a book in which his friends on their first visit inscribe their names ...", and which was considered by a contemporary as "rather valuable as a collection of autographs". It included many hundreds (Smith 1886, 1).

B. Thorpe Diplomatarium Anglicum Aevi Saxonici (privately printed 1865), with manuscript additions

Lot 163 or 164 in Smith's library sale, which were purchased by "Ridler" and "Reader" for 8s and 13s respectively.

Stated to contain many letters (Smith 1883, 70).

F.T. Vine Caesar in Kent ... (1887), with autograph letters inserted.

One of seven volumes which comprised Lot 475 in the sale of F. Hendriks' library, which was sold to Thorpe, bookseller of Bristol, for £1-7s.

Includes letters of the author, J.B. Deane, F.G. Faussett, Revd B. Poste, CRS and T. Wright.

J.G. Waller, Collections of Autograph Letters

Original letters of authors and others collected by J.G. Waller. Lots 210-13 and 215-56 in the sale of his autograph letters, 1900, some of which were purchased by F. Hendriks.

J.G. Waller, Portrait of C.R. Smith, 1842

77 MP, JEP to CRS, 21 May 1882, quoting journal of EBP, now missing.
C. Wellbeloved *Eburacum, or York under the Romans* (York 1842) with manuscript additions

Lot 174 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by "Morgan" for 15s.

Included plates, water-colour drawings, and letters.

T. Wright *An Archaeological Album* (1845), with manuscript additions.

Lot 286 in Smith's library sale, which was purchased by F. Hendriks for 8s. Lot 188 in the sale of Hendriks' library, which was purchased by "Shepherd" for 15s.

Bound in half blue calf, with extra illustrations and autograph letters by the author, Dr. Bromet, T. Crofton Croker, F.W. Fairholt and W.H. Rolfe, etc.

T. Wright *The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon* (1975), with manuscript additions.

Lot 488 in the sale of F. Hendriks' library, which was purchased by "Owen" for £2-2s.

Bound in half red calf, with pen and ink drawings, extra engravings and autograph letters, including some by F.J. Baigent, J.C. Bruce, J.G. Nichols, CRS, C. Warne and A. Way.

T. Wright *Uriconium*, with drawings and manuscript additions

Lot 188 in C.R. Smith's library sale, which was purchased by B. Quaritch, bookseller of London, for £2.

---
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Part c: Institutions contacted, which claim to hold nothing of relevance

* denotes that m/s collections incompletely catalogued

Canada

Toronto - Royal Ontario Museum
Toronto - Thomas Fisher Library
Toronto - University Archives
Toronto - University College (special collections)

Denmark

Copenhagen - Royal Library, Department of Manuscripts

Great Britain

Alnwick Castle Museum*
Aylesbury - Buckinghamshire County Museum*
Aylesbury - Buckinghamshire Record Office
Bangor - The Library, University College of North Wales
Barnard Castle - The Bowes Museum
Bath Museum Service
Bedford - Bedfordshire Record Office
Blackburn Museum and Art Gallery
Birmingham - City Museum and Art Gallery
Birmingham Reference Library
Birmingham University Library, Special Collections
Department
Brighton - Art Gallery and Museums
Brighton - Sussex University Library
Bristol - City of Bristol Museum and Art Gallery*
Cambridge - Cambridgeshire Record Office
Cambridge - FitzWilliam Museum, Department of Antiquities
Cardiff - Glamorgan Archive Service
Cardiff - National Museum of Wales
Carlisle - Cumbria Record Office
Carlisle - Museum and Art Gallery*
Chatham Public Library*
Chelmsford - Essex Record Office*
Chester - Cheshire Record Office
Cirencester - Corinium Museum
Colchester Central Library
Coventry City Record Office
Derby Museum and Art Gallery
Dorchester - Dorset Record Office
Dover Museum
Durham County Record Office
Edinburgh - Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland Edinburgh - Royal Scottish Museum
Exeter - Royal Albert Memorial Museum
Exeter University Library
Folkestone - Kent Archives Office, South East Branch
Glasgow - Art Gallery and Museum
Glasgow - Hunterian Museum
Glasgow - The Mitchell Library, Rare Books and Manuscripts Department
Gloucester - City Museum and Art Gallery
Gloucester Library (including Library of Bristol Gloucestershire Archaeological Society)
Gloucester Record Office
Gravesend - Central Library
Guernsey Museum and Art Gallery*
Guildford Museum; Library of Surrey Archaeological Society*
Halifax - Bankfield Museum
Harpenden - Miss Melita Roachsmith (Smith's Great great Niece, by his brother Richard)
Hereford City Museum and Art Gallery
Hereford - Hereford and Worcester Record Office
Hertford - Hertfordshire Record Office
Ipswich Museum*
Ipswich - Suffolk Record Office
Keele University Library
Kidderminster Library
Kingston-upon-Thames - Surrey Record Office
Leeds City Museum
Leeds University - The Brotherton Library
Leeds - Yorkshire Archaeological Society*
Leicester - Leicestershire Museum and Art Gallery
Lewes - Museum of Sussex Archaeology
Lewes - East Sussex Record Office
Lincoln - Lincolnshire Record Office
London - Bishopsgate Institute
London - Borough of Camden Library Service, Holborn Branch
London - British Museum, Department of Coins and Medals
London - Courtaud Institute of Art, Witt Library
London - Cuming Museum, Walworth, London - Dr. Williams's Library
London - Finsbury Library, Archives and Local History Collections
London - Guildhall Library, Manuscripts Department
London - Hammersmith and Fulham Public Library, Archives Department
London - Institute of Classical Studies Library
London - Islington Central Library, Archives and Local History Collections.
London - King's College London Archives
London - Lambeth Archives Department
London - National Gallery
London - National Portrait Gallery
London - Royal Geographical Society
London - Royal Historical Society
London - Royal Institute of British Architects Library
London - Royal Society of Literature*
London - The Royal Society of London
London - A.J. Smetham Esq. (Great Nephew of H. Smetham of Strood)
London - Tate Gallery
London - Westminster City Libraries, Archives Department
Lynn - The Lynn Museum
Manchester - Greater Manchester Record Office
Manchester - John Rylands University Library of Manchester
Manchester - The Manchester Museum
Margate - Central Library, Margate Local History Collection
Matlock - Local Studies Department (Library Service)
Matlock - Derbyshire Record Office
Middlesborough - Cleveland County Library, Archives Department
Newcastle - Laing Art Gallery and Museum
Northallerton - North Yorks County Record Office
Northampton - Central Museum and Art Gallery
Nottingham - Castle Museum
Nottingham - Notts. Record Office
Nottingham - University of Nottingham Library, Manuscripts Department
Oxford - Oxfordshire County Record Office
Oxford - Pitt Rivers Museum
Oxford - University Museum
Peterborough Museum
Portsmouth - City Record Office
Preston - Lancashire Record Office
Ramsgate Library, Kent Archives Office
Reading - Berkshire Record Office
Reading Museum and Art Gallery
Salford Museum and Art Gall
Salisbury and South Wiltshire Museum
Scarborough - The Rotunda Museum of Archaeology and Local History
Sheffield City Library Archives Division
Sheffield - South Yorks County Record Office
Shrewsbury - Shropshire Libraries, Local Studies Department
Shrewsbury - Shropshire Record Office
Spalding Gentlemen's Society Museum
Southampton City Record Office
Stafford - Staffordshire Record Office
Stoke-on-Trent - City Museum and Art Gallery
Swansea Museum
Swansea - University College Library
Swindon Divisional Library
Taunton - Somerset County Museum
Taunton - Somerset Record Office
Trowbridge - Wilts Record Office
Wakefield - West Yorks Record Office
Warrington Museum and Art Gallery
Warwick County Record Office
Warwick - Warwickshire Museum Service
West Malling - Kent County Museum Service
Whitby Museum
Winchester - Hampshire County Museum Service
Winchester - Hyde Historic Resources Centre
Wisbech and Fenland Museum Worcester City Museum Service
Worcester - Hereford and Worcester Record Office
York Archives
York University, Borthwick Institute of Historical Research

USA

Chicago - University of Chicago Library
New York - Pierpont Morgan Library
Santa Monica - The Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities
San Marino, California - Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery
Washington, D.C. - Library of Congress, Historical American Manuscripts Division
APPENDIX 3: London Site Observations by C.R. Smith.

This appendix comprises a summary list of Smith's observations in the City, Southwark and areas immediately adjacent, with brief interpretations. Observations in other parts of what is now Greater London are not included.

The observations are listed according to the reference numbers on the location map (Fig. 2). Entries not proceeded by a star relate to sites which have been fully published. One star * indicates that some information about the site has been published, but that there are further unpublished details in the manuscript sources. Two stars ** indicate that the information exists only in manuscript.

Only the earliest published sources are supplied. The Merrifield Site numbers are listed in Merrifield (1965).

1. Green Arbour Lane, 1856: Contours wrongly supposed by Smith to indicate Roman amphitheatre (Smith 1856a).
2. *Play House Yard, 1843: walls of Blackfriars; Roman funerary monument (Merrifield Site W.60; Price 1843b; Chaffers 1844b; Smith 1859, 27). 79
3. **Creed Lane, 1843: native gravel. 80
4. **Paternoster Row, 1839: Roman wall-plaster; buried amphora; skeleton in framework of tiles. 81
5. *Christ's Hospital, 1836: Roman city wall; supposed Roman moulding reused in medieval ecclesiastical building (Merrifield Site B16, or perhaps B17 or B18). 82
6. *Newgate St., 1836: Remains of church of St. Nicholas Shambles (Smith 1837a, 151). 83
7. **Thames St., 1840: Great fire deposit over old Thames St.; remains of St. Peter's church, Paul's Wharf. 84

---

79 CRS:J5, 16 Mar. 1843.
80 CRS:J5, Jan. 1843.
81 CRS:J3, 2 Apl. 1839.
82 CRS:J2, 8 Mar. 1836.
83 CRS:J2, 7 Feb. 1836.
84 CRS:J4, 27 June 1840.
8. **Boss Court, 1840: Roman tessellated pavements.**

9. *Paternoster Row, 1839: Superb Roman mosaic pavement, painted walls (Merrifield Site 18; Smith 1842a, 153; 1859, 57-58).*

10. *Lambeth Hill, 1840-1: houses burnt in Great Fire; hypocaust; angle of huge Roman wall foundation, incorporating moulded stones (Merrifield Site 114; Smith 1842a, 150-1 and 158; 1847b, 139 and 143; RCHM 1928, 93 and PI.51).*

11. *St. Paul's Churchyard, c. 1841: Roman tiled pavement; hypocaust and mosaic fragments (Merrifield Site 21; Price 1841; Smith 1842c, 272-3).*

12. Aldersgate St., 1842: Roman city wall and extra-mural burials (Saull 1844; Merrifield Site W50).

13. Cheapside, 1836: piles covered with planks; massive Roman wall (Merrifield Site 18, misplaced; Smith 1837a, 150).

14. **Newgate St., 1835: planks on piles.**

15. **Cheapside, 1835: Natural gravel, Roman(?) wall and skeleton.**

16. **Little Knightrider St., 1844: S.E. corner of Roman terrace wall/circus(?) (Price 1846, 253-4; cf. Black 1866, 49).**

17. Cheapside, 1836: walls; cinerary urn(?) (Smith 1837a, 150).

18. **Watling St., 1849: thick Roman wall and tessellated pavement.**

19. **Little Friday St., 1844: churchyard and foundations of St. Matthew's church; Roman wall.**

---

85 CRS:J4, 27 June 1840.
88 CRS:J4, 18 July 1841.
89 CRS:J2, 7 Feb. 1836.
90 CRS:J1, 25 July 1835.
91 CRS:J1, 25 and 31 July, and 10 Aug. 1835.
92 CRS:N1, 331.
93 CRS:J2, 7 Feb. 1836.
94 CRS:N1, 265.
95 CRS:N1, 20 Nov. 1844.
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20. **Bread St. Hill, 1844: Roman cremations.96
21. *Bread St., 1835: Roman painted walls (Smith 1837a, 149).97
22. **Love Lane, 1836: Late Saxon (?) burial.98
23. **Cheapside, 1835: medieval (?) human bones.99
24. Princes St., 1836: Roman Walbrook (Smith 1837a, 142; 1844d, 111).100
25. **Bread St., 1836: Roman strata (Smith 1837a, 150; RCHM 1928, 113, Plan A147).
27. *Wood St, 1843: medieval foundations of St. Michael's Wood Street(?); Roman mosaic (Merrifield Site 42; Price 1843a; RCHM 1928, 122, Fig.41).101
28. **Basing Lane, 1839: Roman mortar floor.102
29. **Garlick Hill, 1839: Medieval chalk walls; mass of stonework.103 Roman foundation.104
30. **Addle St., 1842: gravel road beneath street.105
31. *Milk St., 1835: remains of St. Mary Magdalen's church and cemetery, including late Saxon finds (Smith 1837a, 149).106
32. **Cheapside, 1838: Remains of Cheapside cross, and other medieval foundations.107
33. *Bow Lane, 1839: Inhumation of late 1st to mid 3rd centuries (Anon. 1840b, 420; Smith 1842a, 146; 1880b, 206).108
34. *Bow Lane, 1839: Roman walls, mortar floor, tessellated pavements (Smith 1842a, 146).109

96 CRS:N1, 30 July 1844.
97 CRS:J2, 7-8 July 1835.
98 CRS:J2, 13 Dec. 1836.
99 CRS:J1, 27 July 1835.
100 CRS:J1, 27 July 1835.
102 CRS:J3, 9 Dec. 1839.
103 CRS:J3, 10 and 24 Nov. 1839.
104 CRS:J5, 4 and 16 July 1842.
105 CRS:J5, 10 Aug. 1842, and loose notes (by W. Edwards?).
106 CRS:J1, Oct. 1835.
107 CRS:J3, 8-11 Oct. 1838; GL:DPD, Reg. Nos. 47696 and 53492, Miscellaneous sketches by CRS.
108 CRS:J3, 5 Dec. 1839.
35. Great St. Thomas Apostle, 1847: Roman mosaic (Merrifield Site 108; BAA 1847).
36. *Queen St., 1839: Roman walls, with two gold objects (Smith 1842a, 155).110
37. *Thames St., 1839: strong Roman foundations (Merrifield Site 124; Smith 1842a, 151).111
38. **Queen St., 1842: human bones from medieval churchyard; Roman (?) wall.112
39. **Brick Lane Hill, 1840: Roman wall.113
40. Cateaton St., n.d.: late medieval well containing face jug (Smith 1854d, 116, No. 596).
41. Queen St., 1842: Roman tile wall (Chaffers 1844a).
42. **King St., 1838: Large medieval foundations.114
43. *Queen St., 1838: medieval chalk walls; Roman tessellated pavement (Merrifield Site 90; Smith 1842a, 155).115
44. *Tower Royal, 1849: Roman wall and mortar pavement.116
45. Aldermanbury, 1857: Roman city wall (Merrifield Site W38; Smith 1859, 17).
46. Cloak Lane, 1846: fragment of Roman funerary monument (Merrifield Site 257; Smith 1847b, 139).
47. **Cateaton St., 1841: Roman mosaic pavement.117
48. *College St., 1839: Roman tessellated pavement; bed of Walbrook infilled with animal bones (Merrifield Site 259; Anon. 1839a; Smith 1859, 59).118
49. Poultry, 1834: Roman mortar floor (RCHM 1928, 130).119
50. **Coleman St., 1839: animal bones.120
51. **Moorgate St., 1835-6: post-medieval brick walls; medieval chalk walls; piles of Roman Walbrook.121

110 CRS:J3, 21 Aug. 1839.
111 CRS:J3, 11 May 1839.
112 CRS:J5, 4 and 16 July 1842.
113 CRS:J4, 26 Dec. 1840.
114 CRS:J3, 4 Sep. 1838.
116 CRS:N1, 266.
117 MOLL, watercolour in one of Smith's personal copies of Smith (1859).
118 CRS:J3, 3 June 1839.
120 CRS:J3, 19 Sep. 1839.
121 CRS:J2, 4-6 Feb. 1836.
52. **Lothbury, 1837-8: Roman tile walls; complete jar (Smith 1842a, 152).\(^{122}\)
53. Princes Street., 1836: Roman Walbrook (Smith 1837a, 142; 1844d, 111).\(^{123}\)
54. **Bank, 1837: Roman(?) cess-pit.\(^{124}\)
55. *Lothbury, 1836: Roman box-frame well, containing whole pots (Merrifield Site 135; Smith 1837a, 148; 1859, 142).\(^{125}\)
56. *Bush Lane, 1840: stone walls, tessellated pavements, hypocaust, huge ragstone foundations of Roman palace(?) (Merrifield Site 271; RCHM 1928, 110, Fig.32; Smith 1842a, 156-7; 1859, 14; Marsden 1975).\(^{126}\)
57. *Lothbury, 1835: 1666 fire debris, medieval chalk walls, Roman building with tessellated corridor(?) (Merrifield Site 162; Smith 1837a, 147; 1859, 57).\(^{127}\)
58. Cannon St., 1836: Roman strata (Smith 1842a, 154).\(^{128}\)
59. *Suffolk Lane, 1855: Roman ragstone walls and mosaic (Merrifield Site 278).\(^{129}\)
60. Lothbury, 1836: Hoard(?) of Roman ironwork; revetment of Roman Walbrook (Merrifield Site 164; Smith 1837a, 147).
61. **Lothbury, 1842: Piles of Roman Walbrook.\(^{130}\)
62. *King William St., 1844: 1st-century(?) inhumations; hoard of forged coins and gravel pit of perhaps even earlier date (Smith 1844d, 110; 1854d, 86, No. 387; 1859, 154).\(^{131}\)
63. *Lombard St., 1839: Later Roman tessellated pavement (Smith 1859, 59; RCHM 1829, 128).\(^{132}\)

\(^{122}\) CRS:J2, 14 Sep. 1837 and 7 Apr. 1838.
\(^{123}\) CRS:J2, 6 Feb. 1836.
\(^{124}\) CRS:J2, 10 June 1837.
\(^{125}\) CRS:J1, 5-15 Aug. 1835; CRS:J2, 7 Feb. 1836.
\(^{126}\) CRS:E, 45-47; CRS:J4, 11 and 27 June 1840.
\(^{127}\) CRS:J1, 13-18 July 1835; CRS:J2, 6 Feb. 1836; CRS:J3, 11 Dec. 1839.
\(^{128}\) CRS:J2, 22 Oct. 1836.
\(^{129}\) COLRO, City Sewer Plan 302; CRS:J5, 1855.
\(^{130}\) CRS:J5, 19 Apr. 1842.
\(^{131}\) CRS:N1, 30 Jan. 1844, and pp. 127-30.
\(^{132}\) CRS:J3, 5 June 1839.
64. **Sherborne Lane, 1841: red tessellated pavement with hypocaust.\textsuperscript{133}

65. **Laurence Poulney Lane, 1836: walls of Roman tiles; tessellated pavement.\textsuperscript{134}

66. *Cornhill, 1840: substantial Roman wall (Smith 1842c, 273; 1859, 14).\textsuperscript{135}

67. **Abchurch Lane, 1840: medieval chalk wall; Roman brick wall.\textsuperscript{136}

68. Royal Exchange, 1841: Roman foundations with stucco decoration; late 1st century infill of gravel pit (Merrifield Site 180; Smith 1842c, 269; 1844d, 110-1; 1859, 12-13).

