

## KENT IN RELATION TO THE ETHNOGRAPHIC SURVEY.<sup>1</sup>

By E. W. BRABROOK, F.S.A., President of the Anthropological Institute.

The evidence of human occupation in Kent goes back literally to the remotest antiquity; and it is reasonable to infer that there was human occupation there in times which have left no evidence of it behind them. Before man began to practise even the rude art of shaping flints he probably availed himself of the advantages which the upright position he had acquired gave him, and of the weapons which nature placed within his reach, and flung stones at any animal he wished to kill. The discovery that a stone would be better for a sharp edge, and that such an edge could be given it by knocking it with sufficient force and smartness against another stone, would be made in due course after some interval of time, long or short. The human mind, excellent instrument as it is, works so slowly that it may have been a long time. At any rate, this discovery was made in Kent; and by all that we can judge from, as early in Kent as anywhere.

Sir Joseph Prestwich, whose recent death full of years and honours leaves a great void in the scientific world, explored the chalk plateau for twenty miles—from Titsey on the west side of the Darent valley to Punish on the east, and recorded fifty different localities in which flint implements have been found. Ninety-five per cent. of the specimens consisted merely of flints slightly trimmed. He accordingly suggested that they were the work of a more primitive and ruder race than that which fabricated the palæolithic implements of the valley drift. Indeed, he went further, and conjectured that as these rough implements appear to have been carried down, with the southern drift, on to the plateau from Central Wealden uplands, which in his estimate might in pre-glacial times, before the denudation of the Weald, have formed a low mountain range 2,000 to 3,000 feet in height, it is possible they may have to be relegated to a very early period

indeed. That, however, he left as a question for the future.

The documents which Sir Joseph Prestwich adduced in support of his theory were 1,277 implements collected mainly by Mr. B. Harrison on the east side of the Darent, and 236 collected mainly by Mr. De B. Crawshay on its west side. Upon these several questions arose: first, were they (as regards the majority of them, excluding those which are obviously of the ordinary palæolithic type) of human workmanship at all? Here the great authority of Sir John Evans was ranged on the negative. He attributed the apparent chipping of their edges to the agency of nature. Second, assuming them to be the work of man, is their rudeness an index of their antiquity? Upon this Professor Boyd Dawkins adduced some cogent instances to the contrary. Third, assuming them to be the work of man, and that the presumptions are in favour of their antiquity, ought we to be satisfied with the evidence, and ought we not to suspend our judgment till more conclusive discoveries have been made? General Pitt Rivers argued that we had better wait; but at the same time he observed, with great force, that "he had always thought that a time would come when implements of a ruder type than those of the river drifts would be discovered. It was hardly reasonable to suppose that implements of the high finish and form of some of the known palæolithic ones should be the earliest implements contrived by man. A single chip or a couple of chips off a rude nodule of flint would be sufficient to constitute a useful tool for some purposes, and at the time of the very first commencement of the arts, probably the ideas of man would go no further."

Since then Mr. T. Bell has enforced the same conclusion in an excellent paper read before the Anthropological Institute; and has shown that in the Oxford Museum there are implements used by savages in Tasmania and South Africa within recent times which correspond to those of this pre-palæolithic stage.

However this may be, and *non nostrum est tantas componere lites*, there is no question but that Kent is largely productive of relics of the palæolithic period. Mr. Worthington Smith found at Canterbury two flint implements

of a very old type, which are now in the possession of Sir John Evans and of the British Museum respectively. They were deeply ochreous and greatly abraded. Sir J. Evans and Sir J. Prestwich found some fine specimens at Hythe Bay and Reculver (*Arch.*, XXXIX). Among those in Mr. Harrison's possession is one found at South Ash, described by Sir Joseph Prestwich as most carefully fashioned, six inches long by three and a-half wide, of the thin flat spatula-shaped form and of a bright yellow colour. At Ightham, Erith, and Hayes, Mr. Spurrell has found numerous specimens, which have been described by him in the *Archæologia Cantiana*. Mr. Stopes has collected an enormous number from the river gravels at Swanscombe. Others from Chartham, Chilham, and Petham are among the collections of the Kent Archaeological Society.

This leads to the observation that palæolithic man has not only left relics of his workmanship, but remains of his personality. In a gravel pit at Galley-hill, near Swanscombe, considerable portions of a skeleton were discovered in the year 1888, but unfortunately were not described until the year 1895, when they were entrusted to the most competent hands of Mr. E. T. Newton, F.R.S. The evidence that these bones are the remains of palæolithic man rests partly on the appearance of the bones themselves, but mainly on the testimony of two intelligent and respectable persons by whom they were seen *in situ*. The skull is extremely long in proportion to its width; the supraciliary ridges are strongly developed; the sutures are completely obliterated both internally and externally. The forehead is only moderately receding.

