

Antiquity

VOL. XXXV No. 138

JUNE 1961

Editorial

IT is a pleasure to draw attention to two important, interesting and attractive Exhibitions in London this summer. The first is the Jubilee Exhibition of the Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies. It will be held at Goldsmiths' Hall (Foster Lane, E.C.2) from 27 June to 22 July and is entitled 'Art in Roman Britain'. It is the most comprehensive exhibition of Art in Roman Britain ever to be assembled, and, incidentally, the first to be held in the City of London. The exhibits are being loaned by over forty public authorities, museums and private owners and include the silver tray from Corbridge lent by His Grace the Duke of Northumberland, the brass helmets from Newstead lent by the National Museum of Antiquities of Scotland, the gilt-bronze head of Sulis Minerva lent by the City of Bath, and the Mithraic sculpture lent by the City of London. All the works shown in this exhibition were discovered in Britain and belong to the first four centuries of our era; they are selected to illustrate as fully as possible the many varied aspects of art that appeared in Britain under Roman rule—many are unique in the Roman world. Incidentally a complete photographic record of the Exhibition, with a general introduction and notes by Professor J. M. C. Toynbee, will be published early in 1962 by the Phaidon Press. May we remind readers of the address of the Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies; it is 31-34, *Gordon Square, London, W.C.1.*



The second exhibition is in the exhibition gallery of the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum. It opened on 2 February and will remain open, we understand, for most of this year. It was designed to illustrate some aspects of forgery and deception in the fields of natural history, antiquity, coins and medals, the fine arts, literature, music and postage stamps. It is of course by no means the first such exhibition; one was held in London, at the Burlington Fine Arts Club, in 1924, another at the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, in 1952, and a third in Paris, organized by that splendid body the *Comité des Salons Artistiques de la Police*, at the Grand Palais, in 1955. This is the first time that any such exhibition has been mounted in the British Museum, and it is discussed in an article in this present issue of ANTIQUITY by Mrs Sonia Cole, whose own book on fakes and forgeries (*Counterfeit*, London, 1955) makes such good reading.

A former distinguished member of the staff of the British Museum, when given a preview of some of the exhibits as they were being assembled, said 'what fun it is when someone takes an enormous amount of trouble to be really naughty', and in a recent B.B.C.

ANTIQUITY

talk, Mr Cecil Gould, of the National Gallery, discussed the role of what he called 'superannuated schoolboy naughtiness' in the creation of fakes. There are some who have suggested that the Piltdown hoax started as such a piece of superannuated schoolboy naughtiness by a member of that fascinating group of young men led by Horace de Vere Cole who appeared here, there and everywhere—in Cambridge, in Portsmouth, in Piccadilly, variously disguised as the Shah of Persia, the Sultan of Zanzibar, or roadmenders. Mr Gould turned a pretty phrase when he said 'A fake only begins to be a fake when someone says it is genuine', and we were reminded of the American impresario who wanted to hire Rouchomowsky and the Tiara of Saitaphernes for a tour of American music halls, but only on condition that the French Government who had bought this piece of period jewellery in all good faith as antique, would give him a certificate that he was getting 'the genuine fake'. Mr Cecil Gould's talk has now been printed in *The Listener* for 6 April, 1961 under the title of 'The Ethics of Faking'. What were the ethics, and what the truth of the astonishing Piltdown affair? Is all yet known that can be known? Mr L. F. Salzman writes reminding us that this is the 50th anniversary of Charles Dawson's 'discovery' of Piltdown Man and says 'As 3 May is the "Feast of the Invention of the Holy Cross", I feel we might inaugurate a "Feast of the Invention of the unholy cross between Man and Monkey": April 1st seems a suitable date'.

Of course there are many reasons for forgery apart from schoolboy naughtiness, and while there is hope of monetary gain, and the existence of wealthy private collectors for whom the fact of ownership gives rise to passionate wilful thinking, we must be prepared for forgeries and deceptive copies in the whole field of art and archaeology from Palaeolithic Mural Art to Modern Painting, from Glouzel to Van Meegeren (there is a 'genuine' Van Meegeren, the only one in England, and lent by the Courtauld Institute, in this exhibition).