69. King William St., 1835: medieval(?) chalk wells, roughly made Roman foundations (Smith 1837a, 140-1).

70. Nicholas Lane, 1850: Roman inscription (Merrifield Site 284; Anon. 1850b; Smith 1854e; 1859, 30-31).

71. *Bartholomew Lane, 1838: piece of mosaic pavement (Merrifield Site 181; Tite 1848, XXXI; Smith 1842a, 155; 1859, 58).\textsuperscript{137}

72. **Threadneedle St., 1838: Curious carved Roman(?) stone.\textsuperscript{138}

73. *King William St., 1835: Roman walls, \textit{op. sig.} (?) and tessellated floors (Kempe 1835a; Smith 1837a, 140-1).

74. Clement's Lane, 1841: Roman walls (Merrifield Site 288; Smith 1842c, 272).

75. *Thames at London Bridge, 1835-40: defaced Roman statuettes; votive deposits of Roman coins (Smith 1841b; 1842a, 161-4; 1844c; 1844d, 113).\textsuperscript{139}

76. Finsbury Circus, n.d.: Roman inhumation with pot (Smith 1854d, 18, No.64).

77. *Birchin Lane, 1848: Roman mosaic (RCHM 1928, 107).\textsuperscript{140}

\textsuperscript{133} CRS:J4, 7-8 Dec. 1841.
\textsuperscript{134} CRS:J2, 1 Dec. 1836.
\textsuperscript{135} CRS:J4, 14 Jan. 1841.
\textsuperscript{136} CRS:J4, 8 Apl. 1840.
\textsuperscript{137} CRS:J3, 28 June 1848.
\textsuperscript{138} CRS:J2, 23 Aug. and Sep. 1838.
\textsuperscript{139} CRS:J1, 26 Sep. 1835; CRS:J2, 16 May 16, 10-12 Nov. and 1-8 Dec. 1836, and 23 Feb. 1838; CRS:E, 18-21.
\textsuperscript{140} CRS:N1, 227.
78. *Finch lane, 1844: part of Roman mosaic (Merrifield Site 187; BAA 1844, 64). 141

79. *Threadneedle St., 1843: Roman black and white mosaic (Merrifield Site 187). 142

80. Fish St. Hill, 1836: Absence of Roman remains (Smith 1842a, 154). 143

81. *Fish St. Hill, 1843-4: Walls and arched culvert, now thought to belong to Roman quayside warehouse; reused greensand masonry and marble facings (Merrifield Site 117; Smith 1846c; cf. Milne 1985, Building 9 or perhaps 5). 144

82. *Carpenter's Hall, 1846: Tudor wall paintings. 145

83. Eastcheap 1833: medieval and Roman walls; Roman(?) well (part of Merrifield Site 297; Anon. 1833).

84. *London Wall, 1837: remains of St. John Zachary church; Roman masonry drain and arch under city wall; Roman gateway(?); Roman tombstone; cinerary urns (Merrifield Site 130; Smith 1837b; 1842a, 152; 1844d, 111; 1847b; 1859, 26). 146

85. **Austin Friars, 1838: Roman drain(?). 147

86. **Threadneedle St., 1846: Roman hypocaust overlying ragstone wall. 148

87. *Finch Lane, 1846: Roman walls and mosaic (Merrifield Site 186; BAA 1847, 205). 149

88. *Blomfield St. and Eldon St., 1838: marsh deposits; Romano-British votive skulls; Roman cinerary urns (Smith 1842a, 153). 150

141 FWF:BAA1, watercolour by CRS.
142 CRS:J5, 22 Apr. 1843.
143 CRS:J2, 4 Aug. 1836.
144 CRS:N1, 28 Nov. 1843 and p. 331; CRS:J4, loose sheet; CRS:J5, 18 Dec. 1844; BM, Department of Prints and Drawings, Acc. No. 1866.5.12.724-1778, FWF, "British Archaeological Association Vol.3 - Drawings of Engravings Etc. Executed for the Association".
145 FWF:BAA1, CRS to FWF, 19 Dec. 1845, with Fairholt's sketches.
146 CRS:J2, 1-5 and 29 Aug., 2, 9, 18 and 21 Sep., and 31 Oct. 1837; SAL Library, "[County Portfolio for] London L-0", sketch of drain by CRS.
147 CRS:J2, 18 June 1838; CRS:E, 52.
148 CRS:J5, 10 Mar. 1846.
149 CRS:N1, 22 Apr. 1846.
89. Threadneedle St., 1841: medieval Hospital of St. Anthony; Roman rooms with tessellated and two mosaic pavements; wall-plaster (Merrifield Site 183; Smith 1842d; 1859, 55-56 and Pl. X). 151

90. **Gracechurch St., 1836: Medieval chalk foundations. 152

91. *Pudding Lane, 1840: melted lead; Roman tile and ragstone wall and hypocaust (Merrifield Site 314; Smith 1842a, 154). 153

92. **Eastcheap, 1833: medieval chalk wall, coin hoard of unknown date. 154

93. *New Broad St., 1837: Roman inhumation (Smith 1880b, 180). 155

94. **Winchester St., 1839: post-medieval horn cores(?) (?from horn-core pit lining or wall); wooden tank containing medieval watering pots; Roman tessellated pavement. 156

95. *Gracechurch St., 1837: Roman walls and concrete pavements with inserted tesserae (Smith 1842a, 154). 157

96. **Talbot Court, 1845: medieval well; Roman red-painted walls. 158

97. **Eastcheap, 1838: Roman walls, debris. 159

98. **Philpot Lane, 1845: Roman inscription in marble; native gravel. 160

99. *Eastcheap, 1836: remains of St. Andrew Hubbard church; Roman tessellated pavement and foundations; cinerary urn (Merrifield Site 352; Smith 1842a, 154; Kempe 1836a, 137). 161

150 CRS:J2, 23 and 31 June 1838.
152 CRS:J2, 23 Sep. 1836.
153 CRS:J4, 12-13 Mar. 1840; CRS:E, 44.
154 CRS:J2, 11 June 1836.
155 CRS:J2, 19 and 27 Nov. 1837.
156 CRS:J3, 7, 14 and 19 May 1839.
157 CRS:J2, 13-17 Apl. 1837.
158 CRS:N1, Dec. 1845.
159 CRS:J2, 23 Aug. 1838.
160 CRS:N1, June 1845.
100. Broad St., 1854: Roman mosaic (Merrifield Site 323; Smith 1854e, 257-8; 1859, 54).
101. **Little East Cheap, 1836: Roman strata.162
102. **New Broad St., 1843: fragments of Roman tessellated pavement; moor deposits.163
103. Bishopsgate St. Within, 1839: Roman mosaic pavement, and possible barrel vault (Smith 1842a, 156; RCHM 1928, 107).
104. *Lime St., 1838: Roman painted walls (Smith 1842a, 153-4).164
105. **Eastcheap, 1836: Roman strata.165
106. *Billingsgate Bath House, 1848: Roman bathhouse; early Roman quay(?) (Merrifield Site 353; Chaffers 1848; Stothard 1848; Smith 1848d).166
107. **Wormwood St., 1837: Roman strata.167
108. **Great Tower St., 1836: Roman painted walls.168
109. Fenchurch Street, 1833-4: remains of St. Gabriel's church; Roman tile and red tessellated pavements (Merrifield Site 340; Carlos 1834).169
110. Fenchurch St., 1857: Roman mosaic (Merrifield Site 340; Smith 1859, 58).
111. **Mincing Lane, 1837: Roman (?) walls.170
112. **Dunster's Ct., Mincing Lane, 1855: Roman pavements.171
113. Fenchurch St., 1839: Roman foundations (Smith 1842a, 153; 1859, 58).
114. *St. Mary Axe, 1849: Roman tessellated pavement and wall-paintings; statue of Atys (Merrifield Site 318; BAA 1850, 90; Smith 1850a, 90).172

162 CRS:J2, 22 Sep. 1836.
163 CRS:J5, Jan. 1843.
164 CRS:J3, 4 and 22 Sep., and 2 Oct. 1838.
167 CRS:J2, 19 Nov. 1837.
169 CRS:J2, 11 June 1836.
170 CRS:J2, 6 May 1837.
171 CRS:N1, 330.
172 CRS:N1, 26 Jan. 1849.
115. **Houndsditch, 1839: 2nd(?) century cremation burial.173

116. **Cree Church Lane, 1843: Roman tessellated pavement.174

117. *Seething Lane & Hart St., Crutched Friars, 1838: Roman tessellated pavements; sculptured stone of deae matres (Merrifield Site 350; Smith 1842a, 154; 1847b, 136-8; 1859, 33-45; Price 1846, 249).175

118. **Seething Lane, 1838: medieval (?) chalk walls.176

119. Tower Hill, 1852-3: Roman city wall; reused masonry including tomb of Classicianus (Merrifield Site B2; Burkitt 1853; Smith 1854e, 255-7; 1859, 15-16 and 27-28; Bird 1978).

120. Haydon Sq., 1853: Roman stone sarcophagus; cremations (Smith 1853a; 1859, 45-47; Anon. 1853a).

121. **Mansell St., 1843-4: Roman cremation burials; lead coffin (Smith 1846b; 1853a, 55).177

Sites not shown on map
(in chronological order)

122. Borough High Street, Southwark, 1832-3: medieval chalk walls and relieving arch.178

123. **Whitechapel High Street, 1836: Roman cremation burial.179

124. St. Saviour's Church, Southwark, 1836-7: medieval chalk walls; Norman stone coffin; Roman walls and debris (Smith 1842a, 148).180

125. *Deveril Street, Old Kent Road, 1837: Roman cremation burials (Kempe 1835a; 1836b; Anon. 1835a).181

---

173 CRS:J3, 26 Mar. 1839.
174 CRS:J5, 22 Apl. 1843.
175 CRS:J3, 3-8 Aug. 1838.
176 CRS:J2, 23 June 1838.
177 CRS:J5, 24 July 1843.
178 CRS:J2, 11 June 1836.
179 CRS:J2, 1 Mar. 1836.
180 CRS:J2, 1-6 Nov. 1836 and 29 Jan. 1837.
181 CRS:J2, 20 Apl. and 24 May 1837.
126. **St. Saviour's Church, Southwark, 1839: Roman
tessellated pavement. 182
127. *Holborn Hill, c. 1839: Cremation burial in oak box
(Smith 1842a, 147 fn; RCHM 1928, 164). 183
128. *St. Thomas's Hospital, 1839-40: Roman stone building
with tessellated pavement (Anon. 1840a; RCHM 1928, 150,
Plan B6; Smith 1842a, 148-9 and Pl. XVIII; 1844d,
112). 184
129. *St. Saviour's Churchyard, Southwark, 1840: post-
medieval (?) pottery kiln; Roman mosaic and tessellated
pavements (Anon. 1840a; Smith 1854d, 119, No. 607). 185
130. *Borough High Street, Southwark, 1840: Roman houses,
mortar floors, superior wall-plaster (Smith 1842a, 149;
RCHM 1928, 149, Plan B1). 186
131. **London Bridge Station, Southwark, 1842: Roman (?)
piles. 187
132. Grove St., Southwark, c. 1866: late 3rd-century coin
hoard (Smith 1867a).

182 CRS: J3, 6 Jan. 1839.
183 CRS: J3, 11 Dec. 1839.
184 CRS: J3, 16-19 Dec/ 1839; CRS: J4, 1 Jan. and 13 Apl.
1840; CRS: E, 9.
185 CRS: E, 7.
187 CRS: J5, 22 Apl. 1842.
APPENDIX 4: Synopsis of the life of Charles Roach Smith, with some relevant background events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>First Records Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>Publication of first volume of * Beauties of England and Wales* by E.W. Brayley and J. Britton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1807</td>
<td>Lysons commences <em>Reliquiae Britannicae Romanae</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Sent to boarding school at Brading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>Father dies (Aug.). C. Hoare publishes <em>The Ancient History of ... Wiltshire Vol. I</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Foundation of Soc. Antiqs. of Newcastle-upon-Tyne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>Goes to Crouch's school at Swathing, then Saint Cross, near Winchester. Scott publishes <em>The Antiquary</em>. Taylor Combe reads paper on hoard of Saxon pennies from near Lancaster. Foundation of <em>Société des Antiquaires de France</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>Belzoni discovers tomb of Seti I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>Elgin marbles brought to London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Birth of Mommsen. Publications: Rickman's paper on Styles of English Architecture; Ruding's <em>Annals of the Coinage of Britain</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Enters solicitor's office at Newport, IoW, but shows no aptitude and returns to Shanklin (autumn).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td>Apprenticed to Mr. Follett, chemist and druggist, at Chichester (Feb.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Munich Glyptothek opens. J. Gage begins excavation of Bartlow Hills. Publications: Whewell's Notes on German Churches; first part of Caumont's Cours d'antiquités monumentales; C. Lyell's Principles of Geology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>Formation of British Association for the Advancement of Science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Elected to Numismatic Soc. (Jan.). Seeks to trace Maidenhead coin hoard. Obtains Roman bronzes from Thames near London Bridge (Jan.). Observes Roman drain under City wall. Publishes paper on Roman London in Archaeologia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Given notice to quit Lothbury because of street improvements (Feb.). Gains minimal compensation by taking case to appeal (May). Moves to larger premises in Liverpool Street, where sister Maria and nephew, John Joliffe join him (Sep.). Writes competition essay on Roman London. Publishes coins from Strood Roman cemetery. Elected secretary of Num. Soc. (Nov.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>Makes first archaeological donations to Guildhall Library (from Jan.). Denied site access following discovery of Roman gravel pit on Royal Exchange site, and accused of theft (Jan.). Excavates Roman mosaics on French Protestant Church site, Threadneedle Street. They are donated to the BM (Mar.-June). Publishes Roman coins from Thames. Examines Faussett collection at Heppington (Aug.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Publishes 9 papers in Archaeologia, mostly on Roman remains from London and Kent. Visits northern France, including museum of Boucher de Perthes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1844
Appointed co-secretary of BAA with Way (Jan.). JBAA commenced (Mar.). Helps save Greenwich Park tumuli and resigns as secretary of Num. Soc. (June). Co-secretary with Wright of first BAA Congress at Canterbury (Sep.). Publishes first paper on pilgrim signs.

1845
Presented with silver tea and coffee set by members of Num. Soc. Resigns from BAA printing committee with Wright after rows over Wright's Archaeological Album. Restored as BAA secretary following reconstitution of BAA at SGM (Mar.). Voted off Antiquaries' council. Co-secretary of BAA Winchester congress (Aug.). Assists excavation of Hartlip Roman villa (Sep.). Accused by W. Tite of hindering Corporation's attempts to rescue City antiquities (Nov.).

1846

BAA branches formed at Gloucester and Maidstone (Nov.). Publications: first part of Wright's Archaeological Album; Brongniart's Traité des Arts Céramiques....

Creation of Archaeological Institute at rival Winchester congress held by Way's party (Sep.). Museums Act passed, but Wyse fails to obtain Royal Commissions on national antiquities and museums. Corporation of London's Library Committee agrees to create a museum. Publications: Caledonia Romana; Lee's Delineations of Roman Antiquities found at Caerleon; Thorpe's History of England under the Saxon Kings; Baudot's Rapport sur les Découvertes archéologiques faites aux sources de la Seine.