In these features the skull possessed a considerable degree of resemblance to two skulls found in a cave at Spy, near Namur, in Belgium, and to the famous Neanderthal skull. It also in various particulars resembles closely a skull of great antiquity found in a river bed at Borris in Ireland. We shall probably be wise if we leave the case there. At the same time, if (which is not very likely) we should happen to meet a man of Kent, or Kentish man, with an extremely long and narrow skull, much flattened in at the sides, and with

strongly projecting eyebrows, we shall be justified in asking his leave to measure him, as a specimen presenting symptoms of a return to the very earliest type of people of whom we know anything as having inhabited Kent. The grinding teeth of the individual were well worn, and indicated a person of something like middle age, but the other bones discovered do not appear to have presented any peculiarities which help us to a conjectural restoration of him.

Mr. Worthington Smith has, however, put together all the indications we have of what palæolithic man was like in a very ingenious manner. He paints him as shorter in stature, bigger in the belly, broader in the back, and less upright than man of the present day. He has but little calf to his legs. The females are considerably shorter than the males. The old men and children are hairy, like the Ainos of the present day. The foreheads recede, the large bushy red eyebrows meet over the nose, the brows are heavy and deeply overshadow the eyes. Many of the women have whiskers, beards, and moustaches. The noses are large and flat, with big nostrils. The teeth project slightly in a muzzle-like fashion; the lower jaws are massive and powerful, and the chins slightly recede. The ears are pointed, and generally without lobes at the base. I do not follow Mr. Smith any further into his description of their manners and customs, though strongly tempted to do so.

We now approach another question that has been much discussed. How is the interval between the palæolithic and neolithic ages to be filled up? Mr. Allen Brown answers it by urging that there is no such interval; that the palæolithic and neolithic periods are continuous, and asks why it should be otherwise. He points to the fact that in the valleys at West Wickham, Mr. Clinch (who now worthily fills the office of clerk to the Society of Antiquaries) found palæolithic implements stained with ochreous deposit, and that neolithic implements have been found in the same place. Mr. Clinch has described these discoveries in the eleventh volume of the second series of the *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries*. Mr. Brown specialises a great number of forms of implements as being an intermediate type, to which he gives the

name of mesolithic. He thus affirms a continuity of man's existence between the two periods.

Professor Boyd Dawkins, on the other hand, has argued that the two periods are separated from each other by a revolution in climate, geography, and in animal life. He acknowledges that the evolution of the Neolithic from the Palæolithic stage of culture in some part of the world may be accepted as a high probability, although we may be unable to fix with precision the land where this transition took place; but wherever it was, he holds that it was not in this country. Palæolithic man was a rude hunter; neolithic man a herdsman and tiller of the ground, and the remains of each are associated with those of animals suited to their different characters. Between the two, in his opinion, there is a great gulf fixed. The discovery of the ruder forms of implement is not inconsistent with their belonging to the neolithic period. These doctrines are also held by Dr. Munro in his delightful work on Bosnia and the Herzegovina, just published; by Sir Henry Howorth, and by other writers of eminence.

There is no contesting this weight of authority; but we cannot help thinking that the other side of the argument possesses the height of probability. Let it be granted that in palæolithic times England was joined to the Continent, and that by the neolithic period it had become an island—that the fauna of the two periods are different in character—and that very little evidence has yet come to light of the intermediate forms—one cannot but think it more highly probable that such intermediate forms existed, and that a continuity of human existence was kept up, than that there was some huge cataclysm which swept away the palæolithic people, and left England untenanted during the long lapse of time which has to be allowed to have passed between the one period and the other.

The ethnology of Kent, therefore, during the interval between the palæolithic and the neolithic periods is a subject on which it is premature to express any opinion. We have little evidence that any people occupied it, and none as to what sort of people they were. Whether they continued gradually improving their implements and

changing their habits, working out their own progress towards better things, or whether during a long period of time the county remained unoccupied, must be held to be a question on which we await further evidence. We find it difficult to realise a state of things where human and animal life was suspended, and suspect, rather, that as the ages rolled on man and beast alike became modified to suit the changed requirements of their surroundings.

The neolithic period in Kent has not yielded human remains, but only remains of human workmanship, and the same remark may apply to the long stretch of time which we may call the Celtic period, and corresponds with the bronze age. A glance at Mr. Payne's excellent map, and still more useful archæological survey of the county shows how considerable are the remains of human workmanship belonging to this period. The whole county except the Weald is freely marked with the symbol (E), representing earthworks and oppida, and the blue marks, representing pre-Roman antiquities, are frequent. The topographical index shows many discoveries of implements and weapons of bronze, ornaments of gold, and coins belonging to this period. In Kent, however, recorded discoveries of human remains are comparatively infrequent. The great ossuary at Hythe belongs to a much later time, and is quite inconclusive. Professor Flinders Petrie has examined about fifty of the seventy earthworks which he found referred to in various maps and works on Kent. He describes the enclosures, entrenchments, pit villages and tumuli on Hayes Common as the finest in Kent for their extent, their preservation, and the great number of pit dwellings, exceeding 150. In fact, he says, they cannot probably be matched nearer than Wiltshire or Dorsetshire.

Upon this hint we may perhaps be permitted, in the absence of direct evidence from Kent itself, to refer to the discoveries of General Pitt-Rivers on his estates in Wiltshire. He discovered, in the two villages of Woodcuts and Rotherley and in the pit near Park House, in Rushmore Park, the bones of a race whose stature did not exceed 5 feet  $2\frac{3}{4}$  inches for the males and 4 feet  $10\frac{9}{16}$  inches for the females.