We should mention here two recent books on forgery. The first is by Guy Isnard and is called *Faux et Imitations dans l'art* (two volumes, Paris, Librairie Arthème Fayard, 1959, 1250 francs each volume) and a translation of Frank Arnau's *Kunst der Fälscher der Kunst* (Dusseldorf, 1959) just published in Great Britain (see *Book Chronicle*, p. 134). Arnau has a particularly illuminating and fair account of Malskat's work at Schleswig and Lubeck, and of the Fey-Malskat picture 'factory' which, after the end of the Second World War, poured out Barlachs, Chagalls, Utrillos, and Henri Rousseaus. Arnau has no dedication to his book, but merely prints before his foreword these two sentences: 'According to the enlarged edition of his *oeuvre* catalogue, Corot painted over 2,000 pictures. Of these more than 5,000 are in the United States.'¹



When, a few months ago, it looked for a short while as though ANTIQUITY might come to an end, as we described in our Editorial for March of this year, the present Editor found some slight solace in examining the history of British archaeological journals which had in the past set out to do the same things, or some of the same things, which Crawford achieved so well in ANTIQUITY between 1927 and 1957. If we exclude *The Gentleman's Magazine*, which for very long carried archaeological news and notes, the first journal in the melancholy chronicle of dead journals was *The Reliquary*, which began in 1860 under the editorship of Llewellyn Jewitt. *The Reliquary* had a splendid sub-title: 'A Depository for

¹ Cf. Sonia Cole's sentence, 'New York customs statistics revealed that over 103,000 Corots were imported from Europe over a period of twenty years during the present century! An eccentric old Frenchman bought up 2,000 of such' (*Counterfeit*, 13).

EDITORIAL

Precious Relics—Legendary, Biographical and Historical, illustrative of the habits, customs and pursuits of our forefathers.’ Ten years later, in 1871, there was founded a new journal, *The Antiquary*, described as ‘A fortnightly medium of inter-communication for Archaeologists, Antiquaries, Numismatists, the Virtuosi, and Collectors of Articles of Virtu and Curiosities’. It came to an end after a few years and was succeeded in 1880 by a new journal of the same name, usually referred to by bibliographers as ‘Walford’s *Antiquary*’, which described itself as ‘A Magazine devoted to the Study of the Past’.

Walford’s *Antiquary* included in the preface of the first number the original prospectus, which said: ‘In spite of the fact that this age lives so much in the present, worships progress so keenly, and looks forward to further progress so hopefully, there is in the breast of our “nation of shop-keepers” a deep-seated reverence for antiquity. . . . It is hoped that a Magazine devoted to the work of cherishing and fostering the antiquarian spirit in the various paths of inquiry and research, will meet with the support that it aspires to merit. *The Gentleman’s Magazine* has for some time ceased to fill the position which *Sylvanus Urban* once held as the organ of all students of Antiquity. . . .’ In 1894 there came into existence the nearest equivalent to a 19th-century version of ANTIQUITY, namely the journal called *The Illustrated Archaeologist*. It was edited by J. Romilly Allen and was sub-titled ‘A Quarterly Journal devoted to the Study of the Antiquities of Great Britain: the Development of the Arts and Industries of Man in Past Ages, and the Survival of Ancient Usages and Appliances in the Present’—a sub-title very near to the heart and purpose of Crawford and of his generation of anthropogeographically trained or interested archaeologists. The first volume of *The Illustrated Archaeologist* had Articles, Notes, Notes on Books and Notes on Museums; the very first article was called ‘A Very Ancient Industry’ and dealt with the flint knappers of Brandon—and contained a very clear diagram of the complicated way in which the modern miners reached the flint veins. The second volume was equally attractively produced and included articles on Stonehenge, the Meayll Stone Circle in the Isle of Man, and the 1893 excavations at Silchester.