Repeal of Corn Laws. Sir Colin Boileau buys Burgh Castle to ensure its safety. British Museum reopens in new buildings. Worsaae addresses Royal Irish Acad. on three-age system (Dec.).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Brought before magistrate for purchasing Roman statue of Atys (Feb.). Re-elected to SAL council (Apl.). Secretary to BAA Chester congress, where he meets Mayer and (July to Aug.). Unofficially resigns as BAA secretary (summer). RedisCOVERs Roman amphitheatre at Richborough (Oct.). Publishes Mount Bures burial. Loses assistant and becomes short of money (from Dec.). Times leading article calls for Museum of National Antiquities to safeguard City antiquities. Bruce organises first pilgrimage along Hadrian's Wall. Lord A. Conyngham resigns BAA over Council's treatment of CRS. Cochet made inspector of historical monuments of <em>Seine Inférieure</em>. Publications: Worsaae's <em>Primeval Antiquities of Denmark</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td><strong>Publishes Antiquities of Richborough, Reculver, and Lympne.</strong> Excavates at Lympne funded by private subscriptions, following refusal of Treasury to supply funds (Apl.-Sep.). Rescues portion of Roman temple dedication for Guildhall Museum, who discard it (June). Trip down Rhine with J.G. Waller, to Trèves, Igel, Mayence, Wiesbaden, Neuwied, Bonn and Cologne (Aug.-Sep.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Publications:</strong> Buckmann and Newmarch, Illustrations of... Roman Art in Cirencester...; Worsaae's Primeval Antiquities of Denmark; Bähr's Die Gräber der Liven; Latham's Natural History of the Varieties of Man. Institute refuses reconciliation with BAA. Parliamentary Commission publishes report on British Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td><strong>Publishes notes on last year's Rhenish tour - the first of his antiquarian travel guides (from Jan.).</strong> Persuades Treasury to waive customs duty on books imported for the Num. Soc. (Feb.). Retires from council of SAL (Apl.). Many continental visitors to Smith's museum. Walks along the Wall with Bruce and E.B. Price, and meets Clayton (c. June). Visits Wroxeter. Resigns as Num. Soc. secretary. Imagines he has found Roman bridge at Tadcaster (Sep.). Visits France, including Dieppe and Lillebonne (Sep.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Great Exhibition.</strong> PRO begins calendar of state papers. Disney Professorship of Classical Antiquities established at Cambridge. Duke of Northumberland invites formation of research committee for Hadrian's Wall. Franks appointed to BM as assistant for British and Medieval Antiquities. Lane-Fox establishes museum at Bethnal Green. <strong>Publications:</strong> First edit. of Bruce's Roman Wall; Akerman's Directions for the Preservation of English Antiquities...; Wilson's Archaeology and Prehistoric Annals of Scotland; Vaux's Handbook to the BM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Withdraws from all &quot;money-extracting&quot; societies, but is made Hon. Member of Num. Soc. Publishes Report on Excavations made on the Site of the Roman Castrum at Lympne ... and paper on Saxon and Frankish finds in CA Vol. II. Roman wall and part of Classicianus' tomb found at Tower Hill (Aug.). Excavates Pevensey with M.A. Lower, funded by public subscriptions (Aug. - Nov.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Mayer acquires Faussett collection after BM's trustees refuse to purchase. Wright lectures on Faussett collection (Oct.). Institute and SAL unsuccessfully petition Home Office over destruction of churchyards. Publication of Cochet's La Normandie Souterraine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Campaigns to persuade public museum to buy his collection (from Jan.).&lt;br&gt;Reluctantly supports moves to create London &amp; Middlesex Archaeological Society (July-Aug.). Attends public Dinner in his honour at Newport, IoW (Aug.).&lt;br&gt;Publishes Saxon urn with supposed Latin inscription.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Purchases Temple Place, Strood (Feb.).&lt;br&gt;Agrees to sell collection to the BM at reduced price of £2,000 (Mar.). Moves to Strood (June). Publishes Faussett's <em>Inventorium Sepulchrale</em>.&lt;br&gt;BM obtains radiated brooches from tombs in Kerch. Hillier disappears with Chessel Down antiquities. Discovery of Neanderthal skull near Düsseldorf. T. Mommsen publishes his <em>Römische Geschichte</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Publishes <em>CA IV</em>. Assists J.C. Bruce with his <em>Catalogue of the Inscribed and Sepultured Roman Stones...</em>. Retires from LAMAS committee.&lt;br&gt;Manchester Art Exhibition. Revd J. Maughan attacks J.C. Bruce over date of Hadrian's Wall (Jan.).&lt;br&gt;Kemble draws attention to La Tène objects in address to Royal Irish Academy (Feb.).&lt;br&gt;Publications: MacLaughlan's <em>Roman Wall</em>; Thurnam's <em>Crania Britannica</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Publishes his 1852 excavations at Pevensey. Witness for prosecution in Eastwood's case against The Athenaeum, following their claim that leaden badges (Billy and Charley's) sold by Eastwood were forgeries (Aug. 5). Takes J.A. Barton and J.G. Waller to visit Roman walls of Dax following outcry over their proposed demolition. Also visits Bordeaux, Sens, Cussy, Autun, Lyons, Vienne, Orange, Arles, Nimes and Toulouse (Oct.-Nov.). Helps persuade French Emperor to halt the destruction (Dec).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Wins law suit for trespass against the Dean and Chapter of Rochester (July).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>F.W. Fairholt dies, making Smith executor and principal beneficiary (Apl.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Completes CA VI. <em>Gents. Mag.</em> stops publication of Smith's antiquarian notes (June). Mounts memorial brass to Fairholt at Stratford-upon-Avon (Sep.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Co-founder of Strood Elocution Class. Publishes pamphlet on <em>The Rural Life of Shakespeare</em> (Apl.). Accepts invitation by South Kensington Museum to publish catalogue of W. Gibbs' bequest of Saxon antiquities from Faversham (c. July). Taken on short visit to Rome and Pompeii, but evidently depressed, and no publications result (June). Visits wall again (Oct.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>Franco-Prussian war. Darwin publishes <em>Descent of Man</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Made life member of BAA and member of its General Committee. Sister Maria dies, leaving him £ 1,400 (Aug.).</td>
<td>J.E. Price excavates Roman bastion, Camomile Street, London. Pitt-Rivers lectures on The Principles of Classification. Publication of T. Wright's Uriconium and Schliemann's Troy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Elected Vice-president of BAA (May).</td>
<td>Publication of Bruce's Lapidarium Septentrionale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>On G. Dowker's committee to excavate Wingham villa. Publishes his brother Henry's &quot;Isle of Wight Words&quot;.</td>
<td>Massive Roman foundations (the forum) found on Cornhill. Corporation of London buys Walker Baily collection. Publication of Evans' Ancient Bronze Implements of Great Britain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Begins work on Retrospections... (Jan.). Organises petition to Parliament urging embanking of Medway at Strood. Wright's widow dies making him sole beneficiary.</td>
<td>Publication of Rhys' Celtic Britain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Assists LAMAS visit to Rochester and Strood (June).</td>
<td>J. Price and others establish fund to rescue London antiquities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td></td>
<td>Publication of Montelius' <em>Chronologie de l'Age du Bronze</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Serves with G. Dowker on KAS committee to excavate Richborough. His correspondence sold in Mayer's posthumous sale.</td>
<td>BAA try to prove Roman origin for walls of Chester by excavation, but only revive the dispute (Aug.). Publications: Pitt-Rivers' first vol. on Cranborne Chase; Daramberg and Saglio <em>Dictionaire des Antiquités</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Publishes articles supporting Roman origin of Chester walls.</td>
<td>Formation of Congress of Archaeological Societies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Last dramatic performance at Strood (May). Writes will (June). Attends BAA Lincoln congress, then makes final visit to Hadrian's wall (July-Aug.). Develops heart disease (from Nov.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Develops pneumonia. G. Payne presents medal and cheque from fellow antiquaries (July). Dies and buried at Frindsbury (Aug.). Temple Place auctioned (Oct.).</td>
<td>Death of Schliemann.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Library sold at Sotheby's (Apr.). J.G. Waller edits and publishes <em>Retrospections</em> III (c. May).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Reichslimeskommission</em> established under T. Mommsen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLATES AND FIGURES

(captions at beginning of Volume 1)
If I had you upon Samum
Lear Act II Sc 2.
ROMAN WALL, BREAD-STREET-HILL.
Pl. 7

12. Roman Sandal found in Bath (May 1835), 20 ft. beneath the surface. Clay with two botting stones & . 3 feet high.

Pl. 8

DIS
MANIBVS
CIVLFF RALVINCLASSIAN

TRICTIONE SIANNIAE
IVIA INIILESI CATAEINDIANAE
VXOR F
Page 1: Reviewing the site of Colchester's Roman fort, a prominent feature is the large circular tower, which served as a watchtower and is believed to have been a part of the fort's defensive structures. The site also includes the remains of a large rectangular building, possibly a temple or administrative center.

Page 2: Further exploration of the site reveals a large open area, believed to be the location of a marketplace or a ceremonial gathering place. The area is marked by several stone monuments and a large stone bench, which may have been used for seating or as a place for locals to gather. The site also includes a number of smaller structures and artifacts, including pottery and coins, which provide insights into the daily life of the inhabitants.

Pl. 11: An illustration of the site with labeled features, including the large circular tower and the rectangular building.

Pl. 12: A diagram showing the layout of the site with the major features marked.

Page 3: The site is rich in historical significance, with evidence of both Roman and medieval occupation. The discovery of a number of inscriptions and artifacts suggests a long history of human activity in the area.
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Fig. 2: Roach Smiths' London Site Observations
Fig. 4

The figure shows a histogram of annual loss per 1000 coins over various coin issue periods. The x-axis represents the coin issue periods, while the y-axis indicates the annual loss. Peaks are observed in certain periods, with the highest losses occurring in periods 3, 12-13, and 20-21.
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CHAPTER TWO

FAUSSETT REDISCOVERED: CHARLES ROACH SMITH, JOSEPH MAYER, AND THE PUBLICATION OF INVENTORIUM SEPULCHRALE

Michael Rhodes

The papers which comprise this volume are the proceedings of a conference to mark the centenary of the death of the Liverpool goldsmith, collector and philanthropist Joseph Mayer (1803–86). That his centenary has been celebrated by a conference on Anglo-Saxon cemeteries is due to his acquisition of the Faussett Collection of Kentish antiquities and the subsequent publication of Faussett’s Inventorium Sepulchrale (1856), which remains a corner-stone of Anglo-Saxon cemetery studies. The events which led Mayer to purchase the Faussett Collection mark and illuminate a series of important turning-points in British archaeology in which his friend Charles Roach Smith played a central role. This paper will firstly assess these events against their social and intellectual background, and secondly highlight the achievements of Smith and his contemporaries in the then newly internationalized field of Dark-Age studies.

THE FAUSSETTS AND DOUGLAS

The Revd Bryan Faussett of Heppington (1720–76), Kent’s premier barrow digger, wrote his will in July 1769, some six years before his death. If he was already crippled with gout, this had not diminished his cultivated eccentricity
Sacred to the Memory of
the Rev. BRYAN FAUSSETT AM of
Heppington, in his Parish, who died
on the 10th of Feb. 1776 aged 56.
He married ELIZABETH his Daughter
of the Rev'd ROWLAND CURTOIS
of Hainton, in the County of Lincoln,
by whom he had Issue:
HENRY, GODFREY, BRYAN, CHARLES
(who died an Infant) and ELIZABETH

PLATE 1  REVD BRYAN FAUSSETT'S TOMBSTONE, Nackington Church (M. Rhodes)
and dry wit, for among various conventional provisions for his wife and family, and the
disposal of his corpse in Nackington Church (Plate 1), of which he was Perpetual
Curate, he made two less than usual requests. The first was that his sermons should be
burnt, every one. The second related to his antiquities:

\[\text{... as I have been at great pains and expense in collecting them, that they may never be disposed of by sale or otherwise but upon the greatest necessity, but that they may still continue in my family and at Heppington, humbly trusting in God that my posterity will some of them at least wisely prefer polite literature and refinement to ignorance and dissipation, and books and medals to hounds, horses and gaming men.}\]

Thus it was that the collection remained in the family for two more generations.\(^2\)

If few outsiders managed to gain access to the antiquities, Faussett's 'posterity'
nonetheless appreciated the importance of their inheritance. His son, Henry Godfrey
Faussett (b. 1749) had himself exhumed the famous Kingston fibula, and had drawn many
of the skilful illustrations in his father's notebooks, the *Inventorium Sepulchrale*, which
provide a grave by grave description of the discoveries.\(^3\) Although Henry's professional
duties as a lawyer prevented him from devoting much time to antiquities, he continued to
take an interest in archaeology, and became friendly with Captain James Douglas
(1753–1819) following a visit to the Chatham Lines in 1779 or 1780 (Jessup 1975, 52).

The significance of Douglas's excavations in Kent is well known (op. cit.). By 1782
his investigations here and elsewhere had almost provided him with sufficient material
for 'a general history of the funeral customs of the ancients' (Smith 1856, 217), and he
became increasingly anxious to examine the Faussett cabinet. For the past year he had
been trying to persuade its owner to sell the treasures to an anonymous collector 'high up
in the estimation of the antiquarian world' (op. cit., 215). Henry Faussett not only
refused to sell, but was reluctant to allow Douglas even to see the collection, hoping
perhaps to publish it himself. Eventually, Douglas was granted access to make notes and
drawings, although Faussett apparently did not permit sight of his father's notebooks.\(^4\)

Douglas's *Nenia Britannica* was published in parts between 1786 and 1793 (Douglas
1793). Each part was illustrated, the text being dependent upon the plates. For the first
time, a British antiquary had recognized the importance of topographical plans,
elevations and sections of tumuli, and the need for a classified description of relics to
facilitate comparisons. The work also incorporated the clearest statement so far of the
principle of applying relative dating from a known to an unknown source. Whilst only
the discovery in a grave of a coin or inscription could obviate dating errors, the historian
was able to use such relics to date others found in less favourable circumstances by means
of comparison. A grave at Gilton, Ash, in Kent, could be no earlier than the coin of
Justinian (527–65) which it contained, and no later than 742 when extra-mural burials
were prohibited outside churchyards. A Roman brooch and a circular stone from Gilton
could not be used for dating, neither could an associated polished flint, which was best
regarded as an amulet preserved from an earlier epoch (op. cit., 92). For the first time,
the remains of the Anglo-Saxons had been identified and characterized, and the true date
of Faussett's antiquities had been recognized. The Kentish burials belonged to local
communities, and not — a popular error even today — to warriors.\(^5\) He was uncertain as
to whether they were of pagans or Christians, but favoured the second option.
Unfortunately for Douglas, antiquarian opinion was not ready for a work which replaced dependence upon early literature in favour of the scientific consideration of observations. Even Colt Hoare who adopted his idea of classifying barrows, rejected Douglas's Anglo-Saxon dating for barrows of the 'small conic' variety (Hoare 1812, 46–7, and Tumuli plate IV). A full generation passed before his achievements were truly appreciated.

CHARLES ROACH SMITH

The major force amongst the next generation of archaeologists, who were active from the mid-1830s, came in the unlikely form of a minor retail chemist (Rhodes forthcoming). Charles Roach Smith (1806–90) was born into an Isle of Wight farming family. After a second-rate schooling, he was apprenticed most unwillingly to a chemist and druggist in Chichester. Here, he developed an interest in coins and antiquities, and studied Cicero, adopting his Stoic philosophy. He also read Camden, noting his choice to remain single 'apprehending that the incumbrances of a married life might prove a prejudice to his studies'. Smith too remained a life-long bachelor.

In 1832 he decided to start his own business, and rented a small shop behind the Bank of England, later moving to Liverpool Street. His arrival in the city coincided with the greatest period of redevelopment since the great fire of London, and Smith was intrigued by the Roman remains which were being exposed. Initially, at least, he made healthy profits, and was able to employ assistants. Thus he had both time and money to pursue his interests, which turned increasingly to purchasing coins, figured and stamped samian, and other minor antiquities. Within a few years he had compiled a large private museum (Kidd 1977). Smith was by no means the only collector; what was unusual was the diligence and clarity of thought with which he studied his acquisitions. A keen Latin scholar, Smith searched the classics for any mention of antiquities. His notebooks record detailed records of finds and find-spots supported by accurate sketches. They evince a clear insight into scientific methods, perhaps shaped by his study of chemistry. From the very beginning Smith avoided unwarranted interpretation, but rather weighed the evidence for and against various possibilities.

By the spring of 1836, Smith had become known to a number of antiquarians and was invited to submit a paper to the Society of Antiquaries (Smith 1837). Towards the end of the year he became a Fellow (Plate 2). Unfortunately, Smith's election was opposed by an anonymous person, supported by Sir Henry Ellis of the British Museum, who maintained that Smith was unsuitable as he was in business. Incidents such as this hardened Smith's views on social prejudice, and he often complained of the respect paid to the ignorant and well connected in contrast to the disregard shown to men of real ability who lacked social standing. His perspective was reinforced by the Corporation's antipathy towards City antiquities. Not only was Smith hindered from recording
discoveries, but in 1841 was actually thrown off excavations for the new Royal Exchange on the pretext that he had paid workmen for antiquities destined for the embryonic Guildhall Museum. By contrast, a private developer had allowed Smith to excavate and record two Roman mosaics, opened the site for public viewing, and adopted his suggestion that the pavements should be given to the British Museum (Smith 1859, 56 fn.). Such actions gave rise to a second theme in Smith’s writings, namely the phenomenon of private enlightenment and generosity as against corporate meanness and ignorance. Both perceptions were seemingly confirmed by the Faussett affair of 1853–4.

If Smith’s heroic struggles on behalf of London archaeology are relatively well known, the same cannot be said for another important aspect of his activities. From the summer of 1836, Smith embarked upon a series of archaeological excursions through the South of England. Whilst he clearly enjoyed an excuse to get out of town, his purpose became increasingly serious. In a country lacking museums and antiquarian publications other than *Archaeologia*, it was the only way to learn about antiquities. By the end of 1839, Smith had visited almost every major archaeological site in the South-East, and made the first of many visits to France. Thus he became the first British archaeologist to travel abroad in search of parallels to indigenous antiquities. Indeed, Smith’s hunger for information was insatiable. Snippets of hearsay from fellow antiquaries about finds or collectors were carefully recorded, and newspapers were scoured for reports of discoveries. Every lead was followed up by a visit. Travelling in the late 1830s was by no means easy. Coaches and vans were infrequent, and Smith covered miles on foot, staying at inns by night. Everywhere he went, innkeepers were questioned about local
discoveries, jewellers' shops were visited in search of coins, and newly dug earth would be scanned for Roman tiles. Local antiquarians received unannounced visits, and not all were pleased to receive a stranger. Smith's records of these excursions provide a unique insight into the activities of contemporary collectors and the state of antiquarianism in the provinces.

Initially, Smith's interests reflected the strengths of his collection, which comprised coins of all periods, and London antiquities of primarily Roman and medieval date. Early Saxon antiquities were almost never found in central London, but Smith's curiosity was roused in 1841 by seeing some of Douglas's finds in the Ashmolean Museum, and by his first unpremeditated visit to Heppington in August. Having tramped from the Gravesend ferry to Canterbury via Reculver, Smith proceeded to Lymne along the Roman road called Stone Street. Heppington lies to the east of this road, about four miles south of Canterbury (Plate 3). By this date, Faussett's collection had passed to his grandson, Dr Godfrey Faussett, an Oxford professor and Canon of Oxford Cathedral, who was away for much of the time. Smith knew of the collection's existence from Douglas (1793) and Hasted (1790, 185 and 557, etc.), although nothing had been heard of it for years. Smith approached the turning to Heppington – and walked past:

*Plate 3* Heppington, shortly before its demolition in the early 1950s. Photograph recently acquired by Liverpool Museum
Faussett Rediscovered

. . . for I had no introduction to Dr. Faussett; and I had heard that he had an objection to shewing the collection. As I walked slowly onwards I reflected; paused; turned back, and went to the house. I was courteously received. Dr. Faussett said that it was partly true what I had heard; and at the moment it would be rather inconvenient for him to shew me the collection; but that there would be no difficulty at some future time . . . (Smith 1883, 67–8).

With this encouraging response, Smith continued his expedition.

