

‘Gratefully dedicated to the subscribers’: The archaeological publishing projects and achievements of Charles Roach Smith

Sarah Scott

Charles Roach Smith (1806-1890) was at the forefront of archaeological scholarship from the 1840s onwards and played a pivotal role in recording and establishing the importance of British antiquities and archaeology, but is rarely mentioned in general histories of archaeology. This paper provides an overview of his major achievements in archaeological publishing and, through an analysis of more than 2,000 subscriptions to eleven of his volumes on British archaeology, explains how and why he published prolifically in the absence of institutional support and often in the face of prejudice against his background in ‘trade’. It argues that his rigorous and evangelising approach to archaeological publication, and the pivotal role which he played within national and international philanthropic social and intellectual networks, was instrumental in the transformation of the discipline in the second half of the nineteenth century, and underpinned the development of a national collection of British antiquities in the British Museum. His efforts also contributed to wider social and educational transformation in this period, which included greater recognition for women. Through a more inclusive and prosopographical approach it provides unique insights into the enterprising strategies and impressive achievements of those whose contributions to archaeology are insufficiently acknowledged today.

‘Gratefully dedicated to the subscribers’¹: The archaeological publishing projects and achievements of Charles Roach Smith

Sarah Scott
School of Archaeology and Ancient History
University of Leicester

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Charles Roach Smith’s interests and projects.....	3
3. Charles Roach Smith’s publications	7
3.1 Collectanea Antiqua (7 vols., 1848-80)	10
3.2 The Antiquities of Richborough, Reculver and Lymne in Kent (1852) & Excavations at Pevensey	11
3.3 Catalogue of the Museum of London Antiquities (1854) and Illustrations of Roman London (1859)	11
4. Marketing and distribution	13
5. Networks of support	15
6. Roach Smith and British Archaeology	26
References	30

1. Introduction

Charles Roach Smith (1806-1890) was at the forefront of archaeological scholarship from the 1840s onwards and played a key role in asserting and establishing the importance of British antiquities and archaeology, but is rarely mentioned in general histories of archaeology (Rhodes 1990; 1991; 1992; 2004; Hobley 1975; Henig 1995, 186)[INSERT LINK: <http://intarch.ac.uk/journal/issue35/1/4-2.html>]. He published extensively on British, and especially Romano-British remains; his studies of Romano-British archaeology and art remain important sources of reference, and he is described by Henig as having ‘an

¹ Dedication. Charles Roach Smith 1861. *Collectanea Antiqua* V. Printed for the subscribers only and not published.

intelligent appreciation of workmanship, and an instinctive feel for iconography' (1995, 186). Sir John Evans, president of the Society of Antiquaries and the Numismatic Society, commissioned a medal in appreciation of his 'services to archaeological science', which was presented to him just before his death in 1890 (Smith 1891, ix-x). His interest in collecting, recording and interpreting evidence of everyday life in Roman Britain was unusual in this period, when many archaeologists of Roman Britain were primarily concerned with military remains (Hingley 2008, 307-11), and when the resources of the government and the British Museum were invested elsewhere; most notably in the acquisition of Greek and Roman antiquities (for which see e.g. Kelly 2010; Dyson 2006; Cook 1998), and increasingly those from Assyria and Egypt (e.g. Malley 2012; Moser 2006; Thornton 2013; Goldhill 2015, 64-108). The focus on the archaeology of these regions was due in part to the intense rivalry between nations in the formation of national collections of art and antiquities, and a perception that investment in these areas was most appropriate for a nation at the heart of a vast empire (Hooock 2010; Scott 2014)[INSERT LINK: <http://intarch.ac.uk/journal/issue35/1/4-2-2.html>]. As noted by Cook (1998, 139) 'British archaeology is not synonymous with archaeology in Britain, and this was especially true in the Victorian period' (see *Illustrated London News* 8 Nov. 1856: 479 on the inadequate provision for national antiquities in the British Museum).

Publications on biblical and classical archaeology, such as Layard's on the remains at Nineveh (1867)[INSERT LINK: <https://archive.org/details/ninevehanditsre03layagoog>], and Gell's descriptions of antiquities in Greece and Pompeii (1852; Sweet 2015)[INSERT LINK: <https://archive.org/details/pompeianatopogra00gell>], are perceived as canonical works, and are certainly better known by most archaeologists today than any of the publications produced by Smith (see Topham 2000, 566 on the dangers of 'culturomorphic distortion' through focus on canonical works; Raven 1992, 24; Scott 2013a, 2). It is unsurprising that major publishers of the day, such as John Murray, were keen to produce volumes relating to these dramatic and exotic discoveries, for which they would have predicted a significant market. However, the majority of archaeological publications in this period were on Britain, and their importance for the history of the discipline has been insufficiently recognised; many volumes were the result of considerable investment by authors and their subscribers, and merit further investigation. For example, a study of the publications of Samuel Lysons (Scott 2013a; 2014) has shown how 'local' antiquities were employed in the assertion of national identities in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Lysons and his circle, which included the eminent explorer and scientist Sir Joseph Banks, were at the forefront of archaeological scholarship in this period, working collaboratively to an international agenda celebrating Britain's scientific and cultural leadership in Europe. The publications of Smith and his associates are similarly impressive and provide valuable insights into the development of the discipline in the mid-nineteenth century, both in Britain and further afield (Rhodes 1992).

[INSERT LINK: <http://intarch.ac.uk/journal/issue35/1/4-2-2.html>]. [INSERT LINK: <https://www.archaeologybulletin.org/articles/10.5334/bha.2323/>][INSERT LINK: <https://academic.oup.com/crj/article-abstract/6/2/294/382921/Britain-in-the-classical-world-Samuel-Lysons-and>]

This paper expands on the discussion of Smith's achievements in the context of archaeological publishing in the nineteenth century, and through an analysis of 899 subscribers to eleven of his volumes on British archaeology, explains how and why he published so prolifically in the absence of institutional support for the study of national antiquities and often in the face of prejudice against his background in 'trade' (Smith 1883, 116). It shows how he established his credentials as an internationally renowned and celebrated archaeologist, assiduously cultivating networks of support and highlighting the inadequacies and incompetence of predominantly aristocratic trusts and societies. It also demonstrates the immense importance of subscription publishing in archaeology in this period, and the significance of the lists themselves as a means of self-promotion, both for the author and his/her subscribers (Robinson and Wallis 1975; Sweet 1997, 30); the importance of these sources for understanding the development of the discipline of archaeology has not been fully recognised. Building on existing scholarship (Rhodes 1992; Levine 2003; Hoselitz 2007; Evans 2007; Hingley 2007; Thornton 2013) it argues that Smith's rigorous and evangelising approach to archaeological publication, and the pivotal role which he played in establishing and growing philanthropic social and intellectual networks, underpinned the transformation of the discipline in the second half of the nineteenth century. His efforts also contributed to wider social and educational reform in this period, which included greater recognition for women; their 'hidden' contributions have received little attention in histories of archaeology, and this is particularly true for women working in British archaeology (for critique see e.g. Classen 1994; Díaz Andreu and Sorensen 1998; Cohen and Sharp Joukowsky 2004. See also Smith 1998 on gender and historical practice). This paper highlights the potential of a more inclusive and prosopographical history of the discipline to provide unique insights into the enterprising strategies and impressive achievements of those whose work is insufficiently recognised today.

2. Charles Roach Smith's interests and projects

Charles Roach Smith (INSERT FIGURE 1) was born near Shanklin on the Isle of Wight in 1806 and attended school in Southampton and Winchester. After serving apprenticeships in Chichester and London, he established a chemist's business at Founders' Court, 48 Lothbury, London, in 1834, moving to 5 Liverpool Street in 1840 when his Lothbury home was purchased for the City Improvements (Rhodes 2004; *Morning Post* 1941, Issue 21985, 4; Smith 1883, 121; *Illustrated London News* 30 Aug. 1890: 262).

[INSERT LINK:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Charles_Roach_Smith#/media/File:Charles_Roach_Smith.jpg]

Smith had many interests which included a passion for archaeology and antiquities. When he first came to reside in Lothbury excavations were in progress for the City Improvements, which included approaches to the new London Bridge with deep cuttings being made to the west of the Bank of England, Moorgate Street and in Lothbury (Roach Smith 1883, 114; Rhodes 1991): 'I was brought face to face with circumstances destined to give tone and character to my future life. Of course I became at once a collector; and something more; I studied what I collected'. That he preferred archaeological pursuits over business is clear in the Preface to *Collectanea I* (1848, v)

The plates have been prepared and the text written, not to employ an occasional leisure hour, but at moments stolen from time fully occupied by less pleasing but necessary engagements. The task has been purely a labour of love

The success of his business enabled him to devote time to archaeological activities; he was responsible for collecting and recording over 5,000 antiquities, many of which he saved from destruction during improvements to the London sewerage system. The effort that he expended in monitoring the excavations and in saving and securing the vast numbers of antiquities which were assembled in his Museum of London Antiquities was considerable; he records that he

bestowed incessant personal exertion and solicitude in watching the works and encouraging the labourers, by the most persuasive of all arguments, to preserve, and also to understand what to preserve (1854, iv)

In order to ensure that 'its integrity is best ensured' he produced the *Catalogue of the Museum of London Antiquities* (1854, vii). His Museum was sold to the British Museum in 1856 after a considerable period of negotiation (Smith 1857, appendix; Kidd 1977; Potter 1997, 130-32; MacGregor 1998, 134-37; Polm 1997, 212-13) and his achievements attracted significant recognition, both at home and abroad. The two well-known Danish archaeologists Christian Thomsen and Jacob Worsaae visited his museum and are listed as correspondents and/or subscribers to his publications (see also *Gentleman's Magazine* 1847, 181, Antiquarian Researches). On visiting London they were unimpressed by the British Museum's attitude to national antiquities (Rowley-Conwy 2007, 100; Wilkins 1961) and praised Roach Smith's achievements in the face of inadequate governmental support:

Remember, that the Scandinavian Museum, in Denmark, was begun with seven pieces. You, as a private man, are where we, as a Committee, were after ten years' working. Go on and prosper (Thomsen of Copenhagen, London 18th May, 1843 in Roach Smith 1859, appendix)

He later published *Illustrations of Roman London* (1859) in which he aimed to 'convey a notion of Roman London from the antiquities themselves' (1859, iii); this volume attracted the largest number of subscribers (344), including well-known figures such as Charles

Dickens (see table 1), and was well received (see for example *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art*, 7 Jan. 1890, 9, 219; Hingley 2008, 279; see Bann 1984 and Zimmerman 2008 for a discussion of the impact of archaeology and the past on literature).

INSERT LINKS

[Smith, C.R. 1854. *Catalogue of the Museum of London Antiquities. Collected by and the Property of Charles Roach Smith*. London: Printed for the subscribers only and not published. <https://archive.org/details/catalogueofmuseu00smit>

Smith, C.R. 1859. *Illustrations of Roman London*. London: Printed for the subscribers and not published. <https://archive.org/details/illustrationsofr00smitrich>]

Roach Smith passionately believed that British discoveries were of national significance and should be 'rendered accessible to all' (1852, 2; see also Dunkin 1845, 29). The situation in Britain is seen as contrasting starkly with that in France, Prussia, Austria and Denmark (1852, 3)

The day is not yet arrived when an enlightened English Ministry, following in the wake of every other European government, shall prove their sense of the value of the institutions of the country, by preserving, instead of neglecting, the monuments which illustrate those institutions (1852, 3).

He played a key role in the establishment of the British Archaeological Association (BAA) in 1843, acting as honorary secretary jointly with Albert Way, to actively promote the study and preservation of national antiquities in response to the perceived apathy of the Society of Antiquaries (Wetherall 1998, 27; see Way 1844, 1-6; Rowley-Conwy 2007, 99-108; on 'radical' connotations of the term 'association' see Parssinen 1973)[INSERT LINK: <http://thebaa.org/about/history-of-the-baa/>]. In his address to the first Congress of the BAA at Canterbury (1844), Smith rails at 'the inconsistency of our own people, who travel to hackneyed antiquities of foreign countries, which do not relate to them, and have been a thousand times transcribed' (Dunkin 1845, 32). While the situation in other countries was not always as enlightened as he suggests (for which see e.g. Effros 2012, 60 and 81-82), he repeatedly, and often aggressively, challenges government and national institutions and their priorities. He is highly critical of superficial patronage of archaeological projects and publications and the misuse of funds; for example, regarding the *Monumenta Historica Britannica* (1848), printed at great expense by the Government but accessible to only a handful of institutions (see 1852 2, x). He is similarly scathing about the membership of councils of 'learned and valuable societies which were not elected from their distinction in the various walks of antiquarian research' (1848, vi; see Hingley 2007, 180-87 on wider criticism of the Society of Antiquaries). The criticism which he and his associates directed at the government and the Trustees of the British Museum, the support which he galvanised in relation to the purchase of his collection for the nation, and the response of the Museum are collated in the appendix to *Collectanea Antiqua* IV (1857).