The Illustrated Archaeologist amalgamated with *The Reliquary*, and from 1891 onwards there appeared *The Reliquary and Illustrated Archaeologist*, which described itself as ‘A Quarterly Journal and Review devoted to the Story of the Early Pagan and Christian Antiquities of Great Britain; Mediaeval Architecture and Ecclesiology; the Development of the Arts and Industries of Man in the Past Ages and the Survival of Ancient Usages and Appliances to the Present’—another very Crawford-like manifesto. *The Reliquary and Illustrated Archaeologist* was first edited by Romilly Allen and then, after his death in 1907, by the Reverend Dr J. Charles Cox, until it ceased publication with Volume XV in 1909. Walford’s *Antiquary* went on until 1915 and then died.



The immediate post-war period when British archaeology at home was being reorganized and revitalized by Fox, Wheeler, Kendrick, Childe and Crawford, and when great discoveries were being made all over the world from Folsom to Mohenjodaro, Harappa and Yang Shao Ts’un, had no popular archaeological journal. There was of course the *Illustrated London News*, but no *Reliquary*, no *Illustrated Archaeologist*, no *Antiquary* to describe Colonel Hawley’s excavations at Stonehenge, Campbell Thompson and Hall at Ur and Eridu, or Carter and Carnarvon’s discovery of Tutankhamen’s Tomb, or to review Crawford’s *Man and his Past*, Burkitt’s *Prehistory*, or Fox’s *Archaeology of the Cambridge Region*. It might be thought in the mid-twenties that something was bound to start sooner

ANTIQUITY

or later. So it did, in the form of *The Antiquarian Quarterly* in 1925, which, though describing itself as 'incorporating articles on archaeology and ancient art', was really a journal tied to the trade sale of antiques and produced by Messrs. Spinks. A second volume was produced in 1927, and then, it, too, died.

The year of the death of *The Antiquarian Quarterly* was the year of the birth of ANTIQUITY. Anyone who looks back through the volumes of the dead proto-Antiquities between 1860 and 1927 will see at once that Crawford modelled the format of his new journal on the earlier ones, although, unlike *The Reliquary and Illustrated Archaeologist* he did not use art paper throughout. Now why did ANTIQUITY succeed while the others had failed? And how did it manage to survive the 1939–45 war when Walford's *Antiquary* had been killed by the 1914–18 war? Was it the peculiar genius of its founder and first Editor? Or was it that by the late 'twenties there was at last an audience, sensed by Sir Bruce Ingram since 1900, for a clear and straightforward and immediate statement of the archaeological discoveries and the interpretation of history from them?—an audience which now supports *Archaeology*, *The Archaeological News Letter*, *Kuml*, *Skalk* and *L'Information archéologique*? It is too soon to say; after all, *The Reliquary* (if we count, as we must, its amalgamated period with *The Illustrated Archaeologist*) had a life of forty-seven years. ANTIQUITY itself is now in its thirty-fifth year, and has two more issues before it can claim to be as old as Walford's *Antiquary*, which died with its thirty-fifth volume, and twelve years to go before it equals the record of *The Reliquary*.



But, apart from records, it is pleasant to be able to say now that, despite the upheavals of 6 December, 1960–late January 1961, ANTIQUITY continues with a larger circulation than ever before, and over half of which is outside the British Isles. We welcome our many new subscribers and tell them as we tell our old supporters, that the September and December numbers will contain, *inter alia*, Professor Masson's account of the new Russian excavations at Anau, Dr Beatrice Blance's study of the Chalcolithic Colonization of Iberia, an evaluation by Dr Geoffrey Bushnell of the new light which Carbon-14 dating has thrown on the pattern of American prehistory, Professor Richard Atkinson on 'Neolithic Engineering', and Dr Gustav Riehm on 'Salt Mining and Trade in Prehistory.' The new discoveries of Dr Louis Leakey at Olduvai (*Nature*, 25 Feb., 1961, 649; *The New Scientist*, 2 March, 1961, 534) have aroused widespread interest and will be discussed in our September number by Dr Weiner and Dr Napier in the light of the conference in London on 12–14 May, organized by the Prehistoric Society.