If this incident aroused Smith's interest in Saxon antiquities, he was spurred into active research next February, when Lord Albert Conyngham (later Lord Londesborough) and his private secretary, J.Y. Akerman, presented a paper to the Society of Antiquaries on their recent barrow excavations at Breach Downs, near Barham, Kent (Conyngham and Akerman 1844). These were the first Saxon barrow excavations to be reported as such since Douglas, and a rich collection of grave-goods was obtained. Akerman considered that the barrows were probably of the late fifth to early sixth centuries, citing Douglas. Their early Saxon date was soon confirmed by J.P. Bartlett who subsequently opened four more of the tumuli, one of which contained a purse with several sceattas. These were identified by Akerman (1843), and illustrated by Smith (1843a, 7 and plate VI).

It seems likely that Smith recalled having seen objects similar to those from Breach Downs in the collection of the Sandwich antiquary, William Henry Rolfe (1779–1859; see Matson 1961), and that he immediately requested these for exhibition. With his comprehensive knowledge of Roman small finds, the umbos, swords and circular brooches in Rolfe's collection would have stood out in his memory (Smith 1856, 39). A hamper of antiquities from Gilton and other sites near Sandwich was delivered to Smith in March, and displayed to the Society of Antiquaries. According to Smith, these showed close affinity with the Breach Downs finds:

. . . thus the two discoveries will be mutually illustrative, and furnish a store of facts, from the general and distinctive features of which deductions may be drawn with greater certainty towards a classification of the remains ascribed to the northern tribes, who successively over-ran Britain after the withdrawal of the Roman forces. As these nations have a near relation one with the other, with similar habits and customs, the correct appropriation of their works of art . . . can only be expected to be fully accomplished by a patient and systematic arrangement of the materials themselves, and the circumstances under which they are presented to us (Smith 1844a).

In a remarkable intuitive leap of imagination, Smith had described what became the principal aim of European Dark-Age studies for the next twenty years, if not much longer. The problem of establishing the ethnicity of the sepulchral remains of northern tribes had been discussed in the last chapter of the Nenia, a work which Smith seems to have read closely whilst preparing his paper. Douglas was unable to suggest a method of approaching the problem, but Smith recognized that the first step was to determine regional differences within burial groups of the same period. For this it was necessary to compile a body of reliable data from which the general characteristics of the various groupings could be derived. Smith began the 'systematic arrangement' of which he had spoken in the same paper, by precisely defining two varieties of Saxon brooch. These were possibly the clearest artifact descriptions since Douglas, whom Smith clearly admired (Smith 1851b, 155–6). During the next year, he met the Danish archaeologist, Thomsen, who would have encouraged this classificatory approach (Smith 1883, 151).
On 17 October, Smith made his long awaited visit to examine the Faussett Collection. This ‘far exceeded my expectations, which from the mention made of them by Douglas were rather high’. Dr Faussett confirmed that it had ‘been never examined for twenty years, and he said, its being thrown open and rearranged was entirely owing to me . . .’. The collection was not confined to grave-goods, but included ‘red Roman pottery from off Margate’, and ‘tiles from Dover Castle’. So numerous were the coins, that Faussett had melted his duplicates into a bell, which hung in the roof (Smith 1856, 204). The manuscript volumes ‘would make two valuable 8vo books of print’. In an excited letter to Rolfe, Smith later remarked that ‘nothing less than a regular week’s stay would have been sufficient to have properly examined everything’. Even so, he made sure to catalogue those coins which had been found in tumuli. Finally, he went outdoors to examine Faussett’s pavilion, which contained fragments of sculpture from Canterbury and London, and having been invited to renew his visit, returned to Canterbury, well pleased.

THE BRITISH ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

By 1843, Smith had probably examined more small British antiquities than any other, alive or dead, and had gathered a mass of data. His formidable gifts had not gone unrecognized; he had been secretary to the Numismatic Society since 1841, and was on the Council of the Society of Antiquaries. Even so, Smith had failed to breathe life into the Society. He was particularly dissatisfied with Archaeologia, which was wordy and scantily illustrated, whereas Smith’s research had shown him the need for ‘facts, copiously illustrated but sparingly diluted with theory’ (Smith 1848, v). For this reason, he now commenced his Collectanea Antiqua – the first journal devoted solely to archaeology. In contrast with Archaeologia, Smith’s Collectanea placed an emphasis on the illustration of minor antiquities – reflecting his interests as a collector and his recent perception that even humble artifacts might be used to characterize ethnic and regional affinities. His enthusiasm for collecting, sketching and publishing minor antiquities later caused Smith to be dubbed ‘the British Montfauçon’, an honour previously awarded to Faussett.

The Society of Antiquaries’ inability to respond to the archaeological destruction wrought by railway excavations and road improvements was also a source of discontent. It had neither encouraged rescue archaeology, nor pressed for government action. By contrast, as long ago as 1818 the French government had formed a Comité Historique des Arts et Monuments to publish an antiquarian survey of France, with descriptions and drawings of all its monuments. Its work was assisted by the Société Française pour la Conservation des Monuments Historiques, founded by Arcisse de Caumont. It was this society which Roach Smith and Thomas Wright tried to emulate when at the end of 1843 they formed the British Archaeological Association (BAA 1846a).

The first formal meeting of the BAA took place in December, at Wright’s house in
Brompton. Wright had settled here shortly after receiving his Cambridge MA in 1836, and was writing brilliantly, if not always accurately, on all manner of historical subjects in order to support himself (Lee 1900). This was unusual – the majority of the Antiquaries enjoyed a private income, and like Smith, Wright may have suffered from social prejudice (Levine 1986, 22). Wright also had academic contacts in France, and in the previous year had been elected a member of the Institut des Arts et Sciences. He was a keen Anglo-Saxon scholar.

Within a few weeks the *modus operandi* of the Association had been agreed. A Central Committee would collect from correspondents in all parts of the country information tending to the ‘discovery, illustration, and conservation’ of national monuments (BAA 1846a). A new inexpensive journal would enable the committee to communicate with the members. Amongst other aims, it would draw attention to foreign finds illustrative of British monuments. The expanding railway system would allow members to attend an annual conference – Canterbury was a possible first venue. Lord Albert Conyngham agreed to become its first president; Wright became its editor; Smith and Albert Way, the Director of the Society of Antiquaries, became its secretaries.

The committee’s first opportunity to act in defence of archaeological monuments came in June, when they learnt of plans to erect a reservoir in Greenwich Park. This would involve levelling Saxon barrows mentioned in Douglas’s *Nenia* (BAA 1845a, 167). The subsequent controversy reached the correspondence columns of *The Times*, where Smith refuted an argument that Douglas had already destroyed the tumuli (Smith 1844b). The affair blew over only after the House of Commons had been informed that workmen had been ordered to replace on the barrows the earth that had been removed (BAA 1845a, 252). Clearly both Douglas and barrows were gaining in public sympathy. The incident is the more remarkable in that it took place prior to the Canterbury Congress.

Not everyone on the committee was in favour of the congress, and preparations fell largely on Smith. Shortly beforehand, he wrote to Dr Faussett to ask if a visit to Heppington could be included in the programme. Faussett replied that he did not want to cause disappointment, but would like advice on how the more fragile items ‘not being under the protection of glass’ might be submitted to the ‘tender mercies of a numerous party’. Inspection of the coins ‘for obvious reasons’ would be out of the question. By 9 August, Smith had answered these points and Faussett was prudently included on the congress’s General Committee.

Despite prognostications of ridiculous failure by staff of the British Museum and the friends of Albert Way, who were suspicious of its popular appeal, the congress succeeded beyond the wildest hopes of its organizers, with nearly two hundred attending amid full press coverage. Ladies were astonished to find that the philosophers included handsome young men, dressed in the most fashionable attire. After a schedule of lectures which would have exhausted the most ardent enthusiast, the band played and there was dancing until midnight (Taylor 1932). The congress marked a watershed in British archaeology. It confirmed archaeology’s growing appeal and was the springboard for many local archaeological societies. Its importance to our present study is that Saxon burials, and the Faussett Collection in particular, became the centre of popular attention. The digging of Saxon graves consequently received a high profile for the next two decades.
On the second day of the congress, about fifty carriages transported the entire assembly to Breach Down. Lord Albert had previously arranged for eight barrows to be excavated to within a foot of the interment, so that the company could participate in the process of discovery. A heavy downpour of rain did nothing to dampen their enthusiasm (Plate 4). According to *The Pictorial Times*, even 'the bigwigs stood round with staring eyes and open mouths' as the grave-goods were passed around for inspection (op. cit., 196). After lunch more burials were exhumed in the grounds of Bourne Park, Bishopsbourne, Lord Albert's country seat, and the evening session included a discussion of the discoveries (Dunkin 1845, 97–114).

The visit to Heppington took place at 2 p.m. the following day. Security was tight with policemen standing guard outside. Visitors were admitted in detachments under Smith's personal guidance to the small room which contained the collections. Despite these restrictions, everyone was well pleased with the proceedings, including Dr Faussett (ibid.; Smith 1883, 9–11). Wright later wrote of how the collection had challenged their image of Anglo-Saxons:

...we are accustomed to regard them as half savages, without refinement, rude in their manners, and skilful only in the use of their weapons. But [...here] the followers of Hengist and Horsa seem to rise up before us...our previous notions vanish...we see at once the refinements of Saxon life...and the skill and taste of Saxon workmen (Wright 1845, 10).

At the close of the conference, Smith proposed a vote of thanks to Dr Faussett, stating that the Heppington visit had been one of the congress's most important and interesting achievements.
He considered that the collection was 'unrivalled in the value of the objects themselves, as works of ancient art of a particular epoch, and in the admirable manner in which they were arranged, classified and illustrated'. Several speakers had commented on the need to publish the collections along with Faussett’s catalogue, and Smith now intimated Dr Faussett’s willingness to assist in this respect. Unfortunately the Association had neither the time, money or vision to undertake the work (Smith 1854a, 181).

Smith and his colleagues returned to London elated by their triumphs, but the very fact of success aroused the jealousy of those who had opposed the conference. Again, social distinction probably lay at the root of the troubles. The ensuing events, then described as 'anarchaeology', need not concern us, except to say that by March the next year the Association had split into two mirror images of itself (Taylor 1932). The bitter feuding between the Association and the new Archaeological Institute headed by Albert Way, continued for decades and seriously weakened the chance of obtaining any effective antiquities legislation (Fox 1872, 172). For Smith, who remained secretary of the Association, there was the added problem of the mounting administrative work, which kept him heavily committed for the next five years. The congresses created a particular burden. On the positive side, his position as secretary gave him a rare overview of contemporary discoveries and research.

TOWARDS A MUSEUM OF NATIONAL ANTIQUITIES

It was at the 1849 congress of the BAA at Chester that Smith and Wright, co-founders of the BAA, became friendly with Joseph Mayer (1803–86), co-founder of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire. Mayer came from a Newcastle-under-Lyme family, whose prosperity was based on industrial wealth. He had trained in his brother-in-law’s Liverpool jewellery shop, but in 1844 established his own business in Lord Street, partly because he wanted to be a manufacturing jeweller, not just a middle man. Like Smith, his business provided the means whereby to purchase his antiquities. Mayer had also remained a bachelor, and the two men found much in common by reason of class and interests. A collector since boyhood, Mayer’s first portrait, c. 1840, depicts him as a connoisseur of pottery and classical sculpture. He also had a professional interest in antique jewellery — to sell, for his collection, and as a source of design ideas (Gibson 1988).

Mayer’s generosity had been noted by the BAA before the 1849 congress had begun: ‘The Liverpool people . . . have already subscribed £300 and will pay the entire expenses of our day’s visit to that place. We are quite unused to such tokens of generosity’. Mayer later promised to pay off any shortfall, which led Smith to comment that ‘such people put one quite in good spirits’. It was a heartening end to an unhappy era for Smith and Wright, both of whom resigned from the BAA shortly afterwards on account of new rivalries. Smith showed his appreciation by sponsoring Mayer’s election as an
FSA, and seems to have arranged his entry into other societies. He also made gifts of antiquities and commemorative medals to Mayer's Historic Society, and autograph letters for his personal collection. Mayer reciprocated by contributing to the sponsorship of Smith's excavations at Lymne and Pevensey (Smith 1852b, 46; 1858a, 41).

In May 1852, Mayer opened his Egyptian Museum in Liverpool's Colquitt Street, furnishing it with sale-room purchases. His inspiration was the Egyptian Gallery in the British Museum which had opened in 1846. The museum had two principal galleries: the Mummy Room and the Jewellery Room (Gibson 1988, 8). At about the same time, Mayer wrote to Smith with a request for materials for a study collection of national antiquities, and for some explanatory notes, with which Smith gladly complied.

The need for museums of antiquities had been a campaign theme of Smith's since he had become aware of the scale of destruction in London. The British Museum was generally unwilling to accept British material, and actively collected only works of artistic merit, with an almost exclusive emphasis on classical and middle-eastern antiquities. The lengthy Parliamentary Select Committee Report on the Museum of 1835–6, included but one passing reference to British antiquities (Parliamentary Committee 1835–6, 417–8). After the Government's refusal to provide the Society of Antiquaries with a room for their projected museum in 1839, Smith donated a number of antiquities to the City Corporation, hoping to encourage their interest. But, following the Royal Exchange débâcle, and other incidents, there were serious doubts about the Corporation's ability to create a museum of suitable quality. A writer to the Literary Gazette now called for a new society 'for the preservation and collection of national antiquities'. Once established, this would attract gifts from the Corporation and local collectors alike ('C.C.' 1843). The current popularity of national antiquities, embodied in the new archaeological societies, increased the impetus for a museum. In April 1845, an article in the Builder called for government action, deploring the lack of provision for British antiquities in the British Museum ('E.H.' 1845). Two months later, in Parliament, a private member called for a new museum of national antiquities, but his motion was badly prepared and was quashed (Hansard 1845, 1330–4; Anon. 1845a).

Such calls were based on the need for preservation and education, but a purely scientific reason for a national collection was now introduced. At the BAA's second congress in 1845, T.J. Pettigrew, Smith's co-secretary, spoke of the need 'to form collections from various parts, to study the history of the several localities, and then generalise the observations and draw the historical deductions'. It was for this reason that a museum of national antiquities was desirable (Pettigrew 1846, 3). Pettigrew's knowledge of British antiquities was small, and these words so closely mirror Smith's of 1842 that there is little doubt that these were Smith's views, not his own. Earlier in 1845, Smith had cited the problem of conducting regional comparative studies to establish the ethnic origin of Dark-Age materials, as evidence of a need for local or county museums (Smith 1845, 103). It was this same problem which, in 1852, caused Ludwig Lindenschmit to create the Romische—Germanisch Museum (Böhner 1969, XVII).

The first hint of success came in 1845, when Lord Prudhoe offered to donate his national antiquities to the British Museum, provided that a place was set aside for the reception of British collections (Anon. 1845b); a similar ruse had met with some success
in 1837 (Miller 1873, 210). The trustees accepted Lord Prudhoe's terms under pressure from the Archaeological Institute (Anon. 1845c). Nevertheless, it was not until the winter of 1850–51, after a Parliamentary Commission (1850) had presented its report on the function and management of the Museum, that a room was opened for British antiquities. Some months later it was still too inadequately arranged to permit a description of the exhibits, but major advances were at hand with the appointment of a new assistant, A.W. Franks, to look after the British material (Kidd 1977, 126).

Franks (1826–97) had graduated from Cambridge in 1849 and the next year became a life member of the Archaeological Institute. Unlike the Museum's other curatorial staff, who were numismatists or biased towards the Mediterranean and Eastern civilizations, Franks was interested in European medieval art, and therefore in the artifacts of barbarian Europe (Wilson 1985a; D. Kidd, pers. comm.). His first task was to improve the British collections, with the aim of creating a national series comparable with that of the Danish National Museum. For three consecutive years after his appointment, Franks published notes on his progress in the Institute's *Archaeological Journal* (Franks 1852; 1853; 1854). In this way he hoped to encourage gifts from private collectors, recognizing that the scientific value of British antiquities depended upon the reliability of associated records, and that antiquities obtained from dealers would always be deficient in this regard. In his article of 1853, despite numerous recent discoveries of Saxon grave-goods, most still in private hands, Franks complained that 'additions to the Saxon antiquities have not been very numerous, and that branch of national archaeology is the most deficient in the whole collection'. Clearly such a man would have done everything in his power to acquire a prize such as the Faussett Collection.

**FAUSSETT REFUSED**

Although the BAA had shown no interest in the collection since the Canterbury Congress, Smith had never forgotten Dr Faussett's offer to permit its publication. Inspired by the success of his recent research on Saxon and Merovingian finds (see below) Smith now wrote to Dr Faussett, offering to publish the collection at his own expense. This was shortly before the latter's death in 1853. Faussett refused, probably because he was considering the disposal of his collection 'consistent with the preservation of its integrity, and the interests of his family' (Smith 1856, v). He nevertheless asked Smith's advice on this subject, and through him offered the collection to Lord Londesborough for £1,000, who seems to have declined.

Dr Faussett's will was proved early that August. The principal beneficiary was his eldest son, Bryan Faussett, who lived at Oxford 'being in holy orders'. Heppington was placed in trust for his benefit, although much of the rest of his estate, including the Faussett Collection and manuscripts, was left to him directly. The executors were, nevertheless, empowered to sell or dispose of such property as was necessary to settle debts and charges, and it was they who decided the fate of the Collection.
There were three executors, namely Dr Faussett's second son, Godfrey, his widow, and his cousin, William Bland of Hartlip. The latter had been friendly with Smith since the mid-1840s, when Smith had helped to excavate and publish a Roman villa found on his estate (Smith 1883, 157–8, 1849). All three executors would, therefore, have been disposed to accept Smith's advice, which now was that the collection should be valued and offered to the British Museum (Smith 1856, v). A few days later, Heppington received a visit from Edward Hawkins, Keeper of the Museum's Antiquities Department (Plate 5), accompanied by Albert Way. Having decided that the collection was 'of the highest importance to the Museum', Hawkins immediately arranged for the manuscript volumes to be forwarded to London, and for a mutually acceptable dealer to visit and to value the collection (BM 1854, 1; Smith 1854a, 182). He was promptly rewarded by a 'brace of birds' sent from Heppington. The approved dealer was the 'numismatist and antiquary' William Chaffers, a friend of Smith's, who was not only a member of the BAA but had an important collection of London antiquities (Smith 1886, 103–6). Again Smith's influence with the Faussett family is evident.

