Special section

Celebrating 75 years of ANTIQUITY

edited by CAROLINE MALONE & SIMON STODDART*

The Archaeological Review

If the scheme to found an archaeological quarterly should succeed, it will one day be of interest to know its inception. The idea was my own, and was suggested by the excellence of the old 'Archaeological Review' published during the eighties and edited by Gomme. This contained amongst other good things Sir Arthur Evans' article on Stonehenge (1885), and it was to read this that I referred to it. The idea, vaguely formed about the middle of November 1925, took more definite form in discussing it (for the first time) with Dr. Clay, with whom I was staying at Fovant November 19th to 25th. Somewhere about this time I wrote to Peake, to prepare him for a full discussion at Boxford, during the week-end December 12th to 14th. This discussion resulted in Peake's introducing me (by letter) to C.K. Ogden (of Cambridge and Kegan Paul's firm) who happened to be staying at the Royal Societies Club at the same time as Peake and myself. We had a long talk about the scheme there on the evening of December 17th, when a course of procedure was decided upon. Ogden was optimistic and thought Kegan Paul would help under certain conditions. While in town I also discussed the matter with the Keillers, who promised help. Last night and tonight I drew up a list of desirable contributors and contributions. The question of an editor is the crucial one and as yet undecided. Finance is of course a great difficulty but may be overcome by a guarantee.

Nursling OGSC December 19 1925
(Crawford Papers 104, Bodleian Library, Oxford)

So Crawford records the first steps in the foundation of the journal, which he only partly printed in his version of events (Crawford 1936: 385–6) in the 40th number of ANTIQUITY. We now celebrate 75 years of production of ANTIQUITY in number 294.

The Crawford archives in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, reveal that Crawford discussed the proposal with Simmons, a doctor friend, on Boxing Day and Sunday 27 December 1925. During these two days the significant decision was made to cut out the publisher and deal directly with a printer. That same tradition continues until the present day. The family firm of Bellows in Gloucester was chosen because of the good dealings Crawford had had with them in the publication of his study of Cotswold barrows, even though this book was published at some loss to the printers themselves (Crawford 1955: 161). Crawford wrote on 18 January 1926 to Bellows as follows:

The purpose, however, with which I am now writing is to open a discussion with you about a big scheme I am meditating over –– namely, to found a quarterly review of popular archaeology. . . . The problems to be solved are (1) the title (2) the price (3) the size and (4) the method of publication of the proposed review. . . . I am in favour, as soon as my address-lists are mobilized, of cutting out the publisher. As I have no funds of my own I should ask Mr. Keiller to guarantee me a sum of money sufficient to pay the printer's bill and all other expenses for the first year. . . . £600. I am particularly anxious that it should not come to the ears of a certain enterprising but rather objectionable person whom you may be able to call to mind! Further, I heard rumours that a similar scheme might be set on foot by the leader of a very unscrupulous school of archaeology (save the mark!) though I doubt it will see light.

On 8 February, Roland Austin was introduced to the scheme and it is to him that the journal owes its title. Austin wrote to Crawford on 14 February 1926: 'In the hundreds of names you may have discussed for the projected magazine, have you thought of ANTIQUITY. It has been in my mind for a few days and I find I get used to it. It is easy to pronounce . . .' Crawford records in the archive: 'On April 29th I wrote to Austin that "No better suggestions having been made, your's of ANTIQUITY wins the prize !"' On 18 February, Crawford had had lunch with Alexander Keiller. On 19 February, Keiller gave a crucial cheque for £100 to Crawford with the important promise to underwrite a certain level of losses. Crawford proudly recorded later that by 10 March 1928 this sum was repaid with £5 interest to Keiller,

* Malone, Department of Prehistoric & Early Europe, British Museum, London WC1B 3DG, England. cmalone@britishmuseum.ac.uk. Stoddart, Magdalene College, Cambridge CB3 0AG, England.

ANTIQUITY 76 (2002): 1063–5

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00091894 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a donor whose name was kept anonymous in Crawford's formal accounts of the foundation of ANTIQUITY (Crawford 1936: 385–90; 1955: 175–200)

The journal attracted rapid support through a dissemination of publicity of which Crawford was immensely proud (1955: 177):

> Subscribers have been got by the simple method asking them in a leaflet, to subscribe, pointing out the benefits which will follow. Those benefits are concisely stated in a leaflet, whose phraseology is composed with great care.