We know only too well that the dislocation caused by changing publishing arrangements has meant some confusion to subscribers and a regrettable delay in dealing with administrative queries about subscriptions and back numbers. The Editor would be grateful if anyone who has a complaint or grievance about any requests for subscriptions, back numbers, indexes, etc., made in the last six months to which no satisfactory reply has been received would write direct to him or preferably to Heffers, 104, Hills Road, Cambridge, England, when they will be promptly dealt with. Will everyone now please note; no more correspondence to Mr Edwards of Ashmore Green, Newbury, Berkshire, and certainly no more to Dr Crawford at Nursling. (In the last week we received two books for review and three subscriptions addressed to Nursling.) And for those who are thinking of taking out

EDITORIAL

or renewing subscriptions, our publishing office is now *Heffers*, 104, *Hills Road, Cambridge*, and our Bank, *Barclays Bank, Bene't Street, Cambridge*.



One or two correspondents have criticized our use of in-text advertising. This was deliberate; no journal which is self-supporting can dispense with advertising, and advertisements in themselves are fascinating, at least when looked at after the passage of years. In turning over the pages of the many volumes of *The Reliquary*, *The Illustrated Archaeologist*, *The Antiquary* and other dead archaeological journals, we have been almost as fascinated with the advertisements as with anything else. Not only archaeological books were advertised, but sherry, armour, portable shelving, office-desks, paints, money-lenders, hop-tokens, sewing machines, cures for toothache, headache, and neuralgia (Hodge's *Sozodonta* . . . 'immediate and infallible'), sermon and manuscript paper, artificial teeth, Mr Nicholls' Patent *Volta Medical Cloth* (Simple! Natural! Effective! Greatly recommended by the Faculty), and Dr Carter Moffat's *Ammoniaphone* ('charged with a chemical compound combined so as to resemble in effect that which is produced by the SOFT BALMY air of the Italian peninsula when inhaled into the lungs—hence the term ARTIFICIAL ITALIAN AIR'). We cannot resist quoting the two finest examples we have found:

Anobium Eroditum, the devouring book-worm, turns up its nose (and its toes) at Stickphast Paste.

and this remarkable entry from *The Antiquary* for 1871:

Qualified Antiquaries, Archaeologists, Virtuosi, Numismatists, Clergymen, and Professors of Music or Arts aspiring to degrees of Foreign Universities may communicate with MEDICUS, 46, King Street, Jersey, who will send gratuitously instruction how to proceed.

This is obviously one of the addresses we must all keep in our special address books, like that of The Druid Universal Bond, which is 112, *Narbonne Avenue, London, S.W.4*.



Dr M. J. Aitken, of the Oxford University Research Laboratory for Archaeology and the History of Art, whose book *Physics and Archaeology* will be reviewed in the next number of *ANTIQUITY*, writes: 'We are keen to co-operate with field archaeologists who are excavating suitable kilns, furnaces and hearths etc. in Britain. If there is reliable evidence as to approximate whereabouts we are ready to assist in precise location by means of a proton magnetometer survey, but for reasons of economy and convenience, we are not keen to visit sites much more than a hundred miles from Oxford, except in special circumstances. . . . In considering the suitability of baked clay for the application of the technique of magnetic dating, the most important criterion is that the clay is still exactly in the position of its last firing. Secondly, several square feet of baked clay should be available (thickness is not so important, half an inch is enough) so that several 4 in. by 4 in. samples can be extracted. It is preferable to sample the floor of a structure, or as low down the walls as possible. Thirdly, the clay should be well burnt and not too friable to extract without crumbling. Sample-taking requires special apparatus and must be done by members of a laboratory skilled in this operation. It is necessarily destructive so that all photographing and drawing has to be finished first: satisfactory sampling of one structure usually takes a full day'. Dr Aitken adds that enquiries should be addressed to himself, or in his absence to Mr G. H. Weaver or Mr I. M. Cossar at 6 *Keble Road, Oxford* (Tel.: 552111).