Chaffers submitted his valuation on 20 September. It provides details of how the collection was arranged. The bulk was ordered by object type in nineteen numbered drawers. Other items were held in two boxes, a basket and a small glazed cabinet. The mantelpiece was arrayed with curiosities, including fourteen Roman lamps, eight Egyptian porcelain mummy figures, and a bust with stone eyes. The collection was valued at £665, excluding the notebooks, which the executors thought rather low. They had not seen the notebooks, which in recent years had been kept by Dr Faussett at Oxford, and decided to ask Hawkins to dispatch them for examination, before deciding whether or not to sell. By 30 September they had determined to proceed, and to include the manuscripts in the valuation price.

The BM's trustees considered the offer on 8 October. Chaffers' valuation was tabled with Faussett's notebooks, and a report from Hawkins was read. This commended the
collection as 'probably the most instructive and interesting ever formed of such objects'. It emphasized the importance of the documentation and that every item was 'ticketed with the name of the place where it was found', but the trustees were unmoved, and 'declined to give so large a sum as there were no sufficient funds'. The matter was back on their agenda for 12 November, when a letter from the Archaeological Institute's Central Committee was read. Clearly Franks had canvassed support. The letter stated that the Institute contemplated making valuable donations of British materials to the Museum, but looked for the formation of a national series to which the Faussett Collection would be a valuable asset. The trustees response was unaltered (BM 1854). Meanwhile, Smith waited anxiously for news: 'although each party consults me in turn, both take care not to let me know where the matter stands'.

As it became known that the purchase might fall through, various private collectors expressed an interest. The Derbyshire barrow digger, Thomas Bateman, was eager to buy, so too was Albert Way. Smith had visited Mayer in early September, and had doubtless discussed with him what might happen if the trustees refused. Some of the correspondence relating to this period has yet to be traced, but there are strong hints that Wright, Mayer and perhaps Smith met in Liverpool in October to discuss tactics. Shortly afterwards, Wright was planning a lecture on Saxon antiquities, and in early November, a second (?) 'Faussett Club' dinner, this time in London, was being talked about. Mayer was probably unknown to the British Museum's officers, but tactfully placed them in his debt by making a gift to the Museum of twenty-five Wedgwood medallions, and a rare and valuable fourteenth-century astrolabe (Franks 1854, 30). He expressed his interest in the Faussett Collection to the executors, who promised that he should have the first refusal. Doubtless Smith had been in contact, and Mayer's undertaking not to split the Collection would have proven attractive to them. The motive behind these moves is revealed in a letter from Smith to Bateman. Mayer was considering a bold philanthropic gesture on behalf of British Archaeology: 'to buy the collection and after I, at his expense, had printed an account of it, to give it to the British Museum!!!'

With this prospect, Smith became anxious to see Bryan Faussett's notebooks, which he had never been able to examine closely. These were still with Hawkins at the British Museum. Accordingly, at the end of November, Smith wrote to ask Godfrey Faussett if he might borrow them for a day or two. Permission was granted immediately. Nevertheless, when Smith applied to Hawkins, the latter refused to hand them over, and informed Mr Faussett that he strongly objected to Smith having them. A strong supporter of Albert Way, Hawkins was not one to forget old scores. However, since it was by Smith's advice that the Collection was on offer to the Museum, the snub was particularly inappropriate. Mayer was disgusted at Hawkins' attitude, and immediately withdrew his plan of giving the collection to the Museum.

When the Archaeological Institute met on 2 December, they heard that a continental museum had registered its interest in the collection, and voted unanimously to petition the BM's trustees (Archaeol. Inst. 1854, 52–3; Smith 1853, 189–91). Hawkins had exhibited the Faussett notebooks to the Society of Antiquaries in November (Evans 1956, 274). Its officers now wrote to advise the trustees that if they accepted Faussett, W.M. Wylie, author of the Fairford Graves, would make a gift of his own collection (BM 1854, 7). The matter was considered anew on 10 December, and on 14 January, but the
reply was always the same, and the full significance of the refusal became clear. The trustees would not even try to raise the money. Finance was not the problem; the trustees did not want the antiquities — probably they did not want any British antiquities!

If there were any doubts that lack of finance was merely an excuse, these were dispelled on 11 February, when the Board considered estimates for the coming financial year. The finance sub-committee had recommended that they should seek a purchase fund of £4,000 if the Faussett Collection were to be bought, and £3,500 if it were not. The trustees submitted a request for £3,500 (BM 1854, 9). In a last desperate measure, the Antiquaries and the Institute wrote directly to the Lords of the Treasury (Anon. 1854a). This was unlikely to succeed, and in any case, Godfrey Faussett’s patience was at an end. On 18 February, he wrote to Mayer saying that he and Hawkins had agreed that if the treasury had not responded by then, he would withdraw the offer.48 The following week, Mayer visited Heppington with Chaffers (whom he knew through the Chester congress) and bought the collection for £700. With characteristic generosity, Mayer paid the full cost of the valuation;49 the Museum would have paid only one half.

This was not quite the end of the matter, for Mayer had declined to buy the coins and seals, which were immediately sold at Sotheby’s along with Faussett’s papers.50 Smith was anxious to know if there was anything else relating to the Saxon antiquities and, indeed, the papers had included important correspondence between Douglas and Godfrey Faussett. Fortunately, Chaffers had managed to purchase these for Mayer.51 The coins were another question, and Smith was obliged to contact the purchasers directly. His efforts were rewarded by the discovery of six Saxon weights made from Roman coins, which had previously escaped attention (Smith 1856, xliii).

News of Mayer’s acquisition was greeted, by societies and the press alike, with praise for the purchaser and condemnation of the BM’s trustees. Smith wrote a tract on the subject, and included a list of the board members, partly to shame them and partly to demonstrate that they comprised the great and the good, most of whom had no specialist knowledge (Smith 1854a). On 1 June the outcry reached Parliament, and the trustees were ordered to supply the House of Commons with copies of all communications relating to the Faussett Collection, which were published for public scrutiny (Hansard 1854a, 283; BM 1854). Smith was frustrated to find that the trustee’s minutes did not record who had attended the crucial board meetings (Smith 1854b). However, by remarkable good fortune, a private letter survives, which points to the individuals concerned. This was written by William Vaux, one of Hawkins’ assistants, to the archaeologist, Henry Layard, who was concerned to know why his Assyrian antiquities were confined to the museum basement.52

The problems created by what Smith called the ‘monstrous anomaly’ of the board were every bit as bad as they appeared to outsiders (Smith 1854a, 186). Of the forty-seven trustees, twenty-seven held post by reason of their position — including the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Speaker of the House of Commons and the First Lord of the Admiralty! Needless to say, very few of these officials attended meetings, and the same applied to the nine family trustees. The remaining fifteen places were elected by the board — in practice the other elected members of the board — who were thereby able to introduce persons of their own taste and outlook. These elected members formed the majority at board meetings, but altogether no more than seven or eight attended, and
numbers were often as low as four or five. In Vaux's words: 'Practically this is the greatest evil – it throws all the arrangements in the hands of two or three men, who if they stick together (as Hamilton, Dundas and the Duke of Somerset for instance) can carry or reject what they like.' What they liked were Greek antiquities. When the Faussett antiquities were finally rejected on 11 February only five trustees were present. One is known to have been Viscount Mahon, President of the Society of Antiquaries, who was in favour of the purchase (BM 1854, 9). Another was the Duke of Somerset, who was against it. Hamilton and Dundas were united in opposition, and would have made every effort to attend. Clearly, the gang of three had voted together.

The views of Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset (1804–85), were expressed in a Commons answer about the Faussett Collection on 3 July. In his opinion, the job of the trustees was:

> to consider how, with the limited funds available, they could best secure those antiquities, which, if they did not purchase, the country would not possess. This was the case with regard to classical antiquities, although British antiquities would very likely find a place in some provincial museum (Hansard 1854b, 1054–8; Smith 1854b, 267).

This last suggestion was impracticable. As late as 1870, when Roach Smith advised William Gibbs about bequeathing his collection, it proved impossible to find a suitable local museum (Smith 1891, 52). For the Faussett Collection, the only realistic alternative to the BM was a private collection, with the attendant risk that the collection might be split up when the owner died. Lord Seymour's next comment shows an even greater lack of insight: the Museum was for ever being offered expensive collections which were reputedly unique, for example a recent offer of some Pacific shells. Smith lost no time in printing a scathing reply, underlining the stupidity of comparing Faussett's antiquities with shells, 'as if the one grew like the other, and was re-produced yearly' (Smith 1854b, 267).

The former MP, Sir David Dundas (1799–1877), regarded by many as being 'not quite, quite right', was no better informed than Lord Seymour. Vaux actually heard him remark that he 'did not think we wanted a heap of Saxon antiquities in the Museum!' The third member of the club, William Hamilton (1777–1859), unlike the others, had at least some claims as an antiquary (Plate 6). As Lord Elgin's secretary in Constantinople he had assisted in obtaining the Rosetta stone and the Elgin marbles. A co-founder of the Royal Geographical Society (Anderson 1890) and former Vice-President of the Society of Antiquaries, Hamilton (although not there) had even been named as President of the Primeval Section at the BA A's Canterbury Congress. Nevertheless, in Hamilton's opinion museums should be 'rather for the improvement of fine arts than merely as an historical collection of objects' (Parliamentary Commission 1850, 781). In a period dominated by historicizing styles, the need to display well-designed historical objects had already been recognized by the government, and in 1852 had given rise to a new Museum of Ornamental Art in Marlborough House (Wilson 1985b, 71). Unfortunately, Hamilton's definition of fine art was Greek art. Such was his bias against other civilizations, that he had vehemently opposed plans to display Layard's Nineveh sculptures. According to Vaux: 'Hamilton would not see with any but Greek eyes, they were not Greek. He wished them at the bottom of the sea . . . .' Even in the 1850s such views were preposterously conservative. In France, medieval art
had been fashionable since the early 1830s. In Russia, Denmark, Germany, and elsewhere, museums of national art and antiquities had already opened or were about to open (Basin 1967, 218 ff.; Sklenář 1983, 78–82). This is not to say that Saxon or Merovingian art was universally appreciated, since a tendency to view through ‘Greek eyes’ naturally persisted. Even the German archaeologist, Ludwig Lindenschmit, had been reluctant to accept that the Selzen graves belonged to early Germanic tribes, since the jewellery found among the grave-goods did not match his grandiose preconceptions. Trained in the classical school, Lindenschmit could not appreciate the style of decoration, which seemed bewildering, fantastic and adventurous (Lindenschmit 1848, 23–4; Kühn 1976, 218). However, he and others were willing to respect their historical interest and to learn, whereas Hamilton was not. In Vaux’s words: ‘I say such prejudices are not only wrong but disgraceful and that a man who is so narrow minded, is not fit to be a trustee of any miscellaneous collection.’ Matters were made even worse because the trustees refused to allow Museum officers to attend their meetings. All communications had to be in writing, and there were no opportunities for discussion or for questions to be asked. Because of this, the poor attendance, and the bias of Hamilton’s clique, decisions were made almost arbitrarily. Faussett was refused, yet less than two years previously, at the end of 1851, the trustees had agreed to spend £200 on Professor J.K. Bähr’s collection of Latvian grave-goods. Ironically the collection was regarded as being of special scientific value because it was well documented, with details of find spots (Franks 1852, 14).

Ultimately, the blame for the mismanagement lay with Parliament. The composition of the board had been recognized as problematic by the 1850 Parliamentary Commission
on the Museum’s government, as was the board’s involvement in decisions about acquisitions — which should have been left to curatorial staff. However, the Commission’s recommendations in this area had been ignored. Smith (a man of Liberal political sympathies) saw this as further evidence of the need for parliamentary reform: ‘When our Government shall be composed of statesmen instead of placemen . . . then, and then only, may it be expected that our national antiquities will be cared for and protected . . . ’ (Smith 1856, vi). In this respect, Smith may have been somewhat naive. We may note that the extraordinary composition of the Board of Trustees remained unaltered until the British Museum Act of 1963 — despite a long series of Parliamentary reforms between 1858 and 1949.

Whether or not the trustees were in any way embarrassed by their public denunciation is not known. Certainly, an anti-British bias was still evident in 1855—6 when they received another genuinely unrepeatable offer in Roach Smith’s own important collection of London antiquities. After an initial refusal, however, when it became clear that there would be another public outcry, the trustees backed down and made a bid, albeit at well below the price of an independent valuation. This Smith accepted, making a financial sacrifice in order to preserve the integrity and scientific value of his collection (Kidd 1977).

Franks’ pleasure at succeeding on this occasion must have been short-lived, for in almost the same week Anthony Panizzi, a man of Greek tastes, was appointed as Principal Librarian. Franks consequently had a difficult time at the Museum for several years to come (Wilson 1985a, 12—14). Even so, after Hamilton’s death in 1859 the quality of decision-making seems to have improved, and following the 1860 Select Committee’s report on the Museum, neither the trustees nor Panizzi could ignore the need to collect British antiquities (Parliamentary Committee 1860, vii—ix). Meanwhile, slowly but surely, Franks had been developing the British and medieval European collections into a museum resource of major international importance. In 1866, having failed to attain his goal of purging the Museum of British material, Panizzi relented, and accepted its permanence by creating the Department of British and Medieval antiquities (Miller 1973, 299, 213 and 313).

Antiquarian ill-feeling towards the Museum persisted for some time. Hillier refused even to offer the BM his collection of Saxon grave-goods from the Isle of Wight and sold them to Lord Londesborough. Wylie stuck to his word, withheld his collection, and eventually gave it to the Ashmolean Museum. Akerman donated or sold his collection to Mayer, even though it was promised to the BM, and Mayer purchased Rolfe’s museum (White 1988, 122). The idea of creating a national archaeological collection at Liverpool instead of London arose immediately after the Faussett purchase. Fairholt wrote to Mayer to say that:

... this would give that town a character of a peculiar kind and one worth obtaining ... I should urge it strongly, and be equally strong in hoping that the grand nucleus you possess in the Faussett Collection be never allowed to leave the City of Liverpool now it has reached it.

Fortunately for Liverpool, Mayer took heed of this advice, and in 1867 donated his Egyptian museum, including the Faussett Collection, to Liverpool Town Council. Although the archaeological collections did not expand to become a national series, their
national significance is indisputable, and in the year of Mayer's centenary, it is appropriate that this has, almost inadvertently, been recognized by the government's new funding arrangements for the museum.

THE PUBLICATION OF INVENTORIUM SEPULCHRALE

On receiving the Faussett antiquities, Mayer lost no time in displaying them to the public. He was also anxious to publish the manuscripts, partly out of respect for the Revd Bryan Faussett, and partly because he wished to underline the philanthropic nature of his purchase (Smith 1856, i). He asked Smith to edit the work, and his illustrator friend, F.W. Fairholt, to prepare the plates. The prospectus appeared at the beginning of April. Meanwhile Wright completed a 'nice popular paper on Anglo-Saxon antiquities', which he read on 27 September before members of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire and the British Association for the Advancement of Science. Mayer's new acquisitions were exhibited at the same event, and were reported in The Illustrated London News (Anon. 1854b; Wright 1855, 8). Mayer was delighted by his new public profile and told Smith: 'How much I owe you you are the best judge, for with me the debt has become so large that I am affrighted when I think of it.' The Inventorium was in proof form by December 1855, and was submitted to Akerman, Kemble and Wright for comment. In general, Smith's editorial work was of very high quality. Apart from the addition of some helpful footnotes, Faussett's text was left virtually unaltered. Whilst some might consider that it included unnecessary detail, Smith held that the work's authenticity and fidelity would be adversely affected by abridgement. So keen was Smith to preserve the integrity of the text that he not only included, but actually illustrated, two post-medieval sword pommels and knife handle, even though he believed that they had been placed in the graves by Faussett's friends as a joke (Smith 1856, 29–30; 82). His only substantial alteration was to place the Crundale antiquities last since, unlike the other finds, these were Roman (which Faussett had not recognized). A preface summarized the history of the Collection, and was supported by an appendix comprising transcripts of relevant correspondence (Smith and Mayer were both ardent collectors of autograph letters). An introduction, supplemented by a full bibliography, discussed Faussett's discoveries in the light of contemporary knowledge; its value as a synthesis of recent discoveries was underlined by the cuts, which had been borrowed from many previous works on Dark-Age cemetery finds. Other aspects of the format show the influence of continental publications, particularly Bähr's Gräber der Liven.

Fairholt's illustrations were unsurpassed in an English publication. Recent works, notably Akerman's Remains of Pagan Saxondom (1855), had demonstrated the potential of high quality tinted engravings in the illustration of Saxon jewellery, and Mayer provided no less than seven coloured plates (Plate 7). But the plates alone cost over ten shillings per set, and Mayer became worried about rising costs. Smith wrote to
PLATE 7  TINTED ENGRAVING from *Inventorium Sepulchrale* (Plate II) by F.W. Fairholt (Museum of London)
reassure him, saying that the work would bring: 'great returns in honourable fame . . .
There are chances, my dear Sir, which occur only once in an age; and the Faussett Collection was a chance of chances. In a month or so you will see the effect.'65 Even so, Mayer was concerned that his beneficence should not go unnoticed and proposed that his portrait should be included in the volume. Smith had doubts, and suggested that it should be circulated separately to friends,66 but when the Inventorium finally appeared during the third week of April, 1856,67 Mayer's portrait was firmly bound in every copy (Plate 8). This was not inappropriate, for in normal circumstances the volume would have sold for three guineas, whereas Mayer set the price at only two (Smith 1883, 69).

Although not widely reviewed, both the Inventorium and Mayer were highly commended, and it was generally recognized that no such volume would have appeared if the Faussett Collection had gone to the British Museum (Anon. 1856a–c; Wright 1856). Franks wrote saying that: 'The publication of the work is the only thing which in any measure reconciles me to the loss of the collection to the National Museum.'68 Smith, Wright and Mayer, were justly proud of their achievements, and for some years their 'Faussett Club dinners' became a feature of the social life which was attendant upon meetings of the British Association.69 The Inventorium provided Mayer with the recognition he so earnestly sought, and led directly to membership of, or high office in some prestigious societies.70 He was delighted and in the latter part of 1856 commissioned two marble portrait medallions of Smith, keeping one (Plate 9), and presenting the other to Smith with a cast of his own portrait and a bust.71 He also paid Smith 200 guineas (Smith 1883, 69), a sum so large that Mayer may perhaps have wanted to compensate him for losses which he incurred by selling his collection to the British Museum.