Smith also highlights the poor levels of expertise and decisions taken by national institutions with regard to other collections; for example, the British Museum's refusal to purchase the Faussett Collection of Anglo-Saxon grave goods (Faussett 1856; White 1988, 118-120; Rhodes 1990) [INSERT LINKS:

<http://www.liverpoolmuseums.org.uk/wml/collections/antiquities/anglo-saxon.aspx>;

<http://inventorium.arch.ox.ac.uk/inventorium.php>]:

The Trustees refused to purchase. It was in vain that individuals, and Societies qualified to judge, represented the national importance of such a unique collection; the Trustees were not to be persuaded ... Why not, it is impossible to understand; for they were incompetent to judge rationally for themselves. (1883, 68)

He describes the BAA excursion to Heppington as the first step in raising general interest in the collection (1883, 10, 68; Gibson 1988, 10; Dunkin 1845, 187); *Inventorium Sepulchrale* (the Faussett archive) was rapidly compiled and edited by him at the expense of Mayer, and remains an essential work on the Anglo-Saxon period (Roach Smith 1883, 68-9; White 1988, 120):

Mr Mayer selected me as Editor, and Mr. Fairholt as draughtsman and engraver. No expense was spared, as the work will shew; and when I and my friends advised Three Guineas as the price per copy to Subscribers, Mr. Mayer would only allow Two Guineas to be charged. To me he presented Two Hundred Guineas. Had I made a charge it would not have been more than a quarter of that sum. (1883, 69)

The Collection, which comprises some of the finest Kentish cemetery material from approximately 750 Anglo-Saxon burials, excavated by Brian Faussett between 1760-63, was purchased by Mayer and presented to the city of Liverpool (MacGregor 1998, 132). Smith's expertise was highly valued and placed him on semi-professional footing as an archaeologist; a payment of 200 guineas (£210) was a considerable sum of money at the time given that an annual income of £150 would have supported a modest middle-class lifestyle with one servant (Elliot 2001; see also Effros 2012, 189-200).

Smith's profession, and his frequently confrontational stance, meant that he was viewed with suspicion in the 1830s and 1840s by some in 'traditional' circles, evident from events surrounding his election as a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London: 'There was an enemy; and he had written a letter which Sir Henry Ellis the acting secretary deemed worth consideration. The writer had stated, not that I was not a fit and proper person to be elected; but that I was in business!' (1883, 116; Hingley 2007, 174-8). However, he was subsequently elected in 1836 with one of the largest majorities recorded in a ballot, and he served on its Council 1840-45 and 1849-51. The fact that he and the other founders of the BAA were 'tradesmen' was probably a major factor in the rift that developed after the Canterbury Congress (1844) and resulted in the formation of the Archaeological Institute (AI), with Albert Way serving as honorary secretary. Smith reports in a letter to M. A. Lower (15 Aug. 1845) that Robert Willis and others were 'poisoning the minds of the clergy and citizens against us by saying we were radicals, low people, upstarts and plebians' (quoted in

Rhodes 1992, vol. 1, 195). The AI was reported as having a more aristocratic membership; its congresses were certainly elaborately staged with Way playing a key role in cultivating and celebrating its aristocratic membership (see *Oxford Chronicle*, 16 Aug. 1845; Smith 1883, 210; Wetherall 1998, 34; Briggs 2009, 212-15; Ebbatson 1994a & b; Buchanan 2013, 167-68).

Smith was nevertheless very successful in establishing a national and international reputation as an archaeologist, and in building social and intellectual networks which increasingly included individuals from a range of backgrounds. By the mid-1850s his status as a recognised scholar is reflected, and was also undoubtedly further enhanced, through his contributions to Dr Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography* (1857), the last in a series of classical dictionaries published by John Murray)[INSERT LINK: https://hdl.handle.net/2027/yul.12210445_002_00?urlappend=%3Bseq=11], where he is listed as a contributor alongside eminent academics, including George Bowen (Brasenose College, Oxford); George Williams (King's College, Cambridge) and William Smith (the editor), who was Classical Examiner in the University of London (see advertisement in *Athenaeum*, 16 May 1857, 1542, 617). That he came to be viewed as an 'expert' is also clear from the case of the Shadwell forgeries (Smith 1861, 252-60; Jones et al 1990, 187-8)[INSERT LINK:

http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=41034&partId=1&searchText=statuette&page=15], where he was called as an expert witness in the trial of Henry Cumming. In 1858 Cumming had suggested that some allegedly medieval lead objects, 'discovered' by William (Billy) Smith and Charles (Charley) Eaton, at Shadwell during the construction of a new dock, were fakes; Smith gave evidence in support of the 'genuineness of the finds'. While these objects were subsequently confirmed as forgeries, the respect in which his judgement was held is clear.

Smith's projects and publications were instrumental in establishing his reputation and he assiduously cultivated networks of support which underpinned the development of the discipline. These networks and projects were themselves important contexts for wider social and intellectual change in the mid-nineteenth century which contributed to dramatic improvements in access to education and culture, greater recognition and support for British archaeology, increased social and intellectual opportunities for the professional classes, and greater recognition for the contributions of women. As noted by Evans (2007, 271) a key area requiring further investigation is the 'group basis' of archaeology as a scientific discipline.

3. Charles Roach Smith's publications

A survey of books published on archaeology in the first half of the nineteenth century shows that by the middle of the nineteenth century a small number of publishers, including Murray, Bohn, Pickering and Longmans, was responsible for producing many of the best-

known volumes on archaeology in this period [INSERT LINK: <http://intarch.ac.uk/journal/issue35/1/3.html>]. Well-known books on continental, and particularly world archaeology, appear in this period, notably in the 1840s and '50s. The quantity of books on British archaeology in this period is nevertheless impressive, and is unsurprising given the flowering of local archaeological and antiquarian societies in this period and the importance of archaeological pursuits as a marker of social and intellectual status (Levine 1986; Hoselitz 2007; Sweet 1997; see Hingley 2007 for discussion of the content of *Archaeologia*). Many of these were produced independently through subscription, using local printers (see Sweet 1997 for a comprehensive study of urban histories in the eighteenth century). Smith is notably prolific and the majority of his works were published for subscribers only. While he achieved a considerable degree of success in the production and distribution of his volumes, like the majority of individuals working on the archaeology of Britain, he did not have the support of a commercially oriented publisher. This was due in part due to his own desire for editorial control, but undoubtedly also due to the increasing preference of leading publishers, such as John Murray, for 'exotic' subjects that would appeal to the widest possible audience (Scott 2013b). The challenges facing Smith in this respect are articulated in a review of *Illustrations*

The careful and laborious compilation before us, illustrated with the best appliances of art and at very considerable expense, has been enabled to see the light by subscription; for Mr Roach Smith has learnt by painful experience how limited is the interest in the subject it refers to, and how little chance there would be of adequate remuneration for the mere costs of publication by the ordinary method of sale (*Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art*, Jan 7, 1860, 9, 219)

While the priorities of commercial publishers gave Smith little choice but to publish through subscription, he was also unimpressed with the skills and motivations of publishers (Scott 2013b). He is similarly scathing about the selection policies for antiquarian journals:

Not unfrequently it happened that a council was composed of members interested in only one subject, who would be tempted to undervalue the labours of their colleagues who worked in a different field (1848, vi).

And also regarding the circulation of these volumes: 'The *Archaeologia* circulates but little beyond the very confined range of the Society of Antiquaries; and, on the continent, it is almost unknown' (1854, viii). He is horrified at the lack of respect shown through the sale of volumes for pennies and the discovery by a friend of forty back issues of *Archaeologia* at a grocery store for eighteen pence a volume (1854, vii-viii).

Smith nevertheless contributed a significant number of articles and letters to *Archaeologia* in the decade 1840-49 (49 articles and letters), which undoubtedly helped to establish his reputation, but his contributions declined steeply thereafter (11 in the period 1850-59 and 2 in 1860-69). He also regularly contributed to many other local and national journals (Rhodes 1992; 2004), including the journal of the British Archaeological Association and the *Numismatic Chronicle*, and 'Antiquarian Notes' in the *Gentleman's Magazine* (1865-68).

Having become disillusioned with the squabbling in the BAA, he resigned his Secretaryship in 1849 and resigned from all subscribing societies in 1852 (Rhodes 2004; Briggs 2009, 226). From the 1850s he increasingly focused his efforts on his own publications (INSERT LINK: <http://intarch.ac.uk/journal/issue35/1/4-2.html>).

From the 1840s until his death in 1890, Smith produced volumes on British archaeology and antiquities, but also on sites and antiquities in France and Germany, and these include illustrations of sites and antiquities, many of which were drawn by the talented artist Frederick W. Fairholt (1883, 218-26; ODNB*). They represent some of the finest scholarship on Roman Britain in the mid-nineteenth century. He took care to record meticulously all forms of evidence (Rhodes 1992a & b; 2004; Hobley 1975; Henig 1995, 186) and was ahead of his time in many respects; for example, drawing comparisons between archaeology and natural sciences including geology (1852, 108; 1868, 1); links which many of his contemporaries eschewed (Rowley-Conwy 2007, 113-20). For example, he recognises the potential of archaeozoological and botanical data to provide insights into the nature of daily life in past times (Sweet 2015; Zimmerman 2008; Hingley 2008, 237 on the growing interest in daily life):

it will be admitted to be of general interest, and worthy of further inquiry and research, as shewing the sorts of food commonly used, the mode of life, and character of the people. With a view to engage, on future occasions, the cooperation of naturalists, and to direct notice to a collateral branch of archaeology, as connected with a sister science, as well as for the sake of immediate comparison (1850, 105).

The prefaces and appendices to Smith's volumes reveal that he was writing for both a British and an international community working to establish archaeology as a scientific discipline in the face of governmental and institutional apathy; as highlighted by Genette (1997, 221), a key function of the preface 'is to provide the author's interpretation of the text or, if you prefer, his statement of intent...'. Smith consistently takes advantage of these opportunities to detail the shortcomings of the government and the Society of Antiquaries with respect to national antiquities and to record and praise the contributions of key supporters, despite his criticism of such formalities in archaeological volumes (1854, 213; 1852, appendix; Effros 2012, 86). The paratextual devices in Smith's volumes also include lists of affiliations to societies both in Britain and Europe, emphasising the nature and extent of his intellectual connections, and especially the honours accorded him by European learned societies

Honorary Member of the Society of Antiquaries of France, Denmark, Spain, Normandy, Picardy, the West of France, the Morini, Scotland, Newcastle upon Tyne, the Society of Emulation of Abbeville, the Numismatic Society of London, the Archaeological Societies of Chester, Cheshire and Lancashire, Bury and West Suffolk, Scarborough, Mayence, Wiesbaden, and Sinsheim (1852, title page)

3.1 *Collectanea Antiqua* (7 vols., 1848-80)

With a few exceptions (see for e.g. Scott 2013a & 2014 on the work of Lysons), archaeological discoveries in Britain in the first half of the nineteenth century were published with little regard to the importance of the physical and social contexts of sites and objects. Smith's international comparative studies, published in his *Collectanea Antiqua* (7 vols, 1843-80), attracted international attention. He began this publication in 1848 as a 'labour of love' (1848, v) to encourage and promote appreciation of national monuments, antiquities and archaeology:

It must ever be borne in mind, that the science which these collections promote is one of the highest consideration, that it might be made of great public utility, and without which every system of education must be incomplete. (1848, vii)

The first part of the first volume included sketches made by Smith of 'rare objects of ancient art in the Museum of Bologna' (1883, 150), and of British and Saxon coins from Sussex and Kent. He records that he was persuaded to continue in the enterprise, although the volumes were published only sporadically due to the foundation of the BAA and its journal. They comprised antiquarian researches 'instituted entirely by individual enterprise, and accomplished at the cost of the parties who originated and conducted them' (1852a, viii).

A key concern of his was the inclusion of illustrations:

Truth and fidelity to the objects portrayed (sic) are indispensable; but these requisites may be ensured by a little care and attention; and it is better that engravings be given, even rudely, and in the slightest outline, if supplied liberally, than that they should be limited in number for the sake of elaborate execution. (1848, vii)

Smith's goals in this respect were achieved in part through close collaboration with Fairholt, who was in great demand as an illustrator for antiquarian publications including those of the Society of Antiquaries, the British Archaeological Association and the Numismatic Society (Smith 1883, 218-26; Selborne 2004).

The first two volumes were published with the support of a limited number of subscribers (see table 1) and with additional contributions in the form of woodcuts and plates from friends (1848, v). He explains that he thought it unlikely that he would be able to continue to publish *Collectanea* (after the publication of volume II) as a result of 'the expenses attending printing'. He then 'resolved to modify my former plan; and to guard against heavy pecuniary losses, restricted the issue of *Collectanea* to subscribers' (1854b, v). Smith was initially criticised for his decision to publish independently (*Athenaeum*, 10 July 1852, 1289, 745), but he came to achieve significant national and international recognition for his efforts (see for e.g. review of *Collectanea Antiqua* III in *The Literary Gazette*, 25 Apr. 1857, 2101, 396). In compiling these volumes, he also established important social and intellectual connections: 'It either introduced me to, or brought me into closer connection with many intellectual, some eminent, persons both in this country and France' (1883, 150). These connections were to prove invaluable for other publishing ventures.

3.2 The Antiquities of Richborough, Reculver and Lymne in Kent (1850) & Excavations at Pevensey (1858)

Smith was involved with high-profile excavations at well-known Roman sites; his interest in the remains at Richborough and Reculver developed at an early stage in his archaeological career (1883, 1). The excavations of the Roman forts at Lymne and Pevensey (1850-2), which he conducted with Mark Anthony Lower (Smith 1883, 213) and James Elliott (Smith 1883, 205), were the first excavations in Britain to be funded through public subscription and were published promptly; he had unsuccessfully applied to the government for a grant to support the excavations (1852, vi; 1886, vi; see Thornton 2013, 12-13 on subscription funding in this period). The excavations at Pevensey were funded by subscribers from across the country (table 1), and attracted considerable popular interest. Smith was presented with a free pass from the London and South East Railway Company to facilitate his research since they recognised that the 'excavations attracted hundreds weekly; and that it was to their interest to encourage them' (1858, ii). This is an excellent example of the growth of archaeological tourism in this period, and the publicity gained was undoubtedly of huge benefit to Smith's campaigns and projects.