In January 1927, 20,000 prospectuses were posted. By 16 January 500–600 replies had been received. Crawford estimated that the first issue of 15 March had a subscription roster of 1270–1280 out of a total publication run of 1322 copies.

The journal thrived. It was only during the Second World War that continuous publication was threatened. The preoccupations are clear from the correspondence which survives. Although only the correspondence received by Crawford from Austin is extant in the Crawford archive, one can sense that it was Austin who worries and Crawford who optimistically persists. On 7 July 1940, Austin wrote to Crawford:

> At any rate whatever happens ANTIQUITY will die with decency. I have examined our probable finance to end of year and there will be some profit on 1940, though for the moment I have written off all outstanding subscriptions for the year. There are 85, and next week I make a final appeal with a few plain words about mitigating the troubles of having to apply so often. It is time we became stiff, just as the step taken with the French Navy showed that we are not quite so limpid as some people think.[1]

In a letter of 15 July 1940, Austin worries about invasion. In a letter of 11 August 1940, he worries about the potential absence of books to review, and the dangers of leaving 'my females at night'. By 17 November he is worrying about paper prices, the loss of subscriptions from occupied countries and 'Even envelopes for "A" have become a trouble. This wonderful Empire is indeed in curious state!'

One can sense the productive, yet dynamic tension between Austin, the production editor, and Crawford, the editor, in the letters. Each part of the team kept the project alive. And it is too easy to forget the team behind the project. On 12 March 1943, Austin wrote:

> I am quite sure this remarkable weather of 1943 is pleasing you but I would like you to give a little consideration to the Journal which bears your name. . . . But it is well to warn you. By some miracle we have always managed to fill the measure, but it does not get any easier.

All editors of ANTIQUITY must have received similar reminders that the copy is due ! At the end of the war, subscriptions recovered substantially, but the relationship with Austin came to a crisis. On 24 October 1948, Austin wrote:

> OGS. I feel compelled to ask what the procedure for the December number will be. Though you have ignored me I am still part of ANTIQUITY, even to the name which was made by me.

Crawford tactfully records in his autobiography that Austin retired through ill-health (Crawford 1955: 296). A letter of 24 October 1948 from Gerhard Bersu to Cecil Curwen, in the Bodleian archives, reveals a more complicated picture.

> As one of Crawford's most intimate friends — I think I am entitled to say this — I always hear a good deal about the affairs of Antiquity behind the scenes. When Crawford came to Dublin early this year, he asked my advice about troubles which he had with Austin. I gather from his letters that since then the position has become worse. Indeed, any reader of the recent issues of Antiquity can see from many details as misprints and so on that there is something wrong in the editorship of the journal. I have the feeling that Austin is getting rather old. Obstinate as old men sometimes are he may overestimate his powers to be able to attend [to] Antiquity as he did in previous years and in years when circumstances were not so difficult as they are now. There is no doubt that Crawford is the personality of the two who, by his gifts, connections and wide knowledge, is the personality of the two [*sic*] to whom we owe the standard and even the existence of Antiquity in these strained times. On the other hand, Crawford who can be also rather obstinate had fortunately in Austin someone who complemented him very well by looking after details and matters of routine which are not so much in Crawford's line. I am afraid that the present relations of Crawford with Austin may even endanger the future of Antiquity. I think it would be a serious loss to archaeology if Antiquity would cease to exist and I am afraid the impasse in their relations may lead to such an eventuality. I have the feeling if someone like you who knows both, Crawford and Austin, well (as you do) and who has been continuously connected with Antiquity from the very start could take an interest in this matter, things could be

1 The French navy had been sunk to avoid use by the enemy!

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00091894 Published online by Cambridge University Press

steadied or a solution could be arrived at for the continued prospering of Antiquity. I know it is rather impudent for me as a foreigner . . .