Smith now retired to Kent, remarking: 'I leave London anything but a rich man; and I intend following up my publication with a view to adding to my scanty income.'72
Mayer talked of funding him to write ambitious new works; a 'general review of our Saxon antiquities', a collection of Roman inscriptions from Britain, and an illustrated catalogue of Mayer's museum were discussed. Unfortunately, Smith had several publications in progress, and by the time they were completed, the impetus had gone and his output greatly declined. Mayer, nevertheless, did finance a few of Smith's smaller papers. He also assisted the publication of several historical works by Wright, and others. Sponsorship of this kind was highly unusual, and is regarded as one of his most important contributions to scholarship (White 1989). However, nothing else that Mayer sponsored evoked the praise which he received for the *Inventorium*: 'To edit and illustrate a book like this requires peculiar powers, and we congratulate Mr. Mayer on having so judiciously secured them... There can be no better monument to his memory than this beautiful volume' (Anon. 1856c).

The influence which the *Inventorium* may have had on the course of Anglo-Saxon cemetery studies is difficult to determine. Probably it did no more than to reinforce the best contemporary practices of observation and documentation. Whilst Faussett's standard of excavation and recording had not been surpassed in 1856, it had been equalled, if with no great consistency, by Akerman and by others. Moreover, the method of presentation of a dated inventory of graves, favoured by Faussett, had already almost superseded the less satisfactory general discussion and excavation diary formats. The importance of the *Inventorium*, both then and now, lay primarily in the information which it contained. Smith's introduction, although now long obsolete, was also acclaimed as a notable achievement:

For the first time he has enabled us to classify the somewhat chaotic mass of Saxon antiquities discovered at home and abroad; and by the careful comparison of their peculiarities, and the
thoughtful testing of the historic record, made one illustrate the other so completely, that we may safely refer certain ornaments to certain tribes, who had settled in various parts of England . . . . (Anon. 1856c).

Clearly, Smith had gone a long way towards achieving the goal he had set in his paper of 1842. The means by which he accomplished this will now be considered in the second part of this paper.

ROACH SMITH’S CONTRIBUTION TO ANGLO-SAXON ARCHAEOLOGY

The Inventorium Sepulchrale appeared two thirds of the way through what might be described as the second period of Saxon cemetery exploration, which began in 1842 and tailed off sharply in the early 1860s. Although some important excavations were still to be published in 1856, the two most significant reports of this period—by Wylie (1852) and Neville (1852)—had appeared, and Smith had already drawn his principal conclusions, most of which feature in his introduction to the Inventorium. The following summary of Smith’s contribution to Anglo-Saxon studies may therefore also be regarded as a discussion of the various themes which appear in his introduction.

That so many of Smith’s deductions remain valid is due to the care with which he recorded data, his wide reading and clarity of thought, and his cautious approach to interpretation. Whereas earlier writers on sepulchral remains—Douglas (1793), Colt Hoare (1812; 1819) and Bloxham (1834)—had centred their efforts on classifying entire burials, grave-goods included, according to broad characteristics, Smith and his contemporaries concentrated on the description and classification of the artifacts. Individual burials remained important, not only as evidence of funeral rites, but because they provided a context for the finds. Cemetery layouts were generally not studied, despite signs of interest in the subject by Douglas (1793, Pls. XXVIII–XXIV etc.), Dryden (1852) and Troyon (1841).

The validity of Smith’s work rested upon the principle of dating by association with objects of known date, first propounded by Douglas. In 1843 he published an article which gently corrected some errors in a book on sepulchral remains by Bloxham (1834; Smith 1843b). The most important amendment concerned a coiled (?) Saxon pot from Churchover, Warwickshire (Plate 10a). The author had considered this to be probably Roman (Bloxham 1834, 34), but Smith thought otherwise on the basis of associated weapons and shield bosses (Smith 1843b, 41). To support his interpretation, Smith illustrated a stamped hand-made globular urn from another mixed cemetery recently identified at Marston St Lawrence, Northamptonshire (Plate 10b; ibid., 44; both vessels are reproduced in Smith 1856, xv). Whilst Douglas had suggested in a footnote that urns of this variety were Saxon (Douglas 1793, 131, fn.), his idea seems to have been overlooked, and Smith here became the first to illustrate correctly-identified hand-made
Saxon urns. Four years later, in a JBAA article on finds from Kingston-upon-Soar, Derbyshire, the range of published forms was extended to include what are now called bossed urns, biconical urns and *Buckelurne* (Henslow 1847). The writer maintained that these belonged to the 'Ancient Britains', although Smith knew better, and a tactful note to this effect was inserted by Wright (1847, 58). Such errors of basic identification became much less frequent after the publication that year of Akerman's *Index* (Akerman 1847). The Kingston urns were eventually republished with a correct identification by Smith (1852a, 228–34). When Kemble later published his important article on mortuary urns recently found in Lower Saxony, their identification rested upon their similarity to these and other Saxon urns from the Midlands, and it was the striking English parallels which convinced some of Kemble's German colleagues that his urns were Saxon, not Slavonic, which had been the prevailing wisdom (Kemble 1855a).

Having ascertained the means of dating Saxon burials, Smith set about to identify and describe the varieties of objects which they contained. His early classificatory work on brooches has already been mentioned, and his introduction is noteworthy for his tripartite classification of Kentish circular brooches, based on construction (Smith 1856, xx–xxiv). This has served as the basis of more recent classifications by Leeds (1936, 115–24) and Avent (1975, 1), although Smith's first and third classes are transposed in their schemes.

Smith's limited experience of excavation taught him that: 'It is important to note the position of things *in situ* to determine their use' (Smith 1847, 237). This remark arose from the 1847 excavations at Ozingell (Osengal), Kent, by Rolfe, assisted by Smith, Wright, Fairholt and others. Here, in a grave, an object interpreted by Douglas as a bow brace was found, hollow side up, immediately beneath the umbo of a shield. Clearly this was the shield's handle (Smith 1853, 3, 11 and Plate II, Nos. 5–6). To record the fact, a drawing was made showing the skeleton and grave-goods *in situ* — a rarity in English publications of this period (Plate 11). In 1851, Smith published two puzzling objects, hoping that similar items might be found in position as buried (Smith 1851b, 165). A few months later, his network of correspondents had sent in their observations, and
Smith was able to pronounce them to be 'pendant girdle-ornaments, somewhat analogous to the modern châtelaine' – another interpretation which has stood the test of time (Meaney 1981, 247–8). All were incomplete but, by combining evidence of finds in different degrees of completeness, Smith was able to build up a picture of the entire artifact (Plate 12; Smith 1852a, 234–5). The same inductive methods were used in his discussion of Saxon shields.

Other writers did not compare and weigh evidence with the same degree of care. In 1850 a skeleton at Little Wilbraham had been found upon which: 'partly upon the occipital portion of the cranium, and the circular vertebrae, was placed a curious and apparently unique object . . . a headpiece or kind of crown' (Deck 1851). The accompanying illustration depicts a wooden bucket with bronze hoops, decorated with vandykes. The same mistake had already occurred in France and Germany (Oberlin 1773, 159 and Table XVI; Houben and Fiedler 1839, 67 and Table XLVIII). Until Smith had convinced him otherwise, even Cochet adopted this interpretation for a bucket hoop from Dieppe (Smith 1851b, 160–1, 169 and Plate XLV; 1875, 466–7; Cochet 1854, 310–6; 1857, 279–98).
PLATE 12. THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE CHATELAINE was achieved by comparing English and German discoveries. Plate LVI from Vol. II of Smith’s Collectanea Antiqua (Museum of London)
Smith's caution in the interpretation of artifacts actually led him into error by his refusal to accept the amuletic usage of certain grave-goods. Here he over-reacted to Douglas, who saw amulets and magical practices everywhere, even supposing that glass tumblers had held the *aqua magica* and that iron shears and mirrors had been used in divination (Douglas 1793, 44–46, 22, and 80–81 resp.; Meaney 1981, 269–71). In his discussion of crystal balls, Douglas had discoursed at enormous length on the use of gems in divination, from Zoroaster and the *Druidical speculum* to the 'celebrated vision and mysterious operations of Dr Dee and Mr Kelly' (op. cit., 14–19). Smith may perhaps be forgiven for suggesting that they were merely ornaments for attachment to the dress (Smith 1864, 150). However, even where an amuletic use was well-established, as in the contemporary Neapolitan use of cowrie shells, Smith would not accept it for the Anglo-Saxons (Smith 1856, 68). His prejudice led also to the incorrect identification of certain objects; for example model weapons were interpreted as 'tooth, ear and nail picks' (Smith 1856, xxviii; cf. Meaney 1981, 149). Nevertheless, in seeking to redress this imbalance, Audrey Meaney has commented that:

Roach Smith's views . . . have had a profound effect upon Anglo-Saxon archaeology virtually up to the present day. Not that this was altogether a bad thing . . . a sceptical attitude in scholarship is always to be preferred to a too ready credulity (Meaney 1981, 271).

Despite his scepticism about amulets, Smith wrote to great effect on the significance of the boar on the helmet from Benty Grange, Derbyshire, citing historical sources (Smith 1852a, 238–42). The use of literary evidence in the interpretation and naming of Saxon artifacts had been demonstrated by Douglas (1793), and became a feature of antiquarian study during the mid-nineteenth century. It was greatly assisted by the fashion for publishing Anglo-Saxon texts in English translation, notably *Beowulf* (Kemble 1835–7). In 1847, Smith arranged a scientific examination of wood adhering to weapons from the mixed cemetery at Northfleet, Kent. The shaft of the spear proved to be ash, which was seen as a confirmation of *Beowulf*, where the spear-shaft was termed *aesc*, meaning ash (Smith 1847, 239). Although not in the same scholastic league as Kemble's *Beowulf*, a discussion of continental Dark-Age sources by Rigollot (1850) was also influential. It was his comments upon Agathios' angon which led to the successful search for the weapon in France by Wylie (1853a). The latter's paper on this subject drew attention on both sides of the channel, and became a celebrated instance of the use of historical sources in naming archaeological artifacts (Akerman and Linden-schmit 1855; Wylie 1855; Smith 1860, 131).

It was literary sources also which first made it clear that cremation was the traditional rite of Germanic peoples, and, by inference, that where inhumation was practised, it probably represented a subsequent development. Mixed cemeteries could be explained in terms of length of use. This notion was challenged when Neville found Saxon cremation urns buried above Saxon inhumations at Little Wilbraham, Cambridgeshire, and Smith made an ingenious attempt to reconcile the discovery with conventional wisdom by suggesting that the urns, having been exhumed when the graves were dug, were carefully replaced after they had been infilled (Smith 1855, 146; 1886, 51). Even today it is doubtful that this problem may be satisfactorily resolved, although Akerman and Neville were probably nearer the truth in suggesting that the two rites could have been in contemporaneous use (Akerman 1855, xvi; Neville 1852, 11).
Having studied the written sources, the historian Kemble concluded that urn-burials were always pagan, and that inhumations were always Christian (Kemble 1855b). Smith was unconvinced, but having submitted the proofs of *Inventorium Sepulchrale* to Kemble, was obliged to include his views in the introduction. Wylie subsequently suggested that the rite probably changed to inhumation as a result of contact with Christian customs, and was not necessarily used solely by Christians (Wylie 1857). Smith ultimately accepted the force of Wylie's argument (Smith 1871, x), and had already adopted a similar argument to explain cruciform brooches (Smith 1850, 89). This was unfortunate because, in their earliest form, cruciform brooches are now known to have lacked the cross bar, being inspired by Roman bow brooches (Aberg 1926, 28–56).

The possibility of interaction between early Saxons and Roman civilization fascinated both Smith and Wright. The latter noted that Saxon burials had been found adjacent to Roman cemeteries at Canterbury, Strood and Colchester (Wright 1847, 51), and Smith pointed to the burial of money with the dead, and the Romanizing style of some brooches as further evidence of such contacts (Smith 1850, 88 and 220). His search for evidence of continuity received false encouragement from a hand-made biconical Saxon urn in the Faussett Collection, with an incised Latin inscription (Smith 1855; 1856, xvi; 1858b). Whilst recognizing that the urn was an East Anglian type (he later found evidence to show that it came from North Elmham, Norfolk), Smith understandably failed to realize that the inscription followed an early Roman formula, and must therefore have been a relatively recent forgery (Haverfield 1901, 312).

Perhaps Smith's greatest contribution to Saxon cemetery studies lies in his recognition of the regional differences in Saxon brooches and other grave-goods. Until 1847 most of the known Saxon material had come from Kent, and hopes of distinguishing regional tribal characteristics depended upon new discoveries outside the county. The only other substantial groups of finds were from the Isle of Wight, and had aroused a comment from Smith about their close affinity to the Kentish finds (Smith 1846, 461). In 1847, however, a substantial Saxon cemetery was excavated at Fairfax in Gloucestershire, and Wright immediately noticed that the two shield bosses were of a form not hitherto found in Kent (Wright 1847, 52). Three years later, in 1850, the Marston St Lawrence finds were exhibited to the Society of Antiquaries, and Smith commented that unlike the Kentish burials, these did not include swords, and the brooches were of different forms (Dryden 1852; Smith 1852d). On museum visits he had found parallels to the concave (saucer) brooches in the Upper Thames Valley (although their distribution is now known to be wider). Other (small long) brooches were similar to examples from Warwickshire, Leicestershire, Northamptonshire and Suffolk. The large (great square-headed) fibula was of a class found also on the continent. During the following year, Smith identified as a class what are now termed Anglian cruciform brooches, giving their distribution as East Anglia and the Midlands (Smith 1851b, 166 and Plate XL), and in 1860 he noted the distinctive character of Kentish buckles (Smith 1860, 143). Smith likened these regional variations to English dialects, suggesting that both indicated a descent from tribes of common origin, language and customs. He was particularly struck by similarities between the provincial dialects of Kent and the Isle of Wight, which as an Isle of Wight man living in Kent he was well qualified to comment upon (Smith 1871, vi–vii; Smith and Smith 1881–2).

In 1850, Smith linked the regional differences in artifact types which he had so
recently recognized to Bede's account of the territories settled by Jutes, Angles and Saxons (Smith 1850, 88–9). This seeming confirmation of Bede appeared just one year after Kemble's highly acclaimed history of the Anglo-Saxons, which had cast serious doubts on Bede's reliability (Kemble 1849, eg. 1–3). Smith's observation, although of far-reaching importance, was made almost in passing. It was left to Wright, always the more fluent writer, to explain in detail the distinctive features in the artifacts of the three tribal groups, based on information compiled by Smith (Wright 1852, 399–431; 1855). Wright made an original and important contribution to this topic in 1854, when he charted the first distribution map of the British Isles, pointing the way for more detailed studies by Leeds (1913). This shows the eighty-one Saxon cemeteries then known in relation to Roman roads, rivers, towns (Wright 1855; republished by Smith 1856). Wright believed, perhaps correctly, that the various clusters of cemeteries indicated those areas which had been occupied by the different tribal groups. He hoped too that the map would stimulate investigations leading to further discoveries; he was particularly keen to discover a Saxon cemetery on the borders of Wales, presumably because this might help to indicate the extent of Anglo-Saxon penetration.

Smith was obviously pleased to find apparent correlations between archaeological and historical sources, but sounded a note of caution in his introduction: 'It is not a slight analogy in some instances only that will establish this theory; it must spring from the remains themselves, and be palpable and convincing, or it must be rejected' (Smith 1856, xii). To Roach Smith archaeology was no longer subservient to history. In this and in other aspects of methodology, his approach had acquired a consistency and coherence which distinguished him from many of his contemporaries. Akerman for example, had no hesitation in freely mixing current conceptions and 'facts'. As a result, his conclusions are more often seen to be erroneous, and even at the time of writing were sometimes at variance with one another (Francis 1984, 19).

Smith's comparative work on Dark-Age antiquities was by no means confined to England, and his importance rests to no small extent on his achievements in placing Anglo-Saxon remains in their European setting. Smith became aware of close parallels between English and continental discoveries almost from the beginning of his Anglo-Saxon research. In the late summer of 1843, he paid his third visit to France, calling on M. Ferét, of Dieppe, who showed him Merovingian artifacts recently found at Ste-Marguerite (Seine-Maritime). These were later published by Wylie, along with Feret's opinion that they were Saxon (Wylie 1853b). This interpretation rested in part on the similarity of the pottery to 'Saxon' material (from Kent?), and of the buckles to finds from Strood. Since Smith recorded Feret's discoveries as Saxon in his journal for 1843, it is quite possible that this interpretation originated with his visit. Unfortunately, since Wylie did not illustrate the pottery, its identification may now not be verified.

The potential value of studying continental parallels to Saxon materials was underlined at the Canterbury Congress of 1844. During a discussion of the Bourne Park finds, someone commented that an unidentified Danish gentleman (this must have been Thomsen), had found Saxon remains in Canterbury museum, and from their similarity to relics in Copenhagen Museum had suggested that they belonged to Germanic invaders from Jutland. Bede's remarks about the Jutish origins of the Kentish settlers
were footnoted in the proceedings (Dunkin 1845, 187—9). Worsaae’s visit of 1846—7 might have encouraged further thoughts on this subject (Wilkins 1961), but it was not until 1850 that Smith fully recognized the potential. In that year he made an antiques tour to North Germany, and was particularly struck by the ‘Frankish’ grave-finds in Wiesbaden Museum (Smith 1851a, 129—31; 1851c). Not only were these arranged in burial-groups – to Smith a novel method of display (Smith 1868, vii; 1886, 295), but they were described in detail in a publication. This was none other than the Lindenschmit brothers’ _Germanischen Todtenlager von Selzen_ (1848), which laid the corner-stone for the interpretation of German Dark-Age materials (Böhner 1969). Smith purchased a copy himself and on returning to England recommended it excitedly to others.78 Similarities between the Selzen and English discoveries were immediately apparent to him: ‘The general analogy is very striking, but at the same time there seem to be some peculiarities in each’ (Smith 1851b, 160).