3.3 Catalogue of the Museum of London Antiquities (1854) and Illustrations of Roman London (1859)

As is clear from table 1, Smith's volumes on the archaeology of Roman London attracted the greatest number of subscribers, and it is this work for which he is best known today (Henig and Coombes 2013; Smith 2016). In his *Catalogue* he apologises for his 'scanty descriptions' of many objects in his collection; despite his protestations, however, the nature and extent of his scholarship is evident; in particular, his knowledge of British and European collections and primary and secondary sources. A key concern of his was to challenge the notion that Romano-British art and antiquities were inferior to those found elsewhere, a view voiced strongly in a review of the *Catalogue* in *The Athenaeum*: 'Such figures as we see in the woodcuts on pages 7, 8, 9, seem to prove little in themselves, and to possess not the slightest recommendation as works of Ancient Art (Mar. 24, 1855, 1430, 345).

While Smith does not question the superiority of 'classical' art, stating that 'Nothing can exceed the beauty of form and brilliancy of colour of the painted vases from the tombs of Greece and Etruria ...', he argues that 'The Roman fictile vases are not less historically and artistically interesting; while they possess an additional charm in being connected with, or comprised among, the antiquities of our own country' (1859, 78-79). The traditional boundary between archaeology and art is challenged by him; a development which was central to curatorial debates in this period (Whitehead 2009, 74):

The Athenaeum insinuated that all is comprised in architecture! This is, as it were, studying the drapery and the dress and forgetting the man; or minutely criticising the form and character of masonry and buildings, and neglecting the people these buildings were erected to shelter' (1883, 12)

He also asserts the importance of preserving the art of the Roman provinces:

The statue of Apollo, of heroic size, discovered at Lillibonne, and now in the possession of the Messrs Woodburn, of St Martin's Lane, is the finest and most perfect example of northern provincial art in this country, and should be secured for the national collection, or rather for that of France, to which it most properly belongs (1854a, 7).

While a small number of earlier antiquarians had shown similar concerns (Scott 2013a; 2014; see also Smith 1861, vii), this level of interest in preservation and conservation was unusual in this period, and was certainly not a government priority (see for example *Punch*, Sat. 15 June 1861, 241, ridiculing the involvement of police in tracking stolen antiquities).

The popularity of the *Catalogue* and *Illustrations* was undoubtedly due in part to the importance of his 'extensive, varied and valuable collection' as an 'intellectual recreation of the season'; it is repeatedly recommended in London and regional newspapers (e.g. *Morning Advertiser*, 25 Dec. 1845; *West Kent Guardian*, 23 Dec. 1844; *Morning Advertiser*, 25 Dec. 1841; *Morning Advertiser*, 26 Dec. 1843; Smith 1886, 1; see Thornton 2015 on archaeology and the London 'season')(INSERT FIGURE 2). There was growing interest in everyday life in the ancient world, and Smith's collection was particularly notable in this respect, providing 'an idea of its prosperity and extent more than fifteen hundred years ago, and of the various changes and conditions of art and civilisation' (*Illustrated London News*, 8 Nov. 1856: 479). The value of his work is championed in *Bentley's Miscellany*: 'No educated person's library ought to be without a copy of a work of so much importance to the past history and condition of this country, and especially of its chief city' (Jan. 1886, 59, 364). His publications on the antiquities of London became key sources of reference until well into the twentieth century, with individual objects regularly attracting popular attention (see for e.g. *Illustrated London News*, 19 Dec. 1863: 614). *Illustrations* has recently been reissued by Cambridge University Press (2015) as it remains 'an invaluable record of finds arising from the Victorian redevelopment of London' [INSERT LINK: <https://cambridgelibrarycollection.wordpress.com/2015/02/23/illustrations-of-roman-london/>].

With respect to his concern for detailed recording, his recognition of the importance of all forms of archaeological evidence, and his understanding of the value of situating discoveries within their contexts, both physical and social, Smith was at the forefront of archaeological scholarship (Brabrook 1907; Rhodes 1992). While his aggressive stance was sometimes detrimental to his cause, particularly in the 1830s and 1840s, he nevertheless tirelessly championed British archaeology and archaeologists, galvanised support for publications, museums and excavations, and became a highly respected and influential archaeologist. The final part of this paper will examine the marketing and distribution of his volumes, and will

further investigate the nature and extent of his social and intellectual networks through an analysis of his subscribers.

4. Marketing and distribution

While his volumes were marketed in the catalogues of publishers [INSERT LINK: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/aeu.ark:/13960/t48p6vz9s>], they were also promoted extensively through other channels. They were advertised in newspapers and journals throughout the country (for example, *Leicester Chronicle: or, Commercial and Agricultural Advertiser* [Leicester, England], 27 May 1854: [1]). Works were advertised in advance of publication (for example *Collectanea* Parts I, II, in Notices of New Works, 18 Nov. 1843, *West Kent Guardian*). Personal connections were important in this respect; for example, he established a close relationship with William Hargrove (proprietor of the *York Herald*) (table 1), who reported on and advertised his work: ‘Mr William Hargrove appears to have been one of my earliest friends in York’ (INSERT FIGURE 3). He praises Hargrove’s use of the *Herald* for asserting the importance of the antiquities of York (1886, 58-9). As a subscriber to Smith’s volumes Hargrove is listed as ‘Proprietor of York Herald’ and ‘Author of The History of York’ (table 1), showing the importance of the lists for self-promotion. James Thompson was proprietor of the *Leicester Chronicle*, later the *Leicester Daily Mercury*, which also regularly publicised and championed Smith’s publications and projects; Thompson was a leading authority on the history of Leicester and a founder member of the Leicester Architectural and Archaeological Society (Thompson 1876) [INSERT LINK: <https://archive.org/details/historyleiceste01thomgoog>].

Having established his reputation through the 1850s and 1860s, Smith became a regular contributor to the *Gentleman’s Magazine*, editing the ‘Antiquarian notes’ (1865-68), which allowed him to promote his causes to a wider audience. He was also supported by friends (the majority of whom subscribed to his volumes) who edited or wrote for other popular journals; they took full advantage of these opportunities to support and promote each other’s work; for example, Llewellynn Jewitt (Smith 1886, 80-83; ODNB) was editor, and Thomas Bateman (ODNB) and Eliza Meteyard (Smith 1886, 106-11; ODNB) were both regular contributors to *The Reliquary* (Bede 1872-73, 141-47); Samuel Carter Hall (ODNB) was editor of the *New Monthly Magazine* and the *Art Journal*; George Godwin was editor of *The Builder* (Smith 1886, 93-97); William Ainsworth (Smith 1886, 84-86; ODNB) was associated with *Ainsworth’s Magazine*, *Bentley’s Miscellany* and *New Monthly*; Charles Wentworth Dilke (ODNB) was editor of the *London Magazine* and proprietor of *The Athenaeum*; John Bruce (ODNB) was an editor of *The Gentleman’s Magazine*; William J. Thoms (ODNB) founded *Notes and Queries*; John Mitchell Kemble (ODNB; Williams 2006) edited the *British and Foreign Review* (1835-44) and *Fraser’s Magazine*; John Timbs (ODNB) was sub-editor of *Illustrated London News*; William Blackwood & Sons published some of

the most eminent writers of the day, including Eliot, Oliphant and Trollope and published *Blackwood's Magazine* from 1879. Smith acknowledges the importance of many of these periodicals in promoting his causes. For example, he expresses gratitude to George Godwin of *The Builder*:

‘for the high-minded and equitable manner in which its columns were open to my pen, at a critical time when it was necessary for the interests of truth that I should speak out’ (1886, 94).

The instrumental role which the periodical press played in the dissemination of archaeological knowledge, and in establishing or challenging professional reputations, merits further study (see Dawson et.al. 2015 on the importance of popular journals in the science and information revolution of the nineteenth century).

Smith often refers to forthcoming volumes, giving details of subscription costs. He took on much of the responsibility for the administration (for example, see a flyer in the back of Vol. III of his *Retrospections* in the University of Leicester Library, with a note of thanks to the purchaser (Scott 2013b). Further insights into the production and funding of his volumes can be found in a notice found in *Collectanea* III:

The first part of Volume III, of the *Collectanea Antiqua*, is now ready and will be forwarded in any way the Subscribers may direct. The safest and best way is through the Booksellers, in which case it is necessary to be provided with the names of those in the country and their town agents also.

The volume will be completed before Christmas, in three or four deliveries as circumstances may determine.

The author trusts that the proposed mode of payment (either in advance or on receipt of the first part) will be found agreeable to the Subscribers, and he begs that Post Office orders be made payable to him (in the name of Charles Smith, in full) at the chief office, St Martin's Le Grand².

Subscription, 24s. The volume for 1853. (1854, note in preface)

Financial concerns are clearly a major concern (see also address to BAA in Dunkin 1845, 27 regarding the burden of collecting subscriptions): ‘In order to carry on effectively a work involving a considerable outlay, it is suggested that payment, as heretofore, be made either in advance, or on the receipt of the first part’ (1854, note in preface; see also 1861, notice to subscribers 245).

His efforts to record and publish British archaeology were very successful despite the challenges that he faced. He was supported by an extensive and generous network of supporters both in Britain and further afield (899 for the 11 volumes in TABLE 1), which merits further study. Subscribers were not only an important source of financial support; subscription lists also lent status to both the author and subscriber (Genette 2001; Wallis

² The General Post Office

1974; Robinson and Wallis 1975). The importance of this relationship within Smith's circle is articulated in a letter from Sir William Boyd to Thomas Pettigrew

I shall consider it a favour if you will permit me to put your name into my list of subscribers, with that of your friend Mr Hudson Gurney. I do not pretend to be disinterested in this, as I am aware that the respect which your name is regarded as that of a profound classical scholar, is likely to be of much advantage to my work (Pettigrew Letters, Box 2, folder 65; Boyd to Pettigrew, July 29th, 18?).

It will be shown that Smith's volumes provided an important opportunity for subscribers to highlight and consolidate their own key achievements, affiliations and connections.

5. Networks of support

Robinson and Wallis show that subscription lists provide an 'unmatched source to the interests and tastes of a large section of the population in the last three centuries' (1975, xvi) arguing that 'no biography of any individual will be complete unless it pays attention to his subscriptions' (Wallis 1974, 270). The potential of subscription lists has been demonstrated through a wide range of scholarship in many disciplines (e.g. Sweet 1997; Holmes 2009). Subscriptions to archaeological societies and journals have provided important insights regarding the social and professional background and affiliations of subscribers, but there is considerable potential for further study (e.g. Ebbatson 1994a & b; Wetherall 1998; Hingley 2007). The majority of volumes on archaeology in the nineteenth century were published through subscription and there is an immense body of data available, much of which is now easily accessible due to digitisation.

Subscription publishing was an important means of sharing the financial risk associated with publishing ventures, but it was first essential for the author to convince potential subscribers of the value of the work. Proposals might be circulated through advertisements in newspapers, periodicals or books, and through booksellers and personal connections (Sweet 1997, 30). As noted above, the lists themselves provided an important opportunity for self-promotion, or 'special puffs' such as titles, numbers of copies, qualifications and honours (Wallis 1974, 257). Lists in this period usually followed a standard format and included name, title, qualifications and address/s. They might also include institutional affiliations and memberships, honours and profession.

The information in table 1 has been entered as recorded in the list of subscribers to eleven of Smith's volumes on the archaeology of Britain, with the addition of information regarding counties and regions. Historic counties have been used with the exception of London addresses, where it was not always possible to identify postal districts [INSERT LINK: <http://postal-counties.com/>]. For the purpose of highlighting general trends the following rules have been applied: Some subscribers list both county and London addresses; here the county address has been taken as the primary address. Where subscribers record different

addresses in different volumes, the primary address is taken as that listed first chronologically and/or the most frequently listed. Titles and qualifications are recorded as listed (e.g. with French titles sometimes anglicised), with the exception of Esquire which is used by the majority of subscribers and was widely assumed in this period; although it is important to bear in mind that this could be seen as a claim not to be in 'trade' (*The Penny Cyclopaedia* 1837, IX, 13). Additional columns have been added to provide further insights (e.g. university and museum posts, and whether the individual has an entry in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (ODNB)). While the tables generated are somewhat oversimplified, they nevertheless provide an overview of Smith's networks, including regional support, institutional subscribers, titles and qualifications (as listed), and in some cases professional background; they also provide important insights into which of these aspects were deemed most worthy of promotion.

Table 1 lists 899 subscribers for the 11 volumes. The volumes attracting the highest number of subscribers are *Illustrations of Roman London* (344) and *Catalogue of the Museum of London Antiquities* (342). *The Antiquities of Richborough* is in third place with 297 subscribers (see table 2). *Collectanea* was not limited to subscribers until volume III, when the numbers increased to 200 or more until volume VII (148). There were 46 female subscribers (5% of total subscribers). 96 (approximately 10%) of the subscribers identify themselves as clergy (table 3). This figure is double that of the BAA, but is significantly less than the 274 (28%) of the AI in 1849 (see Wetherall 1998, 34 for BAA and AI; see Hingley 2007, 176 for membership of the Society of Antiquaries by social categories).