Curwen intervened and Austin was persuaded to retire. In 1949, a limited company was set up in partnership with Harold Edwards, the Bookseller. The simple title *Antiquity Ltd* has already been taken, in much the same way as we, the current editors, found that *Antiquity.org* had already been taken in more recent times.

The celebratory papers presented here take the longer view of the history of ANTIQUITY. After the words of introduction by the President of the SAA, **Bob Kelly**, **Colin Renfrew** emphasizes the global vision of ANTIQUITY from its very start. As a previous Disney professor from Cambridge put it in comparison with no less a person than Childe, Crawford 'may fairly claim to have beckoned us to the more spacious realms of world prehistory' (Clark 1959: 9–12). **Caroline Malone** stresses the independence of Antiquity — it is a journal that is entrusted to its editor, constrained by no society or committee; thus editors and contributors are permitted to speak their mind. **Christopher Chippindale** investigates the implicit tension between generalization and particularization that can be considered almost inevitable in a journal that aims for a general, world-wide readership. **Simon Stoddart** later echoes this idea by taking two specific themes — the generalizing landscape and the particularizing Celts — as illustrations of differing trends in the content of ANTIQUITY. **Paul Pettitt** concentrates on the Crawford years in his discussion of early humanity, since it was then that modern concepts of evolution were also coming to fruition. **Alison Sheridan**, faced with an encylopaedic task — the study of the Old World — focuses on the anecdotal qualities of ANTIQUITY and the dangers of taking ourselves too seriously as scholars of the past. This is a lesson to all of us. **Elizabeth DeMarrais** underlines the dialogue between the two sides of the Atlantic that has developed in the last two editorships. A commitment to a presence at the SAA has been important part of this trend, and our celebration of 75 years has been deliberately staged in three locations which develop this dialogue: an anniversary Quiz at a European TAG (Theoretical Archaeology Group in Dublin), a symposium at the SAA in Denver and a smaller occasion at the most British of institutions, the Society of Antiquaries of London. **Timothy Darvill** investigates the essentially practical foundations of ANTIQUITY, by Crawford, a fieldworker. **Barry Cunliffe** links the development of the study of British archaeology to the development of ANTIQUITY, supported by that key network of scholars.

Anthony Snodgrass provides a specific study of Classical archaeology — Romano-British archaeology — centred round the personality of Mortimer Wheeler, who through the pages of ANTIQUITY gave the lead to important changes. In a broader framework, **Nicola Terrenato** writes a highly stimulating account of the relationship of ANTIQUITY to Classical archaeology, making an implicit link to the famous article of Stephen Dyson written for the SAA celebrations of 1985. It is the type of comparison of which Crawford would have approved, although significantly, when he chose to compare the content of three journals to ANTIQUITY in one of his editorials (1951: 113–17), he chose the *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, *Germania* and *L'Anthropologie*, not all of which would be on the reading lists of world archaeologists. As Colin Renfrew makes clear, the aspiration (and content) of ANTIQUITY is different from the two major American journals compared by Stephen Dyson. *American Antiquity* has concentrated on the Americas, albeit with a strong predilection (Dyson 1985: 453) for analytical method, cultural process and theory. The *Journal of American Archaeology* has concentrated on the Classical Old World, accompanied by a strong interest in material culture, epigraphy, architecture and iconography. ANTIQUITY has aimed to bridge these networks of interests by providing material for all.

The collection closes with two comparisons, one from the current editor of *American Antiquity*, **Timothy Kohler**, the other from **Brian Fagan**. This is an engaging comparison. Timothy Kohler points out the strengths and weaknesses of the two traditions. Brian Fagan emphasizes the need for ecclecticism and communication, which ANTIQUITY, at its best, has always sustained.

References

CLARK, G. 1959. Presidential Address; perspectives in prehistory, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 25: 1–14.

CRAWFORD, O.G.S. 1936. Editorial Notes, *Antiquity* 10: 385–90.

1951. Editorial Notes, *Antiquity* 25: 113–17.

1955. *Said and Done*. London: Phoenix House.

DYSON, S. 1985. Two paths to the past: a comparative study of the last fifty years of American Antiquity and American Journal of Archaeology, *American Antiquity* 50: 452–63.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00091894 Published online by Cambridge University Press