Smith’s growing conviction that English and continental materials should be studied together received a boost during the following year. Not only did the Great Exhibition bring many continental archaeologists to London – including Troyon of Lausanne and Rigollot of Amiens (Smith 1886, 223) – but Smith paid a further visit to France, where Cochet brought him up to date with recent Frankish cemetery excavations near Dieppe – at Londinières, Douvrend and Envermeu.79 In the spring of 1852 he published his notes on Selzen and Dieppe in the _Collectanea_, aiming to demonstrate the relationship between English and Frankish remains (Smith 1852a). To this end, he used a novel technique of juxtaposing illustrations of parallels. Four plates of German and English remains demonstrated the close similarity of what are now termed radiate brooches, iron knives, glass-claw beakers, and ceramic jugs, biconical bowls, and bottles (see Plate 12). Having discovered an angon in a grave in Strood, Smith later went so far as to suggest that its owner might have been a Frank (Smith 1860, 135); Frankish settlement in Kent during the sixth century is now widely accepted (Hawkes 1982, 72). Elsewhere, Smith remarked on some of the differences between English and continental finds, for example the comparative rarity in England of _franciscas_ (Smith 1851c), and the superiority of Kentish composite brooches over their continental counterparts, which led Smith to suggest that they were probably made in this country (Smith 1856, xxiii).

Further research was necessary to confirm such points, especially ‘. . . on an extended scale in the countries north of the Rhine’ (Smith 1852a, 204). Apart from Smith, however, few English archaeologists had established useful contacts with continental antiquaries; Worsaae alone was widely known. ‘There is no such thing as correspondence between English and Foreign societies’ complained Smith in 1851.80 Nevertheless, by the time _Inventorium Sepulchrale_ had been published in 1856 all this had changed. Whether by design or opportunity, Smith’s plea for excavations north of the Rhine had been answered by Kemble, who had published an article on mortuary urns, some excavated by himself, from Stade and Lüneburg, in Lower Saxony (Kemble 1855a). These urns were of immense importance, for they provided unequivocal evidence for the region of departure of Saxon migrants who occupied the Midlands and East Anglia.

More direct evidence of Smith’s influence is seen in the activities of W.M. Wylie. The men first met in 1851 when Wylie sent Smith some of the Fairford brooches for
comment (Smith 1891, 119; 1852c). Wylie's first publication, *The Fairford Graves*,
bears evidence of Smith's advice in matters of interpretation. Immediately after its
appearance in 1852, again doubtless following Smith's counsel, Wylie traced his
footsteps to Dieppe, where he met Feret and assisted the Abbé Cochet in making
excavations (Wylie 1853a; 1853b; Webster 1978). Referring to Wylie and Smith,
Cochet later remarked that English help was the most important outside influence on his
study (Kidd 1978, 63). Wylie's interest in funereal remains subsequently took him to
Germany, Italy and back to France in 1855. The results of these excursions were
published in *Archaeologia*. In so doing, Wylie achieved no more than Smith, albeit in
novel areas of research. Where he exceeded Smith was in attracting articles on Dark-Age
remains for *Archaeologia* from eminent continental archaeologists. These included
Ludwig Lindenschmit, Menzel and Cochet. Several became FSAs. Together with
Akerman's papers on Saxon cemetery excavations (which included the first excavations of
any kind sponsored by the Society of Antiquaries), the *Archaeologia* for 1855–60 contain
no less than nine papers on continental Dark-Age antiquities, six on Saxon, and three on
medieval French burials by Cochet. The latter were of interest because they demon­
strated the continuation of pagan burial superstitions well into the Christian era. This
international approach bore fruit in 1863, with the publication of Kemble's *Horae
Ferales*. With Franks' copiously illustrated discussion of artifact types, this became in
effect the first European-wide survey of prehistoric and Dark-Age burial customs and
antiquities (Kemble, Latham and Franks 1863).

Although the *Horae Ferales* extended beyond even Smith's horizons, it necessarily
relied upon foundations which he had laid with respect to the Anglo-Saxon materials.
Whilst he did little in the way of cemetery excavation, for which Akerman rightly holds
most of the credit (Francis 1984), Smith was responsible for most of the conceptual
strides in the study of Saxon artifacts during this period. The careful identification and
publication of artifacts, which he had done so much to encourage, was an essential
precursor of more detailed studies by others, notably Baldwin Brown (1915). His
fundamentally important work on the classification and regional distribution of brooch
types and other finds, with his recognition of the links between such regional differences
and Bede's account of the Anglo-Saxon migrations, stand among the most significant
achievements of Victorian archaeology. It was probably this which gave rise to Cochet's
remark that: 'Il est une justice que j'aime à rendre à M. Roach Smith, c'est que seul, et
presque avec l'unique secours de son intelligence, il a parfaitement deviné l'archéologie
saxonne' (Cochet 1857, 264).

The potential which this approach revealed pointed the way for Leeds (1913), and
indeed for all future artifact distribution studies. But it was perhaps in his international
approach to the subject that Smith's greatest influence on his contemporaries may be
seen. Through just one article of cardinal significance, Smith had demonstrated
in a lucid and novel manner that the solution to certain archaeological problems
lay beyond the confines of this island (Smith 1852a). In England, as on the continent,
the interest in Teutonic remains had arisen from a search for the roots of nation­
hood (Levine 1986, 79–82, 98; Sklenář 1983, 62–7). It is ironic that the problems
which emerged from this nationalistic aim were the first to excite cross-channel
coopération between antiquarians, in what came to be perceived as a mutual
archaeological problem.
It is with Smith’s German visit of 1850 that we conclude. Having returned home with the Selzen volume carefully stowed in his baggage, still excited by the Merovingian remains which he had seen in Wiesbaden, Smith wrote to his friend Bateman in terms which, with hindsight, have a strangely prophetic significance:

You must give us some little notices of your more recent Saxon discoveries. I have some remarkable materials at hand for a paper making comparison between the continental and the English, but the expense is too much for me . . . I wish I could find some liberal man of humble birth and humble pretentions who would take us by the hand firmly and freely. We would raise a statue of him in the temple of archaeology.\textsuperscript{81}

Unknown to Smith, he had already met such a man in the person of Joseph Mayer. By our conference and this collection of papers we have raised another small monument in his honour. Nothing would have given greater delight to Charles Roach Smith.
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Notes

1. PRO, Prerogative Court of Canterbury, Quire 64, proved February 1776.
2. The story of these years is told in a letter from T.G. Faussett to J. Mayer, 5 August 1854, Bebington Central Library, Joseph Mayer Papers; published by Smith (1856) 201–7.
3. Now in the possession of LM.
4. Ex. Mayer collection, now SAL, MS. 723. Letters from Revd J. Douglas to G. Faussett. These are published by Jessup (1975), and in part by Smith (1856).
5. On a visit to Bridge in preparation for this paper, the writer was told by a local resident that there had been battles all about the locality which accounted for the Bourne Park tumuli.
6. C.R. Smith, untitled manuscript diary for 1827. Private Coll.
7. Most of the known notebooks are held by the BM:DMLA.
9. The house has been demolished, although it survived until the early 1950s (Jessup 1953). The photograph reproduced as Plate 3 (one of a pair) was in the possession of a local resident, but has since been donated to LM (see Acknowledgements).
10. T.G. Faussett to J. Mayer, 5 August 1854, see Note 2.
15. As for Note 11. The pavilion survived largely unaltered until the early 1950s, see Jessup (1953).
16. Smith: LCLRO, Ref. 920 MAY, W. Chaffers to C.R. Smith, 2 March 1854; Faussett: Douglas (1793, 37). Reference was made to the French Benedictine, Bernard de Montfaçon (1655–1741), whose great study of classical antiquities (Montfaçon 1719), became the principal text-book in the study of Romano-British antiquities during the mid-18th to early 19th centuries.
19. Smith (1883) 64–5. It seems that the men first met some months earlier when Mayer visited Smith's museum (Mayer 1849, 121).


22. SAL, election records, 10 January 1850. His other sponsors included W. Chaffers (see above).


24. HSL&C (1850, 2, 183, 212; 1851, 1); SM:BAC, Vol. III, C.R. Smith to T. Bateman, 19 September 1851.


26. BL, Add. MS. 56653, Diary of Sir Henry Ellis, entry for 2 May 1839.


28. The importance of the Danish model is suggested in many places, eg. the report of the Parliamentary Commission (1850, 38–9), and Franks (1853), who also organized the British collection according to the Danish three-age system (Daniel 1950, 82).

29. DNM:C:MA, C.R. Smith to J.A.A. Worsaae, 3 December 1853.

30. PRO, Prerogative Court of Canterbury, Quire 606, proved 9 August 1853.

31. BM:DWAA, Museum Archive, 1st. Ser. f. 1753, G. Faussett to E. Hawkins(?), undated, but prior to Chaffers' visit to value the collection.

32. Two copies of the valuation are extant: BM:DWAA, Museum Archive, 2nd Ser. f. 157; LCLRO, 920 MAY, Mayer Papers, Correspondence of W. Chaffers. Published (BM 1854, 1–3).


34. Loc. cit. Note 30.


36. As for Note 33.


38. Loc. cit., C.R. Smith to T. Bateman, 28 November 1853.


40. BL, Add. MS. 33346, f. 4, T. Wright to J. Mayer, 31 October 1853; f. 5, T. Wright to J. Mayer, 6 November 1853.

41. BM:DMLA, Acc. Nos. 1853.11–14.1 etc. The number indicates that they were accessioned in November, and must have been donated not long before then.

42. As for Note 38.

43. On 24 November Mayer wrote to Franks saying: 'if you refuse them they shall not be separated if I can help it'. BM, Dept. Medieval and Later Antiquities, Correspondence files.


46. As for Note 29.

47. DNM:C:MA, C.R. Smith to J.A.A. Worsaae, 1 February 1854, and ref. cited in Note 44.

48. LCLRO, 920 MAY, Mayer Papers, Revd G. Faussett to J. Mayer, 18 February 1854.


51. LCLRO, 920 MAY, Mayer Papers, W. Chaffers to C.R. Smith, 2 March 1854.

52. BL, Add. MS. 358984, ff. 374–8, W. Vaux to H. Layard, April 1856.

53. BL, Add. MS. 52009, f. 66, A. Panizzi to Lord Holland.


55. DNM:C:MA, C.R. Smith to J.A.A. Worsaae, 5 June 1855.

56. LCLRO, 920 MAY, Mayer Papers, F.W. Fairholt to J. Mayer, n.d.

57. LCLRO, 920 MAY, Mayer Papers, C.R. Smith to J. Mayer, 6 April 1854.

58. BL, Add. MS. 33346, f. 8, T. Wright to J. Mayer, 28 March 1854.


61. There are some errors in the numbering of the artifacts (pers. comm., R. White).

62. Both the *Inventorium* and Bahr (1850) use quarto paper. Both have an introduction in which the circumstances of discovery are summarized, followed by a separate discussion of each class of find, and then of the ethnological origins of the antiquities. Both provide tables, of coins only in Bahr and of all the finds in *Inventorium Sepulcbrale*. Both locate the plates at the end and use indices to link items shown on the plates with individual graves. Some of these features are found also in Lindenschmit (1848).

63. LCLRO, 920 MAY, Mayer Papers, A.W. Franks to J. Mayer, 22 April 1856. If he had seen anything of equivalent quality in a continental publication, it cannot have been in the field of Dark-Age studies.

64. Loc. cit., Invoice by T. Brooker, Christmas 1856.


68. Loc. cit. Note 63.

69. LCLRO, 920 MAY, Mayer Papers, various letters from J. Clarke to J. Mayer; BL, Add. MS. 33346–7, Letters from T. Wright to J. Mayer.

70. A copy was sent to the Soc. Antiqs. de France just before his election (BL, Add. MS 33346, f. 257, T. Wright to J. Mayer, 16 June 1858). He was elected to the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries on 15 December 1855 (LCLRO, Acc. No. 2528a, C.R. Smith's *Retrospections* Portfolio II, C.C. Rafn to J. Mayer, 16 April 1856), and in 1858 to the Council of the Ethnological Society (BL, Add. MS. 33346, f. 252, T. Wright to J. Mayer, 1 July 1858).

71. LCLRO, 920 MAY, Mayer Papers, G. Fontana to C.R. Smith, 3 February 1857.


73. Loc. cit., C.R. Smith to T. Bateman, 7 January 1857.

74. Smith called it 'turned', but it is more likely to have been coiled (pers. comm., R. White).

75. Two of Kemble's letters to Smith on this subject have survived: BM:DMLA, 11 December 1855; Maidstone Museum & Art Gallery, in Charles Warne's copy of *Inventorium Sepulcbrale*, undated.

76. BL, Add. Ms. 33346, f. 4, T. Wright to J. Mayer, 31 October 1853; f. 52, T. Wright to J. Mayer, 23 October 1855.

77. Loc. cit. Note 11, entry for 4 September 1843.


79. Evidence for this visit is provided by a letter written by C.R. Smith to the Abbé Cochet whilst the former was at Rouen. Although no date is given, this may be determined by internal evidence (Kidd 1978, 71). Gifts from Cochet to Smith, made probably on this occasion, include the *Londinieres francisca* and a pot from Envermeu (BM:DMLA Acc. Nos 56,7–1,1416 and 5187, respectively; D. Kidd, pers. comm.).

80. Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle upon Tyne, Correspondence Vol. VI, C.R. Smith to J. Adamson, 7 February 1851.


82. This part of *Collectanea Antiqua* had been distributed by July 1845 since it is mentioned in a letter from Revd B. Poste to C.R. Smith of 18 July 1845: SAL, C.R. Smith scrap-book entitled "British Archaeological Association Second Congress 1845".

83. This part had been distributed by August 1851, as it is mentioned in the Journal of Revd J. Woodruff, Kent Archives Office, entry for 22 August 1851.

84. Stated to be Wright's work in a letter from T. Wright to J. Mayer, 29 August 1856: BL, Add. Ms. 33346, f. 80.
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The Roman Coinage from London Bridge and the Development of the City and Southwark

By MICHAEL RHODES

INTRODUCTION

From 1824–41 thousands of Roman coins were recovered from the Thames during the rebuilding of London Bridge and during subsequent dredging operations to deepen the river channel and remove submerged remains of the previous bridge. The coins covered a wide date range, from the reign of Augustus to that of Honorius. It is generally accepted that the great majority were probably votive offerings which had been tossed into the river from a Roman bridge on much the same alignment as its medieval successor.

Our knowledge of the coins is primarily due to Charles Roach Smith (1806–90) who from 1834 made strenuous efforts to collect and record them. His report of 1841 not only provided the first evidence for a Roman bridge, but contained a detailed statistical summary – one of the earliest ever produced for a collection of Roman coins. This is of great importance because, since the river-bed beneath London Bridge was extensively removed by the dredging, it is unlikely that Smith’s data can be superseded by future discoveries.

This article offers a preliminary reappraisal of Smith’s coin list in the light of the Roman coins from recent archaeological excavations and salvage work in Southwark and the City of London. A comparison of data from these three London sites appears to provide an outline chronology of the rise and decline of the Roman City, its suburb on the south bank, and the wooden bridge by which they were probably connected.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF RECOVERY

The rebuilding of London Bridge led not just to the recovery of Roman coins, but of numerous other Roman and medieval antiquities. These were sold by the workmen to bystanders, and thus gave rise to a market in small antiquities. As a result many antiquities were dispersed without record, and workmen were induced to enhance the value of extraneous relics by falsely claiming that they had been found in London. Both problems

could be overcome by supervision when the antiquities were found, and from May 1836 Smith occasionally rowed a hired boat to the barges, so that he could help retrieve the antiquities as the lifting gear poured gravel onto the deck.4

The efficiency with which such antiquities were collected seems to have varied according to the type of find. Parts of at least three broken statuettes were separately found and reunited, which suggests that a high rate of retrieval was achieved for larger items of metalwork.5 We may nevertheless assume that the 'ballast heavers' discriminated against less saleable items of pottery and wood.6 It is also clear, however, that many coins escaped their attention. Hundreds were picked out of the ballast where it was deposited on the banks of the Grand Surrey Canal at Deptford, and of the Thames at Battersea and Barnes.7 Smith made every attempt to record these coins, although with characteristic caution he did not incorporate them into his list of coins from the Thames.8

THE EXISTENCE AND PROBABLE LOCATION OF ROMAN LONDON BRIDGE

With regard to the provenance of the coins, Smith's principal observation was that:

'Throughout the entire line of the old bridge, the bed of the river was found to contain ancient wooden piles; and when these piles, subsequently to the erection of the new bridge, were pulled up to deepen the channel of the river, many thousands of Roman coins, with abundance of Roman tiles and pottery, were discovered; and immediately beneath some of the central piles, brass medallions of Aurelius, Faustina, and Commodus'.9

Whereas dredging was by no means confined to one place, Smith's journals show that the coins mostly came from a particular location:

'The workmen after a long lapse have again come into the spot where the Roman coins are found and brought up some'.10

This was situated 'about twenty yards below the second arch of the new bridge.'11 Fig. 1 shows its position in relation to the old and new bridges, as revealed by a contemporary street plan.12 Smith's observations would seem to corroborate an earlier record that in demolishing one of the starlings of Old London Bridge, 'two hundred Roman coins were found in the same hole, as if they were the contents of a lost purse or bag'.13

---

4 British Museum, Department of Medieval and Later Antiquities, C.R. Smith's MS. notebook/journal '1836: Vol. II. Notes on Discoveries in London, and also on private matters', entry for May 31, 1836; C.R. Smith, Restrospections, Social and Archaeological ii (1886), 206.
8 Smith, op. cit. (note 1), 194.
9 C.R. Smith, 'Roman London', Arch. Journ. i (1844, for 1845), 113.
11 Smith, op. cit. (note 1), 149.
FIG. 1. The Roman coinage from London Bridge: Location map, showing medieval London Bridge in relation to the nineteenth-century bridge and various archaeological sites and discoveries. Based upon an early nineteenth-century street plan.
In 1831, when the starlings were demolished, it was found that they had enclosed piles from earlier medieval(?) bridges. There was no suggestion at that stage of a Roman bridge on the same alignment. This idea formed in Smith's mind when it became clear that the coins came mostly from several feet beneath the river bed and seemed to have been laid 'in series, as if there had been more than one deposit...'. Towards Adelaide Wharf, lumps of 'conglomerate' were found which, when examined by Smith, contained only Roman coins. He therefore dismissed suggestions that the coins were from a coin-dealer's shop on the medieval bridge, maintaining that they provided evidence for a Roman bridge— an idea both novel and controversial.