The listing of memberships and affiliations was a common method of asserting the social and intellectual credibility and connections of both authors and subscribers in this period, and, as noted by Effros, served to document and celebrate the scholarly achievements and accolades of individuals and groups (Effros 2012, 85). It is evident here that subscribers valued their membership of longstanding institutions: 202 (22.5%) subscribers to Smith's volumes recorded their Fellowship of the Society of Antiquaries, a considerably higher number than amongst the BAA (76 (17%) in 1849/50) or the Archaeological Institute (83 (8%) in 1849)(table 4)(see Wetherall 1998, 33-4 for BAA and AI figures). 46 (5%) list Fellowship of the Royal Society and 24 (2.6%) of the Royal Geographical Society)(table 4). Membership of such institutions clearly remained an important marker of social and intellectual standing despite widespread criticism of the Society of Antiquaries amongst Smith's close circle. The perceived importance of Smith's work to those from a broad social and intellectual spectrum is evident. While usually more closely linked with the BAA, rather than the 'more aristocratic' AI (Briggs 2009, 226; see Ebbatson 1994, 1999 on the AI), in many ways he appears to have bridged the divide. Interestingly, very few subscribers record their membership of either the BAA or the AI (table 6).

Other memberships listed can be seen in table 5, which include membership or fellowship of national and foreign archaeological and/or scientific societies, such as the Linnean Society

and the Numismatic Society. As at the turn of the century, many of those with interests in archaeology were polymathic; indeed, some of Smith's friends and associates, such as Dawson Turner (*The Athenaeum*, 17 July 1858, 1603, 82; Smith 1868, 314-19; ODNB) and Frederick Perkins (ODNB), had been active within Joseph Banks' social and intellectual circle, which played a formative role in the development of archaeology in the early part of the nineteenth century (Scott 2013a & 2014).

French societies listed include the Imperial Society of Emulation of Abbeville, the Society of Antiquaries of the Morini, Saint-Omer, the Society of Antiquaries of Normandy, the Société des Antiquaires (*sic*) de l'Ouest and the Institute of France (table 7). The French societies were admired by Smith and his associates (1851, 3; Effros 2012, 59-87), who were critical of the superficiality of the Society of Antiquaries' continental links. Indeed, some English subscribers list only their membership of French societies; for example, Thomas Wright and Alfred Dunkin, both key figures in the BAA.

It is notable that several of Smith's most generous supporters list membership of the Numismatic Society amongst their associations (e.g. Corner, Mayer, Wright, Evans)(tables 8 and 13); a symbolic statement of affiliation and 'professional' links (see Effros 2012, 70 on situation in France). Smith and his close associates, most notably Akerman and Evans, believed that numismatics was not taken seriously enough by the Society of Antiquaries and were founder members of the Numismatic Society (Smith 1878-80, 256)[INSERT LINK: <http://numismatics.org.uk/about-the-society/history-of-the-society/part-1/>]. Smith asserts that coins combine 'the claims of sculpture and painting, equally rich as gems of art, and as historical pictures, showing, within the smallest compass, the fullest view of ancient times we possess' (1850/2, 116). He was awarded the first medal of the London Numismatic Society in 1883, for his work on Romano-British coins (*Illustrated London News*, 30 Aug. 1890; see Rhodes 1991 on Smith's pioneering work on the Roman coinage from London Bridge). That numismatics was increasingly seen as a distinct field of study can be seen in J. R. Smith's publishing catalogue, included at the back of Akerman's (1844) volume [INSERT LINK: <https://archive.org/details/coinsofromansre00aker>], where volumes on History, Archaeology and Numismatics are listed separately (see Schlanger 2011 on Evans and the emergence of numismatics).

Also significant is the number of overseas subscribers listing official archaeological positions (tables 9 and 18); for example, Professor and Royal Inspector of the Ancient National Monuments of Copenhagen (Worsaae), Inspecteur des Monuments Historiques de la Seine-Inférieure (Cochet), Homme de Lettres, Officier de la Légion d'Honneur (Belloquet) and Director of the Imperial and Royal Ambras Museum of Antiquities (Arneth). This evidence of international recognition from eminent 'professional' archaeologists was undoubtedly key in establishing and cementing Smith's reputation as an expert, and provided a valuable opportunity for them to engage with a wider British audience (see also separate lists of foreign correspondents in the lists of subscribers). Access to comparative material was an

increasing concern of British and continental archaeologists: 'In France the abbé Cochet has set an example to his countrymen by the assistance he has gained from our publications' (Smith 1861, v-vi).

The number of female subscribers to Smith's volumes is small but very significant since during this period female membership of societies was rare (Anna Gurney became the first female member of the BAA in 1845)(Hoare 1857, 187-9; Smith 1998, 37-69; ODNB)(table 10); these listings presented an important and rare opportunity for inclusion and self-promotion (see Hingley 2007 on class and gender in the Society of Antiquaries; see Effros 2012, 69 for situation in France). A significant number of women subscribed independently of their husbands: for example, Mr and Mrs Dawson Turner and their daughter are listed separately as subscribers to *Illustrations of Roman London* (Fraser 2004) (table 1); his wife and daughters provided illustrations and other forms of support for Turner's publications and projects (Smith 1883, 236, 241). His library of more than 8,000 volumes is described as containing 'copies of the best antiquarian and topographical works in English literature...many of the works being large-paper copies. The volumes were, moreover, enriched by drawings and etchings by the late Mrs Dawson Turner and the Misses Turner' (*The Athenaeum*, Jul 17, 1858, 1603, 82).

Amongst Smith's female supporters are notable writers and scholars. Anna Gurney (1795-1857), was a renowned scholar of Old English and the half-sister of Hudson Gurney (*Gentleman's Magazine*, Sep 1857, 342; *Literary Gazette*, 4 July 1857, 2111, 342; ODNB), who was very active in archaeological circles. In addition to her scholarly pursuits she was a progressive educator and was well known for her many and varied philanthropic activities; more than 2,000 people attended her funeral [INSERT LINK: <http://norfolkmuseumscollections.org/collections/objects/object-2382054964.html/#!/q=anna%2Bgurney>).

Eliza Meteyard (1816-79), a close friend of Smith's, was a prolific writer of novels, a contributor to many periodicals, including *The Reliquary*, and an advocate of women's rights (*The Academy*, 12 Apr. 1879, 362, 325; Smith 1886, 106-12; ODNB; see Beetham 2015, 206-20 on women and periodical writing); she was an active member of the radical Whittington Club, founded by Douglas Jerrold, which admitted women (Kent 1974, 36-7). She was also a noted expert on the life of Josiah Wedgwood (1865). She was interested in archaeology, and published *Hallowed Spots of Ancient London* in 1862; a guide to historical sites 'Presenting a vast number of curious facts relating to its churches and chapels, its halls and streets, its prisons and houses, as also the lives who hallowed them' (1862, vii; for reviews see *Eclectic Review*, Apr. 1862, 212, 348 and *Gentleman's Magazine*, Mar. 1862, 212, 348). The volume is dedicated to Smith, who was a key supporter of hers

To Charles Roach Smith Esq. FSA. Author of 'Illustrations of Roman London', 'The Antiquities of Richborough, Reculver and Lymne' etc etc etc. In testimony of lengthened friendship, as well as literary obligation, this book is inscribed by his most sincere friend, Eliza Meteyard (1862).

In return for his support, she helped to publicise Smith's works:

In the little book I have been finishing, I have taken leave to mention you and the *Inventorium Sepulchrale*. It is but a mention; still, as thousands of the book will be circulated, it may make your labours known, and next month when I sit down quietly to my antiquarian work, you, and what you have done so well for the Faussett MSS, shall have my first care (letter to Charles Roach Smith, June 16 1857, in Smith 1852, 107)

Notable female support for Smith can be also be seen through additional financial contributions to his projects: for example, Mrs John Charles of Chillington House, Maidstone is thanked for her donation of fifty pounds towards the cost of publishing *Collectanea IV* (1857, vii; see *Gentleman's Magazine*, Sept. 1855, 325-26 for obituary of Thomas Charles); Susannah Charles was the sister-in-law of Thomas Charles and an executor for his estate, which included a museum of 'minerals, fossils, Roman and other pottery, coins, curiosities, and articles of vertu' which he wished to be permanently preserved for the people of Maidstone (*Gentleman's Magazine*, Sept. 1855, 326; Smith 1883, 141-146).

That many women were enthusiastically engaged in archaeological pursuits is clear from illustrations and descriptions of activities which took place at the Canterbury Congress of the British Archaeological Association in 1844. One incident involved Mrs Pettigrew (wife of the BAA treasurer Thomas Pettigrew) who, together with a group of women, visited nearby excavations of Anglo-Saxon barrows on Breach Down; the women were offered shelter in a windmill during a heavy rain shower, but declined because 'the loss of a dress, which could easily be replaced, was of trifling consideration compared with the equally interesting and instructive researches in which they were engaged' (Dunkin 1845, 93; Moshenska 2014)[INSERT LINK: <http://trowelblazers.com/elizabeth-pettigrew/>](figures 4 and 5).

INSERT FIGURE 4

INSERT FIGURE 5

Smith acknowledges many women who supported archaeological projects and publications, and in return he provided support and encouragement for their various projects. These 'hidden' contributions have received little attention in histories of archaeology, which have tended to focus on women whose exploits and interests most closely approximate those of men, with an emphasis on exoticism and adventure (for e.g. Classen 1994; Díaz Andreu and Sorensen 1998; Cohen and Sharp Joukowsky 2004 for critique; see also Levine 1987; 1990; Smith 1998; Browman 2013). The value of a more prosopographical approach is clear [INSERT LINK: <https://digventures.com/2015/03/pioneering-women-in-archaeology/>][INSERT LINK: <http://trowelblazers.com/>], and book subscription lists are an under-utilised resource in this respect.

Subscribers were largely based in England (803), but with significant numbers from other regions of the United Kingdom (Scotland 24; Wales 8; Ireland 9); Europe, most notably France (22); Germany (7); Denmark (2) and Switzerland (2), and from further afield: USA (3); Australia (3) and Canada (2)(table 11). Smith had personal connections with a number of the overseas subscribers: for example, his brother-in-law Colonel Joliffe and his nephew William Joliffe (Smith 1883, 99; 102; 126; 1891, 154-57). French subscribers and correspondents include the President of the Academy of Sciences, Arts and Belles Lettres of Caen (Charma), President of the Imperial Society of Emulation of Abbeville (Boucher de Perthes), President of the Société des Antiquaires (*sic*) de l'Ouest (Dupont) and the President of the Society of Antiquaries of the Morini, Saint-Omer (Hermand). Smith visited France on several occasions and regularly corresponded with French archaeologists (see, for example, his obituaries of Monsieur de Caumont (Smith 1874; Schnapp 1996, 280) and the abbé Cochet (Smith 1875; Effros 2012, 153; Smith 1883, 196-296 on visits to France)). He successfully campaigned with the abbé to persuade Napoleon III to save the Roman walls of Dax (1991, 50). He also developed a close relationship with M. Boucher de Perthes at Abbeville (1861, ix; Schnapp 1996, 312-13, 371-73). He describes their relationship in *Retrospections II*:

we were in constant correspondence; and he visited me during the Great Exhibition. Not only did he supply me with his publications, but he sent them to all the Societies with which I was connected, and to my private friends (1886, 138)

Boucher de Perthes's pioneering work establishing connections between flint tools and extinct animals was initially ridiculed, but subsequently verified by Evans and Lyell (see below) amongst others (1861, ix). Smith asserts that 'the triumph of science over prejudice and incredulity will be hailed by all lovers of truth' (1861, ix). Their relationship was mutually beneficial; Smith publicly supported his work at a time when many scholars were resistant to the notion of prehistory, while in return he provided Smith with information, publications and promoted his work to a French audience (Rowley-Conwy 2007).

The two Danish subscribers are Thomsen and Worsaae, the eminent Danish archaeologists. Worsaae visited London in 1846 (*The Academy*, 29 Aug. 1885, 140; Rowley-Conwy 2007, 108; Wilkins 1961) in the midst of squabbling between the Association and the Institute. While Worsaae was generally unimpressed by archaeologists in London, he corresponded regularly with Smith, whose support he acknowledges:

Amongst the many gentlemen to whom I owe my thanks, I must particularly name: Sir H Dryden, Bart. Of Canons Ashby; C. Roach Smith Esq., FSA, London; E. Hawkins Esq, British Museum; J. M. Kemble Esq; Professor Cosmo Innes, Edinburgh; Dr Trail *ibid.*; C. Neaves Esq. *ibid.*; R. Chalmers Esq. of Auldbar Castle; Rev. J.H. Todd, DD, Trinity College, Dublin; Professor C. Graves; and Dr G. Petrie, likewise of Dublin (Worsaae 1852)

The majority of English subscribers (33%) was London-based (292), but a number of counties have significant numbers of supporters: Kent (112); Yorkshire (39); Hampshire (38); Sussex (35); Norfolk (27) and Lancashire (27)(see table 12). 27 subscribers list both London and

county addresses. Those counties with large numbers of subscribers were those that had particularly active archaeological societies, such as London and Middlesex, Yorkshire, Sussex, Newcastle upon Tyne, Norfolk, Lancashire and Cheshire and Kent (see Levine 1986, appendix IV; Hoselitz 2007, 19-22; Wetherall 1998; see also Sweet 1997 on the importance of urban histories for local pride and patriotism). For example, the vice-presidents of the Norfolk and Norwich Archaeological Society (1847) include Sir J. P. Boileau (*Gentleman's Magazine*, May 1869, 2, 746; ODNB), Hudson Gurney (Smith 1868, 319-23; 1883, 242-5; *Gentleman's Magazine*, Jan. 1865, 1, 108-9; ODNB), Daniel Gurney (ODNB) and Dawson Turner (*The Athenaeum*, 17 July 1858, 1603, 82; Smith 1868, 314-19; ODNB), all of whom were generous supporters of Smith's volumes; Smith is listed as an honorary member of the Society (1884, iii). The significant number of subscribers from Hampshire (which encompassed the Isle of Wight) and Kent is unsurprising given Smith's roots and connections. William Henry Rolfe of Kent was one of his closest friends and supporters, and Smith retired to Strood, Kent (Smith 1883, 1-8). These networks of support merit further investigation as they were critical to the dissemination of archaeological knowledge in this period.

Smith's most generous supporters (10 volumes or more), all of whom he acknowledges in his *Retrospections*, were John Collingwood Bruce (Smith 1883, 170); Joseph Clarke (Smith 1883, 8, 12, 153); George Richard Corner (Smith 1868, 324-6); John Evans (Smith 1891, 126-31); James Cove Jones (Smith 1883, 245); Joseph Mayer (Smith 1883, 67-76); Revd Beale Poste (Smith 1886, 15-19); Edward Pretty (Smith 1883, 146-7); William Henry Rolfe (Smith 1883, 1-8)(subscribed to all 11 volumes); John Green Waller (Smith 1886, 20-31); Charles Warne (Smith 1883, 85-87); Humphrey Wickham (Smith 1883, 127); Thomas Wright (Smith 1883, 81-85); and Albert Denison Conyngham (Smith 1883, 162-69)(table 13).

As noted above, a key subscriber and generous supporter of Smith's was Joseph Mayer (*The Reliquary*, Apr. 1886, 26, 226; Smith 1883, 67-76; ODNB). Mayer was born in Newcastle under Lyme, Staffordshire, attended Newcastle under Lyme Grammar School and developed a passion for archaeology and collecting as a child. He became a highly successful jeweller and goldsmith, running his own business from 1844, and became a leading benefactor of education and the arts. While he is perhaps best known for his purchase of the Faussett Collection (White 1988, 121), he was committed to the development of national art and archaeology; for example, he supported many publication projects, such as Wright's *Feudal Manuals of English History* (1872), Meteyard's *Life of Wedgwood* (1865) and Thorpe's *Diplomatorium Anglicum Aevi Saxonici* (1865), and donated his substantial collection of art and antiquities to the city of Liverpool (INSERT LINK: <http://www.liverpoolmuseums.org.uk/wml/collections/antiquities/ivories/related-person-24343-1.aspx>). He is described as a 'true lover of archaeology, and munificent patron of Art and literature' (*The Reliquary*, April 1886, 26, 226). He was similarly generous in celebrating the achievements of his friends through commissioning busts, medallions, paintings and photographs, which were 'liberally distributed by him' (*The Reliquary* 1886, 26, 226); a topic

which merits further study. He met Smith at the Chester conference of the BAA and they developed a close friendship (Smith 1883, 67-76).

In addition to subscriptions, he provided many contributions to Smith's projects, such as £25 towards the cost of *Collectanea* IV (1857, vii), £20 for *Collectanea* V (1861 x) and £10 towards volume VI (1878-1880, vii). He is recorded as providing 'substantial sympathy' and 'substantial pecuniary help' for *Collectanea* III (1854 viii) and VII (1868, vii). As noted above, he also paid 200 guineas to him for his work on the publication on the Faussett Collection. In return, Smith was instrumental in helping Mayer to establish his impressive collections through his British and overseas connections (White 1988, 131); Mayer greatly valued these connections, and the subsequent recognition which he gained. In the subscription lists he records his membership of the Numismatic Society, the Society of Antiquaries of Normandy, the Société des Antiquaires (*sic*) de l'Ouest, and his Fellowship of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, in addition to his Fellowships of the Society of Antiquaries of London and the Royal Society. The association with new and more 'scientific' organisations made an important statement about his connections and ambitions at a time when a background in 'trade' could result in marginalisation within long-established institutions (Hingley, 2007, 174-78; Hoselitz 2007, 71).

Sir John Evans (1823- 1908)(Smith 1891, 126-31; MacGregor 2008a & b) also worked closely with Smith and subscribed to 10 of the 11 volumes [INSERT LINK: <http://johnevens.ashmolean.org/index.html>]. Alongside his exceptional achievements as a leading paper manufacturer, he pursued his archaeological and numismatic interests at every opportunity; he also developed an interest in geology through investigating the water supply for his paper mill. He became a close friend of the geologist Sir Joseph Prestwich (1812-1896), with whom he visited Jacques Boucher de Crèvecœur de Perthes in 1859. He developed an expertise in river gravels and cave deposits, and was instrumental in validating the revolutionary discoveries of the French archaeologist. He subsequently played a key role in national institutions, including the Society of Antiquaries of London, the Royal Society, and the Numismatic Society, and was a fellow of the Geological Society from 1857; he was awarded the Lyell Medal for services to geological science in 1880. Perhaps most significant here, he was one of the first men with a background in trade to be elected FRS (1864) (he became Vice-President in 1876). In the lists of subscribers, Evans records his Fellowships of the Royal Society and Society of Antiquaries, his connections with the Numismatic Society (member and Vice-President), as well as his honorary LLD (Dublin), one of many honours which he was awarded (Foote 2004). Evans' recognition of the importance of Smith's work is clear in *The Coins of the Ancient Britons* [*sic*] (1864, 207; 353; 350 15; 245). It is also evident that Smith provided significant support in kind for Evans' projects: 'Mr C. Roach Smith, who not only furnished me with a large number of casts of British coins, and with notes as to the places where they were found, but also presented me with several scarce coins, and aided me in procuring others' (1864); their relationship was mutually advantageous.

Smith's supporters also included those who made a living from archaeological writing (Akerman and Wright), which was rare in this period. Wright's significant investment in Smith's work (10 of the 11 volumes) is notable given his frequently precarious financial situation. He was the son of a bookseller and printer (his father wrote the *History and Antiquities of Ludlow*, 1822) and studied at Trinity College, Cambridge (BA 1834; MA 1837) where he developed an interest in vernacular sources (*Art Journal*, Mar. 1878, 75; *The Reliquary*, Apr. 1878, 18, 255; ODNB). He was a regular contributor to many popular periodicals, and played a lead role in the establishment of a number of archaeological and literary societies. He was elected to the Society of Antiquaries in 1837, supported by a number of eminent medievalists and folklorists, and was an acknowledged expert on French history and antiquities; he was chosen by the Emperor Napoleon to translate into English his *Vie de Jules César* (*Art Journal*, March 1878, 75). He published prolifically, often collaborating with Fairholt, and relied heavily on patronage; Mayer was a key supporter of his. He worked closely with Smith from the 1840s (Smith 1883, 76-85) and together they founded the British Archaeological Association. However, Wright's work was not viewed favourably by many of those who subsequently formed the Archaeological Institute (AI), most notably Albert Way, who was reported as being jealous of Wright and his *Archaeological Album* (*Lloyd's Weekly London Newspaper*, 8 Mar. 1845, 120; Briggs 2009, 213; Ebbatson 1994; 1999)(INSERT LINK: <https://archive.org/details/archaeologicala00fairgoog>). In contrast, Smith was an enthusiastic supporter of his work; for example, providing a glowing review of his *Album* in the *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* (1844, 1, 269-71). Wright, in return, is full of praise for Smith's work:

The best collection of antiquarian materials we possess at present is the *Collectanea Antiqua* by Mr Roach Smith, which, however, is already becoming rare. Many good papers on primeval antiquities, by Mr Roach Smith and others, will also be found in the volumes of the *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, and in the *Archaeological Journal* published by the Archaeological Institute (Wright 1902, ix).

The importance of Smith's support, in the form of knowledge, materials, reviews and access to intellectual and social networks, was of the utmost importance to those attempting to publish their work on British history and archaeology in this period. Many of his most generous supporters were indebted to him for their own publishing ventures; for example, Beale Poste and John Waller were both supported by Smith, as acknowledged in their volumes (Waller and Waller 1864; Smith 1886, 15-19; 20-31).

It has been argued that the BAA was less 'academic' and less 'aristocratic' in its makeup than the AI (Briggs 2009, 217; Wetherall 1998, 34); however, Smith's supporters included academics, museum professionals and members of the aristocracy, and members of both societies. A significant number was university educated (12% list their qualifications)(table 14) and a number held key positions in national museums and institutions (table 9).

Notwithstanding his background in 'trade', his association with individuals whose activities attracted considerable criticism amongst the establishment in the 1840s, most notably Thomas Wright and Thomas Pettigrew, and his frequent challenges to those in positions of authority, Smith cultivated and sustained friendships with influential members of the aristocracy (table 15). Albert Denison, Lord Londesborough (Smith 1883, 162-169), became a close friend and supporter of his projects. Smith records that he 'offered to build me a house that I might be near him at Grimston'. He also offered a cheque for £3,000 for Smith's Museum (see below).

It is clear from the biographies (ODNB) of numerous subscribers that many were Nonconformist, philanthropic, and at the forefront of educational and social reform in this period (table 19). For example, John Kenrick was acknowledged as 'Indisputably the greatest nonconformist scholar of our day' (*The Times*, May 7, 1877). The eminent geologist Sir Henry Thomas de la Beche (Portlock 1856, xxxiv–xxxviii; ODNB) was vehemently opposed to all kinds of aristocratic privilege, while William Henry Blaauw (Campion, C. 1870; ODNB) helped to build links between the Sussex gentry and archaeologists from professional backgrounds, such as Mark Lower. Notable philanthropists included Henry Dodd (ODNB), George Gibson (ODNB), Apsley Pellatt (ODNB) and William Devonshire Saul (ODNB). Smith's networks and projects were therefore important contexts in which social inequalities were challenged, with an increasing emphasis placed on the importance of specialist knowledge over aristocratic privilege. The key role which he and many of his friends and supporters played in social and educational reform is reflected in the fact that 214 (24%) of his subscribers are recorded in ODNB, a 'national record of men and women who have shaped British history and culture' (www.oxforddnb.com).

A number of subscribers held key positions in national institutions (table 9). For example, Edward Hawkins and Augustus Franks, at the British Museum (Caygill and Cherry 1997; ODNB), supported Smith's campaigns and benefitted from his knowledge. Franks played a key role in securing Smith's collection for the British Museum, and Smith acknowledges his generosity in the support of a collection of national antiquities:

As keeper of our National Antiquities, Mr Franks cannot be surpassed in the knowledge requisite; and I may add, in generosity; for like General Pitt Rivers, he cheerfully allows his purse to be taxed when the Government objects to purchase (1891, 184; see also 185-6)

The British Museum, in return, benefited immensely from Smith's undertakings; his collection formed the basis of the Museum's collection of national antiquities (Smith 1857, appendix; Kidd 1977; Potter 1997, 130-32; MacGregor 1998, 134-37; Polm 1997, 212-13).

His volumes attracted subscriptions from 121 institutions, including major national institutions (table 16) such as the British Library, the Museum of Science and Art (South Kensington), university libraries (e.g. Cambridge University), major regional libraries (e.g. Corporation of Liverpool; Corporation of Manchester; Dorset County Museum and Library; Leicester Permanent Library), free libraries (e.g. Cambridge) and book societies (e.g.

Sandwich Book Society). A number of subscribers played a key role in establishing and reforming universities in this period, including the politician James Heywood (Ward 1965, vi; ODNB), who supported women's suffrage and the opening of London degrees to women and worked with Thomas Wright [INSERT LINK: <https://archive.org/details/ancientlawsoffif00heywuoft>], Henry Hallam (Clark 1982; ODNB), who helped to found the University of London, and William Cavendish (Earl of Burlington) (*The Times*, Tue. 22 Dec. 1891; Issue 33514; ODNB), a leading philanthropist and the first chancellor of the University. Free and public libraries flourished in this period, and collections expanded rapidly; James Heywood was a keen supporter of the free public library movement, founding and maintaining the free library in Notting Hill.

Smith's personal connections were critical; for example, Daniel Wilson was a notable anthropologist and university administrator (Trigger 1992; Ash and Hulse 1999; ODNB) who moved from Edinburgh to take up a chair at the University of Toronto; hence the University of Toronto Library subscription. That Smith's work was valued internationally is clear from subscribers such as the Berlin Royal Library; the Academy of Sciences, Arts and Belles Lettres of Caen and Melbourne Public Library, New South Wales; these subscriptions further enhanced his status as an internationally recognised expert. Other subscribers associated with libraries include Richard Thomson (Smith 1883, 130; ODNB) 'the accomplished Librarian of the London Institution'; Joshua Stratton (ODNB), sub-librarian at Canterbury Cathedral; Beriah Botfield (Botfield 1849; ODNB); Philip Bliss (ODNB), sub-librarian at the Bodleian under Bulkeley Bandinel (ODNB); Henry Christmas (ODNB), librarian of Sion College, London and Charles Lovell (ODNB) who helped to develop the Guildhall Library. Joseph Mayer founded the Free Library at Bebington (Cheshire). The role that librarians played in the selection, classification and dissemination of archaeological knowledge, particularly through personal connections, merits further investigation.

The approximate total value of the subscriptions listed here, bearing in mind the limitations of the sources (Scott 2013b), is £3,208 (not including multiple subscriptions or large formats or additional sales and contributions)(see for e.g. *The Reliquary*, 1873, 14, 53 for prices for unsubscribed copies)(table 20). An average middle-class annual income was around £150 in this period, while a vicar might earn as little as £40 to £50 [INSERT LINK: <http://www.victorianweb.org/economics/wages2.html>] [INSERT LINK: <https://www.measuringworth.com/calculators/ppoweruk/>]. This is therefore an impressive achievement given the challenges that Smith faced. As many of his subscribers were from middle-class backgrounds, their financial investment in his projects was considerable, suggesting serious commitment to his causes, and/or the importance of being seen to commit to these.