In 1928, doubts were raised about the value of the coins as evidence for a bridge, on the grounds that they could have been deposited around the medieval starlings by tidal action. The coins themselves show that this was not the case. Although some did indeed show signs of abrasion, as noted by Smith, the many surviving examples in the British Museum's Department of Coins and Medals are generally both unabraded and exceptionally sharp—a sure sign of undisturbed burial in anaerobic silts.

As Roach Smith recognised, the existence of bridges in Roman Britain is well attested by place-names, one of the clearest examples being Durobrivae (Rochester, Kent), where the Medway was not much narrower than the Thames of London. It might further be argued that if a bridge was deemed necessary at Rochester, presumably to facilitate the swift passage of troops and communications between Richborough and London, then it is unlikely to have been tolerated that military personnel and imperial messengers approaching the seat of government in London should be obliged to wait for daylight and favourable river conditions for a ferry from Roman Southwark to the city proper.

Moreover, in addition to the coin evidence, the position of a Roman river crossing near medieval London Bridge, and the existence of a bridge here in Flavian times are strongly supported by recently-acquired archaeological evidence (see Fig. 1). On the Southwark bank, the location of the Thames crossing has been demonstrated by the discovery of two Roman roads, which converged towards the site of medieval London Bridge. On the north bank, excavations in Pudding Lane have revealed what is thought to have been a Flavian pier base, aligned with the downstream side of medieval London Bridge.

Taken together, the evidence for a Roman bridge at London is persuasive, although it falls short of the degree of proof which might for example be provided by the recovery from midstream of piles datable by dendrochronology. The ensuing reinterpretation of the coins is therefore offered with this important caveat.

16 Smith, op. cit. (note 1), 154–8.
18 A.L.F. Rivet and C. Smith, The Place-Names of Roman Britain (1981), 346–8; see also Ad Pontem, Durobrivae, Pons Aeli, and Pontibus.
In the absence of any previous research on Roman coin statistics, neither Smith nor his contemporaries had grasped that the volume of Roman coinage fluctuated greatly from reign to reign. Thus when he observed the relative frequency of Flavian, Carausian and early House of Constantine coinage at London Bridge, Smith was able to conjecture that they represented a series of ‘commemorative memorials’, deposited to mark the repair or rebuilding of the bridge, or the accession of new emperors ‘precisely as such objects are used for similar purposes at the present day’. This interpretation is characteristic in that Smith always took insufficient account of the force of superstition in Roman and Saxon times. There can now be little doubt that the coins were votive offerings to the divinity of the bridge or the river. Smith himself virtually conceded that this was the case after the recovery of coins on the site of a Roman ford at St. Léonard (Mayenne).

The practice of making votive offerings at fords and bridges appears to have been widespread throughout the northern provinces of the Roman Empire. Elsewhere in Britain, coins have been obtained from the line of Roman river bridges at Piercebridge and Newcastle-upon-Tyne (Pons Aelius).

Finds from the bed of the river Liri (about 80 km north-west of Naples, Italy), from Piercebridge and from Coventina’s Well show that jewellery, small bronzes, and other small valuables were also offered to water deities. Unbeknown to Smith, this may also explain most of the other Roman finds from London Bridge, including anatomical features cut from large bronze statues – the famed head of Hadrian, and a hand in Smith’s collection. The Roman practice of offering anatomical representations at venerated waters is now well established. Whereas Smith recognized the votive nature of the bronze prow of a galley, he could not satisfactorily explain a votive enamelled plaque of a Roman altar, which he ascribed to the Dark Ages. The five bronze statuettes – still one of the finest groups of Roman bronzes from Britain – he suggested had been defaced and disposed of by Christians. It now seems equally plausible that they may have been pagan offerings.

20 Smith, op. cit. (note 7), 21.
28 Merrifield, op. cit. (note 22), 97-102.
29 Smith, op. cit. (note 7), 75; J. Brailsford, Guide to the Antiquities of Roman Britain (1964), 71, and fig. 37, no. 1.
30 Smith, op. cit. (note 5), 84.
31 C.R. Smith, ‘On some Roman Bronzes discovered in the bed of the Thames . . .’, Archaeologia xxviii (1840), 38-46.
which were ritually ‘killed’ prior to deposition.\textsuperscript{32} The same may apply to the clamp adorned with deities, now thought to have been used for ritual human castration.\textsuperscript{33}

Two broken silver denarii and about nine ‘defaced’ bronze coins from the London Bridge site may also have been ritually damaged.\textsuperscript{34} The ritual bending or defacement of medieval coins has been noted by Merrifield.\textsuperscript{35} To judge from the bent coins from Piercebridge and from the bed of the Liri (but surprisingly not from Bath) it now seems likely that the practice extended back to Roman times.\textsuperscript{36}

A SHRINE ON LONDON BRIDGE?

The concentration of coins at a particular point along the probable line of Roman London bridge has a parallel on the line of the bridge over the river Liri.\textsuperscript{37} There are several possible explanations. It may be that it was considered more efficacious to cast offerings into deep water, and that this was the first point at which there was sufficient depth. Alternatively, the bridge might conceivably have been connected to a deep water pier or floating jetty, which provided a convenient platform from which to cast objects into the water. A far more compelling explanation is that the bridge was furnished with an altar or shrine, which encouraged acts of devotion. A lead curse tablet to ‘Metunus’ (i.e. Neptune) found in 1984 on the foreshore near the bridge suggests the possible dedicatee of this shrine.\textsuperscript{38} In Smith’s day, the nature of lead curse tablets was unknown; any such finds would have been discarded by the ballast-heavers.

At Chesters, the possibility of a shrine to the nymphs is suggested by stonework from a structure over one of the cutwaters of Bridge 2.\textsuperscript{39} A closer parallel to London is provided by the bed of the Tyne at Newcastle, which in addition to coins, has yielded matching altars to Oceanus and Neptune, presumably from the bridge, with a dedication slab of c. A.D. 155–9.\textsuperscript{40} The manner of their deployment on the bridge is suggested by the surviving Roman bridge over the Cendere Çay, Turkey. This retains three of its four original altars, each of which stands adjacent to a dedication slab. Originally, the four stelae, each with its altar, stood in opposing pairs on either side of the carriageway, about a quarter of the way across the bridge from either end.\textsuperscript{41}

The Roman coins from London Bridge are not the only ones to have been found in the Thames. From 1984–5, nearly 380 coins were recovered by metal-detector users from fly tips of spoil derived from the Billingsgate Lorry Park site (for site location, see FIG. 1). The coins were submitted to staff of the Museum of London for identification and recording, and have mostly been returned to the finders. Since the Billingsgate site lay to the south of

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{32} Merrifield, op. cit. (note 22), 30 and 97–101.
  \item \textsuperscript{34} Smith, op. cit. (note 1), 160–3.
  \item \textsuperscript{35} Merrifield, op. cit. (note 22), 109–11.
  \item \textsuperscript{37} Houghtalin, op. cit. (note 26), 67–81.
  \item \textsuperscript{39} P.T. Bidwell and N. Holbrook, \textit{Hadrian’s Wall Bridges} English Heritage Arch. Rep. 9 (1989), 46.
  \item \textsuperscript{41} K. Humann and O. Puchstein, \textit{Reisen in Kleinasien und Nordsyrien} (1890), 393–5. Taf. XLI–XLIII.
\end{itemize}
London's Roman quays, these coins must have been derived from the Roman river bed. They are interpreted as votive offerings, which were tossed into the river from boats or perhaps a floating jetty.

**COIN STATISTICS**

The most remarkable aspect of Smith's report lies in its presentation of statistical data. In this, Smith presumably took the lead from Taylor Combe of the British Museum, who from 1817 had pioneered the practice with regard to Saxon coins. From 1840, Smith applied Combe's approach to Roman coins, beginning with those from the Roman cemetery at Strood.

Any reappraisal of the London Bridge coin statistics is reliant upon Smith's data, because many of the coins are no longer available for study. Having acquired Smith's collection intact, the British Museum selectively sold many of his coins as duplicates. As with those of his contemporaries, Smith's coin descriptions were inadequate by modern standards, not least because he used the size classification, of 1st (or large), 2nd (or middle), 3rd and 4th (or small) brass. This is now largely obsolete because it overlooks the importance of weight and metal in determining denomination, so that, for example, dupondii and asses cannot be distinguished. Ironically, the Roman coins from London Bridge were among the only ones from Britain which were bright enough to reveal the colour of the metal without being cleaned (R. Bland, pers. comm.). Nevertheless, for his time Smith was a proficient numismatist, and he was able to draw upon Eckhel's scholarship through the medium of two new working manuals by J.Y. Akerman. His identifications are often sufficient to be matched with types in *RIC*, and are usually adequate for broad dating at least.

It is fortunate, too, that by his own account Smith's list of coins from London Bridge includes most of those which he saw or purchased. It may, therefore, be used for comparison with recent coin data for Southwark, and also with the first detailed statistics from the City, which have not been published previously. These have been compiled by the writer from computerised tables derived in the main from identifications by Jenny Hall. They include coins from post-1945 excavations by staff of the Guildhall Museum and, from 1975, by the Museum of London's Department of Urban Archaeology. Records of the finds from the Billingsgate site have also been examined, although they await a full assessment.

Special care is required in comparing these sites because whereas the coins from the city and Southwark were lost during everyday use, those from London Bridge and Billingsgate are from votive deposits. This probably accounts for most of the more unusual coins from London Bridge, which include several gold and silver rarities and bronze medallions of Faustina, Commodus and Aurelius.

---

44 J. Casey, pers. comm.
45 A Descriptive Catalogue of Rare and Unedited Roman Coins... (1834); Coins of the Romans relating to Britain (1836).
46 Smith, op. cit. (note 1), 152–3 and 194.
49 The Faustina and Commodus medallions survive in the British Museum, Department of Coins and Medals, Reg. Nos 1935-4-4-3 and 1935-4-4-2, respectively.
There are no signs at London Bridge of a predisposition against offering the deity coins of high value, for which some evidence has been claimed at Bath. For every silver coin from London Bridge of A.D. 43–238, Smith recorded 12.1 bronze coins. This compares with a ratio of 1 silver to 17.3 bronze among the coins from recent City excavations. The discrepancy may have arisen because Smith paid special attention to coins of precious metal.

To compare Smith’s statistics from London Bridge with other sites, it is necessary to translate them into a coin loss diagram of the kind advocated by Casey (Fig. 2). There are two difficulties in so doing. Firstly, Smith excluded forged denarii of the first to early third centuries. This will have slightly diminished the figures for Periods 3–10. (It is fortunate for present purposes that there were apparently no forgeries of Periods 1–2, see below).

---

50 Walker, op. cit. (note 36), 284.
52 Smith, op. cit. (note 7), 154.
Smith also provided a round figure of 100 for ‘minims’, in which category he seems to have included small radiate and diademed copies of late third- and early fourth-century coins. For convenience, Smith’s ‘minims’ have all been placed in Period 18 (A.D. 260–73), as have the late third-century ‘barbarous’ radiates from Southwark and the City. This permits the use of Period 19 to denote the coinage of Carausius and Allectus. It should nevertheless be noted that many numismatists consider that the production of radiate copies continued until the introduction of the ‘follis’ around A.D. 295–6.

Fig. 3 permits comparisons between the figures for London Bridge (1,685 coins), Southwark (701 coins) and the City (998 coins, counting each hoard as one coin). The figures from Billingsgate are not given since, except in one respect, they do not differ significantly from those from the City (see below). Corroded coins (defined as those which are too corroded to reveal the identity of the emperor) were excluded, but only after it had been ascertained that their inclusion would have made no difference to the chart other than to smooth out the peaks and troughs. For present purposes, no distinction has been made between regular and irregular coins; Smith’s coin list does not distinguish between them.

INTERPRETATION OF THE STATISTICS

For Southwark and the City, the overall pattern of coin loss, with its Flavian, Gallic Empire and Constantinian peaks, is typical of many other continuously-occupied Roman sites. The pattern of coin loss in the fourth century belongs to Ravetz’s coinage pattern A, although there is a conspicuous shortage of Valentinianic coins in comparison with other large Roman towns such as Silchester, Corbridge, Verulamium and Wroxeter. Since this low volume of late Roman coinage is also apparent at London Bridge and Billingsgate, it cannot be blamed upon a general truncation of late Roman deposits due, for instance, to the digging of medieval foundations or pits. From Coin Periods 3–17, the pattern of coin loss on all the London sites is remarkably similar. This draws into focus some significant points of divergence between the sites in Periods 1–2 (Claudian–Neronian) and onwards from Period 20 (late third century A.D.).

The most notable feature of Coin Periods 1–2 is the relatively high loss in Southwark of Claudian coins, which suggests that during the first decade or so of London’s existence, the focus of activity was in Southwark, rather than the City. The figures for the City may be slightly depressed because the earliest levels are not always fully excavated on rescue excavations, but this is probably balanced by the fact that on other sites only the earliest Roman layers survive. The relatively high number of Claudian coins from Southwark has already been noted by Hammerson, who concluded that most were in circulation during the earliest phases of occupation, and that since a majority are high grade imitations, they are suggestive of a fort or military supply-base. As Haverfield once suggested, if early settlement was indeed concentrated in Southwark, this might explain why Ptolemy, writing in the early second century A.D. but using earlier sources, stated that London lay within the territory of the Cantii, that is south of the Thames.

55 Geography 11. 3; see F. Haverfield, ‘Roman London’, JRS 1, pt. 2 (1911), 146, n. 2. Another explanation is that Ptolemy was simply mistaken on this point, see A.L.F. Rivet and C. Smith, The Place-Names of Roman Britain (1981), 299, 398.
The Roman coinage from London Bridge: Chart to compare annual coin losses in the City, Southwark, and along the line of London Bridge.
The relatively low number of Claudian coins (Period 1) from London Bridge is consistent with evidence from the 1984 excavations at Pudding Lane, which suggested that the bridge may not have been a primary feature. Here a landing-stage dated by dendrochronology to A.D. 69–91 was found to be cut through by the possible bridge pier. This was made of timbers felled in A.D. 79–118, but was probably constructed around A.D. 90 because it was cut through to accommodate a timber quay of A.D. 86–105. It is thought that the landing-stage may have served a ferry which preceded the bridge. Since crossing the river would have been easier by bridge, its construction would be expected to lead to an increase in traffic and hence in votive offerings. On this basis, the bridge was probably constructed during the main period of loss of the Period 2 coinage. Allowing for circulation, this was presumably during Period 3 – A.D. 68–81. After the construction of the bridge, it seems that the City assumed its traditional pre-eminence over Southwark (Periods 3–17).

As on many other Romano-British sites, large numbers of radiates have been recovered from the City (Period 18; nearly 25 annual losses per 1000 coins). The relative scarcity of radiates in Southwark, for reasons unknown, has already been noted by Hammerson. The figures for London Bridge appear to mirror those from Southwark, but the smaller radiates and minims are more likely to have been missed by the ballast-heavers and, in that they were mainly unofficial copies with unidentifiable portraits, may have been discriminated against by Smith and other collectors. Nevertheless, sufficient radiates were found to show that they were not considered inappropriate as offerings to water-deities, the possibility of which has been raised at Piercebridge.

Positive discrimination in favour of collecting and recording coins of Carausius and Allectus (Period 20) must be at least partly responsible for the apparent high numbers from London Bridge. There had been a long antiquarian tradition of interest in Carausian coins. Moreover, Smith's journals show that he became interested in them early in his antiquarian career. From 1855 he produced a series of plates of them in his Collectanea Antiqua.

A different explanation is required for the large number of Period 22 coins from London Bridge. Since Smith detailed three-quarters of the reverses, thus permitting close dating by reliable modern sources, we may be confident that the high figure is not due to errors of identification and dating. (Only in recent years has the fourth-century coinage been satisfactorily sorted out.) It seems likely that they included one or more particular votive deposit, such as a bag of coins. Several such groups have been identified from the sacred spring at Bath. This is supported by the presence of thirty coins of Crispus, including an extreme rarity – a gold solidus from the Trier Mint (RIC 363). By comparison, just two bronze coins of Crispus have been recovered from the City during the last forty years of systematic excavation. Nevertheless, this explanation is by itself insufficient, in that

---

56 Milne, op. cit. (note 19), 37.
57 G. Milne, pers. comm.
58 Hammerson, op. cit. (note 54), 594.
59 Casey, op. cit. (note 25), 42.
63 Casey, op. cit. (note 51), 37.
64 Walker, op. cit. (note 36), 310.
65 Presumed sold, as it is no longer extant in the British Museum.
whereas the Billingsgate coins generally follow the pattern of coin loss in the City, they include the same proportion of Period 22 coins as was found at London Bridge. It is therefore possible that there was a genuine increase in votive offerings to the Thames water deities in the early fourth century, the reasons for which can only be a matter of speculation.

For Periods 23–27, the very low coin figures from London Bridge might imply that the bridge had been swept away, so that the Thames crossing was once more by ferry, which presumably took a trajectory away from any submerged remains of the bridge. The loss must have occurred before A.D. 330 because the Period 23 peak seen on most Romano-British sites is entirely missing. This concurs with other evidence that London was decreasing in economic importance from the mid third century. Excavations near the bridgehead suggest that the harbour works ceased to be maintained from around A.D. 260. Moreover, on present evidence, by around A.D. 330 the forum itself had at least been reduced in size, and may have been demolished. Against such a background, it is perhaps not unreasonable to suppose that a timber bridge 300 metres long may have proven too expensive and difficult to maintain.

An alternative explanation for the scarcity of late Roman coins from the bridge – that there was a sharp decline in the veneration of the water deities – is unconvincing. The Period 23 peak is well represented at Billingsgate, and coin depositions in the spring at Bath remained at a high level during Periods 23 and 24, and did not begin to decline until A.D. 353–68. Evidence from elsewhere puts the widespread decline in pagan practices even later. The destruction of the bridge might also explain the relative economic buoyancy of Southwark during Periods 24–25, in that trades and activities previously confined to the City might now tend to be duplicated in Southwark.

The absence from all the London sites of the typical Valentinianic peak (Period 25) shows that despite London’s continuing administrative importance and, indeed, the presence of the treasury, both the City and its southern suburb were by now in steep decline. It is a point for debate whether the apparent failure to maintain such a strategic asset as London Bridge contributed to, or was itself a consequence of this process.
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