Table 20: Approximate value of subscriptions by volume

Volume	Price	Number of subscribers	Source	Total subscriptions
<i>Coll Ant 1</i>	24s	94		£112 16s
<i>Coll Ant 2</i>	24s	133		£159 12s
<i>Coll Ant 3</i>	24s	201	Note in Preface to <i>Coll Ant 3</i>	£241 4s
<i>Coll Ant 4</i>	24s	213		£255 12s
<i>Coll Ant 5</i>	24s	207		£248 8s
<i>Coll Ant 6</i>	24s	201	Notice, <i>Coll Ant 5</i> , 364	£241 4s
<i>Coll Ant 7</i>	30s	148	UoL flyer	£222
<i>Catalogue</i>	15s	342	UoL flyer	£256 10s
<i>Illustrations</i>	63s	344	<i>English Catalogue</i>	£1,083 12s
<i>Richborough</i>	21s	296	<i>English Catalogue</i> and UoL flyer	£310 16s
<i>Pevensey</i>	See list of subscribers for individual contributions	76	Preface	£76 14s
TOTAL		2,255		£3,208 8s

6. Roach Smith and British Archaeology

Smith and his associates were working to establish the importance of archaeology at a time when antiquarian pursuits, and the activities of local archaeological and historical societies, were often an object of ridicule (see for example, *Punch*, Sat. 22 Aug. 1846, 78, issue 267; Sat. 1 Mar. 1851, 84, issue 503). The importance of establishing his social and academic credentials as a result of his background in ‘trade’, and in the aftermath of the rift in the BAA, were undoubtedly also key factors underpinning his desire to produce academically rigorous and well-illustrated volumes in a timely fashion. However, it is notable that Albert Way continued to support Smith’s publications (table 1) despite the rivalries and disagreements, suggesting that the divisions were less clear-cut than has previously been suggested. Indeed, they were often working towards the same goals. While they had little contact for more than a decade, they re-established their relationship in 1863 at the Congress of the Archaeological Institute in Rochester. In the final volume of his *Retrospections*, Smith is full of praise for his achievements: ‘I must give him a place amongst the most learned and accomplished with whom it has been my good fortune to be associated’ (1891).

Smith's publications reveal an appreciation and understanding of material culture as a source of information about everyday life in the past, and the potential for interdisciplinary study; for example, in relation to the study of animal bones and botanical remains (1850, 105; Rhodes 1993). His understanding of the links between archaeology and geology was exceptional in this period (1852, 108), as was his appreciation of the value of all forms of art, not simply those which most closely approximated the classical ideal (Henig 1995, 186).

Many of Smith's supporters and close associates, including women, were philanthropic (on philanthropism in this period, see Adams 2004; 2009; Alberti 2005; in archaeology: Thornton 2013, 2), polymathic and often Nonconformist, and made a significant contribution within their professional field. They socialised regularly at society events, conversazioni [*sic*], and archaeological society meetings and congresses (Thornton 2015, 2; Price 2006; Hoselitz 2007, 56; on learned societies in the period see Lubenow 2015). They pursued their archaeological interests with passion and evangelising zeal; the contributions of many, including Smith, place them on a semi-professional footing in this formative period in the history of archaeology, if professionalism is taken to include 'notions of standards and specialist knowledge' (Hoselitz 2007, 70). Many had links with the pioneering group of archaeologists and antiquarians in the circle of Joseph Banks (Scott 2013a; 2014), and their work informed that of the Lubbock circle, which included Evans, Franks, Pitt-Rivers and many scientists and public figures (Evans 2007, 270).

A review of *Retrospections* I notes that: 'Mr Roach Smith has lived to see archaeology, which was looked upon as a foolish mania, treated almost as one of the exact sciences' (*Athenaeum*, 30 June 1883, issue 2905, 823). That he was increasingly accepted by the 'establishment' is clear from the change in tone from earlier articles and reviews in the *Athenaeum*, which had been far from supportive of him in the aftermath of the split; aristocratic support, most notably that of Lord Londesborough, was also key to his success. The subscription lists show that he increasingly attracted supporters from a wide range of backgrounds. The ways in which archaeological networks were established and maintained in this period through social and cultural events, correspondence and paratextual devices are key to a more prosopographical and inclusive history of archaeology, that identifies and acknowledges the contributions of those normally overlooked in histories of 'British' archaeology, and indeed highlights the importance and impact of archaeological pursuits upon society more generally.

Smith opened archaeology up to a wider public (Briggs 2009, 211). He believed support in kind to be just as important as financial contributions; there are many examples of mutual support in the form of information and access to objects and collections, exchanges of publications, advertising and favourable reviews of volumes. That he was acutely aware of the inequity of access to societies and their activities is evident in his address to the Canterbury Congress (1844): he states a desire to 'render the association as extended and comprehensive as possible' and questions the assumption that all members have an equal

ability to give ‘pecuniary aid’, arguing instead that they may ‘be able to afford literary aid or other useful co-operation’ (Dunkin 1845,26). As identified above, women were afforded increasing access to archaeological knowledge and activities and greater recognition for their contributions, which were often in kind. Foreign participants were similarly encouraged and acknowledged. While their enlistment was often symbolic rather than practical in this period (*Literary Gazette*, 1153, 3 Jan. 1846, 10; Briggs 2009, 217), it is clear from his voluminous correspondence that he pursued, cultivated and promoted these connections assiduously throughout his life, and in return provided critical information, support and publicity for them, most notably those in France.

While heavily criticised in the 1840s for his promotion of inclusivity (Briggs 2009, 211), it was undoubtedly due to the wider publicity of, and access to, his projects that they were so successful. Smith’s ability to overcome class divisions was increasingly acknowledged and celebrated:

The Lothbury druggist lived to enjoy not only the esteem and respect, but the friendship of the highest and most distinguished people in the land, and that at a time when class distinction was more marked than it is (*Athenaeum*, 30 June 1883, 2905, 823).

While he is best known for his work on Roman London, he also played an instrumental role in shifting the focus away from the metropolis through his support for the formation of local archaeological societies, and not simply as the preserve of an educated London-based elite. In return they championed his work and causes through their own publications and meetings and through local papers. Subscription lists were of critical importance for the spread of knowledge, providing a directory of like-minded supporters, as well as opportunities for the display of achievements and accolades. They therefore provide an excellent starting point for better understanding the relationship between social and intellectual background and the development of archaeology, as well as the nature and extent of participation by region.

The scale and success of cooperative ventures, spearheaded by Smith, underpinned the development of local and national collections of antiquities (MacGregor 1998, 127-37; Polm 2016). As noted above, he relentlessly pursued the campaign to establish a collection of British antiquities in the British Museum using the prefaces and appendices to his volumes; most notably in the volumes of *Collectanea*. His commitment to this cause is also clear through his sale of his collection to the British Museum for £2,000. While Lord Lonsborough had sent him a cheque for £3,000, he chose to accept the British Museum’s offer to ensure that the collection was not dispersed and that ‘a safe resting place in the national institution’ was secured (1883, 167). As reported in *The Athenaeum*,

though he has shared the fate of all pioneers and seen the great leaders of research avail themselves of his labours ... They who pay a visit to the recently arranged collections in the British Museum must needs be struck by the recurrence of Mr. Smith’s name, attached to so many objects exhibited (30 June 1883, issue 2905, 823).

This collection was the basis of a new department of British and Medieval Antiquities and Ethnography [INSERT LINK: https://www.britishmuseum.org/about_us/the_museums_story/the_collection.aspx], and his *Catalogue* and *Illustrations* remained key reference works into the twentieth century (e.g. Haverfield 1915, 50). The divisions between museum professionals, academics and ‘amateurs’ in this period are not as clear-cut as has been suggested (Levine 1986). As shown in table 1, the reception and impact of his work can now be more fully explored; for example, through reports and reviews in journals and newspapers, which are now easily accessible online.

Smith’s work serves as a timely model for what can be achieved in the face of limited institutional support for archaeological publishing. Through challenging existing priorities and power structures, and through his enterprising, evangelising and inclusive approach, he played a pivotal role in transforming the discipline in the second half of the nineteenth century. While the lack of investment in British archaeology continued to attract attention (Pitt-Rivers 1890), and topographical and military traditions remained dominant, his achievements nevertheless underpinned the formation of British archaeology in its widest sense, and were key to the development of national and international archaeological collections and networks; for this he received national and international recognition in his lifetime. As argued by Sinclair (2016), in order to demonstrate the importance of Archaeology to a wide audience, including ‘students, industry, charities, decision makers, such that they will value their activities’, it is essential that we examine and celebrate its full scope, diversity and multi-disciplinary links (see also British Academy, *Reflections on Archaeology* 2016, 6-7)[INSERT LINK: <http://intarch.ac.uk/journal/issue42/8/1.html>]. A more inclusive approach to the history of the discipline, which examines the full range of contributions, provides a better understanding of the ways in which institutional and commercial priorities develop, but also of means by which they can be effectively challenged.

Words 13,266

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Reverend Professor Martin Henig for encouraging my interest in Charles Roach Smith and for his comments on an earlier draft of this paper. I would also like to thank Professor Graham Shipley and the reviewers for their constructive comments on earlier drafts, and Heather Keeble for information about William Hargrove and the *York Herald*. I am grateful to the School of Archaeology and Ancient History, University of Leicester for financial support for the publication of this paper.

References

19th Century British Library, Gale NewsVault and British Periodicals

Anna Gurney. *The Gentleman's Magazine*, Sep 1857, 342

Anna Gurney. *Literary Gazette*, July 4, 1857, issue 2111, 638

Athenaeum, July 10, 1852, issue 1289, 745

Athenaeum, Mar. 24, 1855, issue 1430, 345

Athenaeum, Jun. 30, 1883, issue 2905, 823

Bentley's Miscellany, Jan. 1886, issue 59, 364

Collectanea Antiqua III in *The Literary Gazette* Apr. 25, 1857, issue 2101, 396

Dawson Turner. *The Athenaeum*, Jul. 17, 1858, issue 1603, 82

Eliza Meteyard. *The Academy*, Apr. 12, 1879, issue 362, 325

Gentleman's Magazine 1847, 181, Antiquarian Researches

Hudson Gurney Esq FRS FSA. *Gentleman's Magazine*, Jan. 1865, 1, 108-9

Jewitt, Llewellyn. Some departed contributors and literary friends. *The Reliquary*, Apr 1878, 18, 255

John Charles. *Gentleman's Magazine*, Sept. 1855, 325-26.

Leicester Chronicle: or, Commercial and Agricultural Advertiser, 27 May 1854, 1

Literary Gazette, 3 Jan. 1846, 10

Lloyd's Weekly London Newspaper 8 Mar. 1845, 120

Morning Post 1841, Issue 21985, 4

Morning Advertiser 25 Dec. 1841

Morning Advertiser, 26 Dec. 1843

Morning Advertiser, 25 Dec. 1845

Roman London. *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art* Jan. 7, 1890, 9, 219

Sir J.P. Boileau. *Gentleman's Magazine*, May 1869, 2, 746

The Late Joseph Mayer FSA etc *The Reliquary*, Apr. 1886, 26, 226

Thomas Wright MA, Hon FRSA, FSA etc. *Art Journal*, Mar. 1878, 75.

The Hallowed Spots of London. By Eliza Meteyard (Silverpen). *Eclectic Review*, Apr. 1862, 2, 366

The Hallowed Spots of London. By Eliza Meteyard (Silverpen). *Gentleman's Magazine*, Mar. 1862, 212, 348

West Kent Guardian, 23 Dec. 1844.

West Kent Guardian, 18 Nov. 1843

William Cavendish, Earl of Burlington. *The Times*, 22 Dec. 1891

Worsaae. *The Academy*, 29 Aug. 1885, 140.

Punch Historical Archive

[Gilbert a'Beckett]. "The Archæological Association." *Punch Historical Archive* [London, England] 22 Aug. 1846: 78. *Punch Historical Archive*. Web. 27 Feb. 2017.

[Gilbert a'Beckett]. "More Archæology." *Punch Historical Archive* [London, England] 12 Aug. 1848: 72. *Punch Historical Archive*. Web. 20 Mar. 2017.

[Gilbert a'Beckett]. "Punch's Popish Relics." *Punch Historical Archive* [London, England] 1 Mar. 1851: 84. *Punch Historical Archive*. Web. 27 Feb. 2017.

[Tom Taylor, Henry Silver, and Shirley Brooks]. "Felony v. Fine Arts." *Punch Historical Archive* [London, England] 15 June 1861: 241. *Punch Historical Archive*. Web. 27 Feb. 2017.

Illustrated London News

Christmas Column for the Curious. *Illustrated London News* [London, England] 19 Dec. 1863: 614. *Illustrated London News*. Web. 13 Feb. 2017.

Gale Document Number: HN3100526983

Mr. C. Roach Smith's Collection of Antiquities Lately Purchased for the British Museum. *Illustrated London News* [London, England] 8 Nov. 1856: 479+. *Illustrated London News*. Web. 13 Feb. 2017.

Gale Document Number: HN3100044338

The Late Mr. Roach Smith. *Illustrated London News* [London, England] 30 Aug. 1890: 262+. *Illustrated London News*. Web. 13 Feb. 2017.

Gale Document Number: HN3100458383

The Late Mr. Thomas Wright, F. S. A. *Illustrated London News* [London, England] 12 Jan. 1878: 42+. *Illustrated London News*. Web. 13 Feb. 2017.

Gale Document Number: HN3100000693

Symon, J. D. Books of the Day. *Illustrated London News* [London, England] 23 Sept. 1922: 462. *Illustrated London News*. Web. 13 Feb. 2017.

Gale Document Number: HN3100250719

Thurley, S. London's Hidden Depths. *Illustrated London News* [London, England] 6 Dec. 1999: n.p. *Illustrated London News*. Web. 13 Feb. 2017.

Gale Document Number: HN3100438017

** Selected Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (ODNB) entries*

Bell, Alan. "Boileau, Sir John Peter (1794–1869)." Alan Bell In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., edited by David Cannadine. Oxford: OUP, 2004.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2779> (accessed February 22, 2017).

Brookman, Helen. "Gurney, Anna (1795–1857)." Helen Brookman In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., edited by David Cannadine. Oxford: OUP, September 2016.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11759> (accessed February 17, 2017).

Courtney, W. P. "Botfield, Beriah (1807–1863)." Rev. A. S. G. Edwards. In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by David Cannadine, 2004. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2960> (accessed February 22, 2017).

Davies, Glanville J. "Warne, Charles (1801–1887)." Glanville J. Davies In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by David Cannadine, January 2008.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28751> (accessed February 17, 2017).

Dix, Brian. "Dryden, Sir Henry Edward Leigh, fourth baronet and seventh baronet (1818–1899)." Brian Dix In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., edited by David Cannadine. Oxford: OUP, 2004. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/60772> (accessed February 17, 2017).

Foote, Yolanda. "Evans, Sir John (1823–1908)." Yolanda Foote In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by David Cannadine, October 2007.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33040> (accessed February 17, 2017).

Fraser, Angus. "Turner, Dawson (1775–1858)." Angus Fraser In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., edited by David Cannadine. Oxford: OUP, 2004.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27846> (accessed February 17, 2017).

Goodwin, Gordon . "Hargrove, William (1788–1862)." Rev. William Joseph Sheils. In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by David Cannadine, 2004.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12320> (accessed February 17, 2017).

Goulden, R. J. "Smith, John Russell (1810–1894)." R. J. Goulden In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., edited by David Cannadine. Oxford: OUP, 2004.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25864> (accessed February 17, 2017).

Hawke, E. G. "Poste, Beale (1793–1871)." Rev. H. C. G. Matthew. In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by David Cannadine, 2004.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22594> (accessed February 17, 2017).

Hulse, Elizabeth. "Wilson, Sir Daniel (1816–1892)." Elizabeth Hulse In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., edited by David Cannadine. Oxford: OUP, 2004.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29647> (accessed February 22, 2017).

Hunter, Fred. "Meteyard, Eliza (1816–1879)." Fred Hunter In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by David Cannadine, May 2005. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18624> (accessed February 17, 2017).

Kirby, M. W. "Gurney, Daniel (1791–1880)." M. W. Kirby In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., edited by David Cannadine. Oxford: OUP, 2004.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11761> (accessed February 22, 2017).

Manley, K. A. "Thomson, Richard (1794–1865)." K. A. Manley In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., edited by David Cannadine. Oxford: OUP, 2004.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27321> (accessed February 22, 2017).

Nurse, Bernard. "Way, Albert (1805–1874)." Bernard Nurse In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., edited by David Cannadine. Oxford: OUP, 2004.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28903> (accessed February 17, 2017).

Osborne, Peter. "Gurney, Hudson (1775–1864)." Peter Osborne In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., edited by David Cannadine. Oxford: OUP, 2004.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11765> (accessed February 17, 2017).

Rhodes, Michael. "Smith, Charles Roach (1806–1890)." Michael Rhodes In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., edited by David Cannadine. Oxford: OUP, 2004. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25789> (accessed February 17, 2017).

Selborne, Joanna. "Fairholt, Frederick William (bap. 1813, d. 1866)." Joanna Selborne In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., edited by David Cannadine. Oxford: OUP, 2004. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9098> (accessed February 17, 2017).

Sutton, C. W. "Mayer, Joseph (1803–1886)." Rev. Lionel Burman. In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by David Cannadine, 2004. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18428> (accessed February 17, 2017).

Symons, John. "Pettigrew, Thomas Joseph (1791–1865)." John Symons In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., edited by David Cannadine. Oxford: OUP, 2004. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22063> (accessed February 17, 2017).

Thompson, Michael Welman. "Wright, Thomas (1810–1877)." Michael Welman Thompson In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by David Cannadine, September 2015. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/30063> (accessed February 17, 2017).

Wroth, W. W. "Bruce, John Collingwood (1805–1892)." Rev. C. M. Fraser. In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by David Cannadine, 2004. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3741> (accessed February 17, 2017).

Wroth, W. W. "Corner, George Richard (1801–1863)." Rev. Joanne Potier. In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by David Cannadine, 2004. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6324> (accessed February 17, 2017).

CRS volumes

Smith, C.R. 1848. *Collectanea Antiqua, Etchings and Notices of Ancient Remains, illustrative of the Habits, Customs and History of Past Ages*. Volume 1. London: John Russell Smith. http://solo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/OXVU1:LSCOP_OX:oxfaleph012213330

Smith, C.R. 1850. *The Antiquities of Richborough, Reculver and Lymne in Kent*. London: John Russell Smith. <https://archive.org/details/antiquitiesrich00fairgoog>

Smith, C.R. 1851. *Notes on the Antiquities of Treves, Mayence, Wiesbaden, Niederbieber, Bonn and Cologne*. London: John Russell Smith. <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/100725879>

Smith, C.R. 1852a. *Collectanea Antiqua, Etchings and Notices of Ancient Remains, illustrative of the Habits, Customs and History of Past Ages*. Volume 2. London: John Russell Smith.
http://solo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/OXVU1:LSCOP_OX:oxfaleph012213330

Smith, C.R. 1852b. *Report on Excavations made on the site of the Roman Castrum at Lymne, in Kent, in 1850, with notes on the original plan of Castrum ... by James Elliott, jun.* London: J. Richards.

Smith, C.R. 1854a. *Catalogue of the Museum of London Antiquities. Collected by and the Property of Charles Roach Smith*. London: Printed for the subscribers only and not published. <https://archive.org/details/catalogueofmuseu00smit>

Smith, C.R. 1854b. *Collectanea Antiqua, Etchings and Notices of Ancient Remains, illustrative of the Habits, Customs and History of Past Ages*. Volume 3. Printed for the subscribers only and not published. http://solo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/OXVU1:LSCOP_OX:oxfaleph012213330

Smith, C.R. 1857. *Collectanea Antiqua, Etchings and Notices of Ancient Remains, illustrative of the Habits, Customs and History of Past Ages*. Volume 4. Printed for the subscribers only and not published. http://solo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/OXVU1:LSCOP_OX:oxfaleph012213330

Smith, C.R. 1858. *Report on Excavations made upon the Site of the Roman Castrum of Pevensey in Sussex in 1852, under the direction of M.R. Lower and C.R.* London: Printed for the subscribers to the excavations and not published.
http://solo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/OXVU1:LSCOP_OX:oxfaleph013911602

Smith, C.R. 1859. *Illustrations of Roman London*. London: Printed for the subscribers and not published. <https://archive.org/details/illustrationsofr00smitrich>

Smith, C.R. 1861. *Collectanea Antiqua, Etchings and Notices of Ancient Remains, illustrative of the Habits, Customs and History of Past Ages*. Volume 5. Printed for the subscribers only and not published. http://solo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/OXVU1:LSCOP_OX:oxfaleph012213330

Smith, C.R. 1863. *On the scarcity of home grown fruits in Great Britain with remedial suggestions*. Liverpool. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5962/bhl.title.107424>

Smith, C.R. 1868. *Collectanea Antiqua, Etchings and Notices of Ancient Remains, illustrative of the Habits, Customs and History of Past Ages*. Volume 6. Printed for the subscribers only and not published. http://solo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/OXVU1:LSCOP_OX:oxfaleph012213330

Smith, C.R. 1878-1880. *Collectanea Antiqua, Etchings and Notices of Ancient Remains, illustrative of the Habits, Customs and History of Past Ages*. Volume 7. Printed for the subscribers only and not published.
http://solo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/OXVU1:LSCOP_OX:oxfaleph012213330

Smith, C.R. 1873. *A catalogue of Anglo-Saxon and other antiquities, discovered at Faversham, in Kent, and bequeathed by E. Gibbs to the South Kensington Museum*. London:

George Eyre and William Spottiswoode.

http://solo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/OXVU1:LSCOP_OX:oxfaleph013914389

Smith, C.R. 1874. (2nd ed) *The Rural Life of Shakespeare, as Illustrated by his Works*. London: George Bell and Sons. http://solo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/OXVU1:LSCOP_OX:oxfaleph013911626

Smith, C.R. 1877. *Remarks on Shakespeare, his birth-place &c. suggested by a visit to Stratford-upon-Avon in ... 1868*. London. George Bell and Sons.
http://solo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/OXVU1:LSCOP_OX:oxfaleph013179669

Smith, C.R. 1883. *Retrospections*, Volume 1. London: Printed by subscription.
http://idiscover.lib.cam.ac.uk/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=44CAM_ERDB548428&context=L&vid=44CAM_TEST&search_scope=default_scope&tab=default_tab&lang=en_US

Smith, C.R. 1886. *Retrospections*, Volume 2. London: George Bell and Sons.
http://idiscover.lib.cam.ac.uk/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=44CAM_ERDB548434&context=L&vid=44CAM_TEST&search_scope=default_scope&tab=default_tab&lang=en_US

Smith, C.R. 1891. *Retrospections*, Volume 3. Ed. J.G. Waller. London: George Bell and Sons.
http://idiscover.lib.cam.ac.uk/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=44CAM_ERDB548429&context=L&vid=44CAM_TEST&search_scope=default_scope&tab=default_tab&lang=en_US

Secondary sources

Adams, T. (ed.) 2004. *Philanthropy, Patronage and Civil Society: Experiences from Germany, Great Britain, and North America*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Adams, T. 2009. *Buying Respectability: Philanthropy and Urban Society in a Transnational Perspective, 1840s to 1930s*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Akerman, J.Y. 1847. *Archaeological Index for Celtic, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon Remains*. London: John Russell Smith.

Alberti, S 2005. Civic cultures and civic colleges in Victorian England. In Daunton, M. (ed.) *The Organisation of Knowledge in Victorian Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ash, M. and Hulse, E. (eds.) 1999. *Thinking with Both Hands: Sir Daniel Wilson in the Old World and the New*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Bann, S. 1984. *The Clothing of Clio*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Bedo, G. 1872-73. Roman remains discovered around Faversham Co. Kent. *Reliquary*, 13, 141-47. <https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=oqxDAQAAMAAJ>
- Beetham, M. 2015. Periodical writing. In Peterson, L. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Victorian Women's Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 206-20. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CCO9781107587823.017>
- Botfield, B. 1849. *Notes on the Cathedral Libraries of England*. London.
- Brabrook, E. 1907. The progress of research up to and in the nineteenth century. *The Antiquary* 3 (5), 186.
- Briggs, C.S. 2009. Some reflections on the Archaeological Institute's Oxford Congress in 1850, *Archaeological Journal*, 166 (1), 210-36. DOI: 10.1080/00665983.2009.11078224
- British Academy 2016. *Reflections on Archaeology*. <http://www.britac.ac.uk/reflections-on-archaeology>. Accessed 31/07/17.
- Browman, D.L. 2013. *Cultural Negotiations: The Role of Women in the Founding of Americanist Archaeology*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.
- Buchanan, A. 2013. *Robert Willis (1880-1875) and the Foundation of Architectural History*. Martlesham, Suffolk: Boydell and Brewer.
- Campion C. 1870. W.H. Blauw. *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, 22, ix–xi.
- Caygill, M. and Cherry, J. (eds) 1997. *A. W. Franks, Nineteenth-Century Collecting and the British Museum*. London: British Museum Press.
- Classen, C. (ed.) 1994. *Women in Archaeology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press
- Clark, P. 1982. *Henry Hallam*. Twayne: Boston, MA.
- Cohen, G. and Sharp Joukowsky, M. (eds) 2004. *Breaking Ground. Pioneering Women Archaeologists*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Coltman, V. 1999. Classicism in the English library. Reading classical culture in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. In *Journal of the History of Collections*, 11(1), 35-50. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jhc/11.1.35>
- Coltman, V. 2006. Representation, replication and collecting in Charles Townley's late eighteenth-century library. *Art History*, 29(2), 304-24. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8365.2006.00503.x>
- Cook, B. 1998. British archaeologists in the Aegean. In Brand V. (ed.) *The Study of the Past in the Victorian Age*. Oxbow Monograph 73: Oxford, 139-54.

Daunton, M. (ed.) 2005. *The Organisation of Knowledge in Victorian Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dawson, G., Lintott, C. and Shuttleworth, S. 2015. Constructing Scientific Communities: Citizen Science in the Nineteenth and Twenty-First Centuries. *Journal of Victorian Culture*, 20(2), 246-54.

Díaz-Andreu, M. and Sørensen, M.L.S. (eds) 1998. *Excavating Women. Towards an Engendered History of Archaeology*. London: Routledge.

Dunkin, A. J. 1845. *A Report of the Proceedings of the British Archaeological Association, the first general meeting, held at Canterbury, in the month of September, 1844*. London: John Russell Smith.

Dyson, S. L. 2006. *In Pursuit of Ancient Pasts: A History of Classical Archaeology in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Ebbatson, L. 1994a. *Conditions of the Emergence and Archaeology in the Nineteenth-Century: The Royal Archaeological Institute 1843-1914*. Unpublished PhD thesis.

Ebbatson, L. 1994b. Context and discourse: Royal Archaeological Institute membership 1845-1942. In Vyner (ed.) 1994. *Building on the Past: Papers Celebrating 150 years of the Royal Archaeological Institute*. London: Royal Archaeological Institute, 22-74.

Effros, B. 2012. *Uncovering the Germanic Past: Merovingian Archaeology in France 1830-1914*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eliot, S. 2001. "Never mind the value, what about the price?"; or, how much did Marmion cost St. John Rivers?, *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, 56(2), 160-97. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/ncl.2001.56.2.160>

Evans, C. 2007. 'Delineating objects': nineteenth-century antiquarian culture and the project of Archaeology. In Pearce S. (ed.) *Visions of Antiquity: The Society of Antiquaries of London 1707-2007*. London: Society of Antiquaries, 267-305.

Evans, J. 1864. *The Coins of the Ancient Britains*. London: John Russell Smith.

Evans, J. 1873. Note on an Anglo-Saxon knife, found in Kent, bearing an inscription, read Feb. 8 1872. *Archaeologia* 44, 331-334.

Faussett, B. 1856. *Inventorium Sepulchrale: An Account of some Antiquities... in the County of Kent, from A.D. 1757 to A.D. 1773*, ed., with notes and intr. by C.R. Smith. London: Privately printed. http://solo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/OXVU1:LSCOP_OX:oxfaleph013914398

Genette, G. 1997. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* (J. Lewin trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511549373>

Gibson, M. 1988. Joseph Mayer 1803-1886. In Gibson, M. and Wright, S. (eds.) *Joseph Mayer of Liverpool*. Society of Antiquaries of London Occasional Papers (New Series) XI. London: Thames and Hudson, 1-20.

Gibson, M and Wright, S. (eds.) 1988. *Joseph Mayer of Liverpool*. Society of Antiquaries of London Occasional Papers (New Series) XI. London: Thames and Hudson.

Goldhill, S. 2015. *The Buried Life of Things*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haverfield, F. 1915. *The Romanization of Roman Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Holmes, H. 2009. Analysing a source of evidence for the purchase and ownership of Scottish books in the late eighteenth century: A comparison of three subscription lists in the agricultural books of David Young of Perth published in 1785, 1788 and 1790. In *Folk Life*, July 2009, 47, 1, 32-50. DOI: 10.1179/175967009X422684

Henig, M. and Coombe, P. 2013. Roach Smith and the antiquities of London: the sculptures. In H. Wiegel and M. Vickers (eds), *Excalibur: Essays on Antiquity and the History of Collecting in Honour of Arthur MacGregor*. Oxford: BAR International Series 2512, 127-31.

Henig, M. 2004. A house divided: The study of Roman art and the art of Roman Britain. In Sauer, E. (ed) *Archaeology and Ancient History: Breaking down the Boundaries*. London: Routledge, 134-50.

Henig, M. 1995 *The Art of Roman Britain*. London: B.T. Batsford.

Hingley, R. 2007. The Society its Council, the membership and publications. In Pearce S. (ed.) *Visions of Antiquity: The Society of Antiquaries 1707-2007*. London: Society of Antiquaries, 173-97.

Hingley, R. 2008. *The Recovery of Roman Britain 1586-1906: A Colony so Fertile*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hoare, E. 1858. The coming night...on the death of Miss Anna Gurney. *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 14, 187-99.

Hobley, B. 1975. Charles Roach Smith (1807-1809) pioneer rescue archaeologist. *London Archaeologist* 2(13), 328-33.

Hoselitz, V. 2007. *Imagining Roman Britain: Victorian Responses to a Roman Past*. London: Royal Historical Society.

Jerdan, W. 1845. Suggestions for the extension of the British Archaeological Association. *Archaeological Journal* 1, 297-300.

Jones, M., Craddock, P. and Barker, N. 2012. *The Art of Deception*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

- Kelly, J. 2010. *The Society of Dilettanti: Archaeology and identity in the British Enlightenment*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kent, C. 1974. The Whittington Club: A Bohemian Experiment in Middle Class Social Reform, *Victorian Studies*, 18, 1, 31-55. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3826451>
- Kidd, D. 1977. Charles Roach Smith and his Museum of London Antiquities. *British Museum Yearbook*, 2, 105-35.
- Knowles, K. 2014. Britain must dig deeper to save its archaeology, *The Independent*. 12th July 2014. <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/science/archaeology/news/britain-must-dig-deeper-to-save-its-archaeology-9602435.html>
- Lee, A.J. 1976. *The Origins of the Popular Press 1855-1914*. London: Croom Helm.
- Levine, P. 1990. *Feminist Lives in Victorian England: Private Roles and Public Commitment*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Levine, P. 1987. *Victorian Feminism 1850-1900*. London: Hutchinson Education.
- Levine, P. 1986. *The Amateur and the Professional: Antiquarians, Historians and Archaeologists in Victorian England, 1838-1886*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lubenow, W. 2015. *'Only Connect': Learned Societies in Nineteenth-Century Britain*. London: Boydell Press.
- Officer, L. and Williamson, S. Purchasing Power of British Pounds from 1270 to Present, *MeasuringWorth*, 2017. URL: www.measuringworth.com/ppoweruk/
- MacGregor, A. (ed.) 2008a. *Sir John Evans (1823-1908). Antiquity, Commerce and Natural Science in the Age of Darwin*. Oxford: Ashmolean Museum.
- MacGregor, A. 2008b. Sir John Evans, model Victorian, polymath and collector. In MacGregor, A. (ed.) 2008a. *Sir John Evans (1823-1908). Antiquity, Commerce and Natural Science in the Age of Darwin*. Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 1-38.
- MacGregor, A. 1998. Antiquity inventoried: Museums and 'national antiquities' in the mid nineteenth century. In Brand, V. (ed.) *The Study of the Past in the Victorian Age*. Oxford: Oxbow Monograph 73, 125-37.
- Malley, S. 2012. *From Archaeology to Spectacle in Victorian Britain: The Case of Assyria, 1845-1854*. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate.
- Mayer, J. 1876. *Early Exhibitions of Art in Liverpool*. Liverpool: Privately Printed.
- Meteyard, E. 1862. *The Hallowed Spots of Ancient London: Historical, Biographical and Antiquarian Sketches*. London: Marlborough.

- Meteyard, E. 1865. *The Life of Josiah Wedgewood*. London: Hurst and Blackett.
- Moser, S. 2006 *Wondrous Curiosities: Ancient Egypt at the British Museum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Moshenska, G. 2012 Selected Correspondence from the Papers of Thomas Pettigrew (1791-1865), Surgeon and Antiquary. *Journal of Open Archaeology Data* 1:e9, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/4f913ca0cbb89>
- Novum Inventorium Sepulchrale: Kentish Anglo-Saxon Graves and Grave Goods in the Sonia Hawkes Archive*, July 2007, 1st Edition, <http://inventorium.arch.ox.ac.uk/>, Accessed: 11 August 2017
- Parsinnen, T. 1973. Association, convention and anti-Parliament in British radical politics. *English Historical Review* 88, 348, 504-33.
- Petrie, H. 1848. *Monumenta Historica Britannica, or, Materials for the History of Britain from the Earliest Period. Vol. 1, Extending to the Norman Conquest*. Prepared and illustrated with notes by the late Henry Petrie; assisted by John Sharpe. London : George Eyre and William Spottiswoode.
- Pitt Rivers, A. 1890. Wanted, an English Exploration Fund. *The Times*, 2 June: 4.
- Polm, M. 2016. Museum representations of Roman Britain: A post-colonial perspective. *Britannia* 47, 209-41.
- Portlock, J. E. 1856. Henry Thomas de la Beche. *Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society*, 12, xxxiv–xxxviii.
- Potter, T. 1997. Later prehistory and Roman Britain: The formation of the national collections. In Caygill, M. and Cherry, J. (eds.) *A.W. Franks. Nineteenth-Century Collecting and the British Museum*. London: British Museum Press. 130-35.
- Price, M. 2006. Conversazione in the University Museum 'By kind permission of the Delegates'. *Bulletin of the History of Archaeology*, 16(1), 35–38.
DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5334/bha.16106>
- Raven, J. 1992. *Judging New Wealth: Popular Publishing and Responses to Commerce in England, 1740-1800*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rhodes, M. 1990. Faussett rediscovered: Charles Roach Smith, Joseph Mayer, and the publication of *Inventorium sepulchrale*'. In Southwood, E. (ed.) *Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries: A Reappraisal*, 25-64. Stroud: Alan Sutton.
- Rhodes, M. 1991. The Roman coinage from London Bridge and the development of the City and Southwark. *Britannia* 22, 179-90. doi:10.2307/526638.

Rhodes, M. 1992. *Some Aspects of the Contribution to British Archaeology of Charles Roach Smith (1806-1890)*, Unpublished PhD diss., University of London.

Roach Smith, C. 1875. The ábbe Cochet. *Archaeological Journal* 32, 462-70.

Robinson, F. and Wallis, P. 1975. *Book Subscription Lists A Revised Guide*. Harold Hill Ltd: Book Subscriptions List Project, Newcastle Upon Tyne.

Rowley-Conwy, P. 2007. *From Genesis to Prehistory: The Archaeological Three Age System and its Contested Reception in Denmark, Britain and Ireland*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schnapp, A. 1996. *The Discovery of the Past*. London: British Museum Press.

Scott, J. 2003. *The Pleasures of Antiquity: British Collectors of Greece and Rome*. New Haven: Yale University Press for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art.

Scott, S 2013a. Samuel Lysons and his circle: Art, science and the remains of Roman Britain. *Bulletin of the History of Archaeology*, 23, 2, 1–22. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.2323>

Scott, S. 2013b. Pioneers, publishers and the dissemination of archaeological knowledge: A study of publishing in British archaeology 1816-1851. *Internet Archaeology*, 35. Council for British Archaeology. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11141/ia.35.1>

Scott, S. 2014. Britain in the classical world: Samuel Lysons and the art of Roman Britain. *Classical Receptions Journal* 6, 2, 294-337. <https://doi.org/10.1093/crj/clt030>

Smetham, H. 1929. *C.R.S. and his Friends: being Personal Recollections of Charles Roach Smith, F.S.A. and his Friends*. London: C.W. Daniel Co.

Smith, B.G. 1998. *The Gender of History: Men, Woman and Historical Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, R. 2016. London down under spurred by a building boom, archaeologists are plumbing the depths of one of Europe's oldest capitals. *National Geographic*, Feb 2016, 229, 2, 90.

Sweet, R. 1997. *The Writing of Urban Histories in Eighteenth-Century England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Sweet, R. 2015. William Gell and Pompeiana (1817-19 and 1832). *Papers of the British School at Rome* 83, 245-281. DOI: 10.1017/S0068246215000100

The Penny Cyclopaedia of The Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. 1837. Volume IX. London: Charles Knight.

Thompson, J. *The History of Leicester*. Hewitt: Leicester.
<https://archive.org/details/historyleiceste01thomgoog>

Thornton, A. 2011. *British Archaeologists, Social Networks and the Emergence of a Profession: the Social History of British Archaeology in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East, 1870-1939*. Unpublished thesis (PhD), University College London.

Thornton, A. 2013. '...a certain faculty for extricating cash': Collective sponsorship in late 19th and early 20th century British Archaeology. *Present Pasts*, 5, 1: 1-12. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/pp.55>

Thornton, A. 2015 Exhibition season: Annual archaeological exhibitions in London, 1880s-1930s. *Bulletin of the History of Archaeology*, 25: 2, 1-18, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.252>

Thorpe, B. 1865. *Diplomatorium Anglicum Aevi Saxonici, a Collection of English Charters, with a tr. of the Anglo-Saxon by B. Thorpe*. London.

Topham, J. R. 2000. Scientific publishing and the reading of science in nineteenth-century Britain: A historiographical survey and guide to sources. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, 31(4), 559-612. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0039-3681\(00\)00030-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0039-3681(00)00030-3)

Trigger, B. 1992. Daniel Wilson and the Scottish enlightenment, *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, 122, 55-75.

Tythacott, L. 2011. *The Lives of Chinese Objects: Buddhism, Imperialism and Display*. Oxford and New York: Berghahn.

Waller, J.G. and Waller, L. A. B. 1864. *A Series of Monumental Brasses from the 13th to the 16th Century*. London: Pickering.

Waller, P. 2006. *Writers, Readers and Reputations: Literary Life in Britain, 1870-1918*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wallis, P. 1974. Book Subscription Lists. *The Library*, 5th Series. XXIX, No. 3, September 1974.

Ward, W.R. 1965. *Victorian Oxford*. London: Routledge.

Way, A. 1844. Introduction. *Archaeological Journal*, Vol. 1, 1-6.

Wetherall, D. 1998. The growth of archaeological societies. In Brand, V. (ed.) *The Study of the Past in the Victorian Age*. Oxbow Monograph 73: Oxford, 21-34.

White, R. 1988. Mayer and British Archaeology. In Gibson, M and Wright, S. (eds) *Joseph Mayer of Liverpool*. Society of Antiquaries of London Occasional Papers (New Series) XI. London: Thames and Hudson, 118-36.

Whitehead, C. 2009. *Museums and the Construction of Disciplines: Art and Archaeology in Nineteenth-Century Britain*. London: Duckworth.

Williams, H. 2006. Heathen graves and Victorian Anglo-Saxonism: Assessing the archaeology of John Mitchell Kemble. In Semple, S. (ed.) *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History*. Oxford: Oxford School of Archaeology, 1-18.

Wilkins, J. 1961. Worsaae and British Antiquities. *Antiquity* 35, 139, 214-20.

Wilson, D. 2002. *The British Museum. A History*. London: British Museum Press.

Worsaae, J. A. A. 1852. *An Account of the Danes and Norwegians in England, Scotland and Ireland*. London: John Murray.

Wright, 1826. *History and Antiquities of Ludlow*. London: Longmans.
<https://archive.org/details/historyantiquit01wriggoog>

Wright, T. 1872. *Feudal Manuals of English History*. London: Published under the direction and at the expense of J. Mayer. <https://archive.org/details/feudalmanualsen00mayegoog>

Zimmerman, V. 2008. *Excavating Victorians*. New York: State University of New York Press.