He asked, are these the survivors of the neolithic



population which, after being driven westward by successive races of Celts and others, continued to exist in the out-of-the-way parts of this region up to Roman times? and found some justification for the hypothesis that they were in the crouched position of the interments and their markedly dolichocephalic and hyper-dolichocephalic skulls. The meaning of this is that the cephalic index varies from 689 to 799. The cephalic index of the Galley-hill skull as it now appears is, as nearly as can be measured, 640. On the other hand, he suggested that they might be simply the remnants of a larger race of Britons, deteriorated by slavery and reduced in stature by the drafting of their largest men into the Roman legions abroad, a view which might perhaps be supported by the comparatively large size of the females. The meaning of this is that, as compared with skeletons at Frilford of about the same period, measured by Professor Rolleston, while the men are six inches shorter, the women are about the same height.

If the first theory be correct we have a continuance of race from neolithic to Roman times, through successive invasions. If the second theory be correct we may, it is presumed, take these remains as probably belonging to the later Celtic or Brythonic races. Whether the earlier Celtic or Goidelic races ever occupied Kent there is little to show. Professor Rhys intimates that their position to the west and north of the others affords a sort of presumption that they were found occupying the county when the Brythons or Gauls came and drove them westward, and that they had probably occupied it for centuries, having themselves driven before them the neolithic peoples who preceded them. He refers to the visit of Pytheas to Kent about 330 B.C. on a mission from the merchants of Marseilles, when he found a thriving agricultural community, making and drinking mead and beer, and ready and willing to enter upon trading relations with the Greek merchants who commissioned him.

Sir John Evans tells us that gold coins were struck in Kent as early as the second century before Christ, and Dr. Rhys mentions the curious circumstance that they were all modelled after Greek coins of the time of Pytheas,

which was nearly two centuries earlier. Nothing could more strikingly indicate the slow and gradual and yet certain and important advance in the arts caused by commerce and by intercourse with the Continent. The people with whom Pytheas opened up relations were not savages to be propitiated by trumpery ornaments or bits of tinsel, but knew the value of money, and in due course saw the advantage to them of striking their own coins, and acquired the art of doing so. Professor Boyd Dawkins has shown cause to think that iron mining was carried on in the Weald as early as this period.

Among the collections of the Kent Archæological Society is a magnificent series of gold armillæ and torques in the highest state of preservation. Four armillæ of solid gold, weighing from 1 oz. 10 dwts. to 2 ozs. 12 dwts. were found in the Medway below Aylesford in 1861. One weighing as much as 22 ozs. 4 dwts. is now in the British Museum, and was figured in the thirtieth volume of the *Archæological Journal*. Three torques (one broken) are also in the collection of the Kent Society, and have been described by Mr. Roach Smith in Vol. IX of the *Archæologia Cantiana*. So highly does the Society prize these precious objects that it has deposited them in a cabinet at its bankers, where they can be seen by special arrangement.

The next stage in Kentish history which involves an ethnological development is the landing of Cæsar at Dover. That great soldier gives us little information about the people themselves, but the slight indications we derive from his narrative are all in their favour. He found them awaiting his arrival in force displayed to view on all the hills: "in omnibus collibus expositas hostium copias armatas conspexit." When he sought to land he found cavalry and chariots ready to endeavour to prevent him. They had an advantage over his soldiers in the free use of their limbs, unencumbered by the heavy armour the Romans wore, and in their better acquaintance with the ground.

He speaks well of their military tactics. "Being well acquainted with all the shallows, when from the shore they observed any single persons coming out of a ship, putting spurs to their horses they would set upon them



while encumbered in the water; a great number would surround a few; and others at an open flank would shower in darts upon multitudes." So that Cæsar did not at first obtain his wonted success "*hoc ad pristinam fortunam Cæsari defuit.*" Nor were the natives crushed by their first defeat; for "as they knew that cavalry and ships and corn were wanting to the Romans, and could guess at the paucity of their soldiers by the smallness of their camp, the leaders of the Britons resolved to cut off the Romans from corn and provisions and prolong the campaign till winter." The men of the Seventh Legion being sent out to forage was overcharged by the Britons and scarce able to stand their ground; the natives had awaited their arrival all night in the woods, and poured in darts upon them when they had scattered and laid aside their arms and were busy reaping the corn they had not sowed.

Cæsar also describes their tactics in fighting from their chariots in terms of admiration. "*Ita mobilitatem equitum, stabilitatem peditum, in præliis præstant.*" "By daily experience and practice they become so expert, that they are accustomed on declining and sloping ground to check their horses at full gallop and quickly manage and turn them and run along the pole and rest on the harness and from thence with great nimbleness leap back into the chariot." The Romans found that these people, rightly struggling to retain their freedom, were not despicable foes. "*In perpetuum sui liberandi facultas daretur, si Romanos castris expulissent, demonstraverunt.*" Cæsar's soldiers "having demolished and burnt everything a great way round" left for the winter.

Cæsar found four Kings in Kent; and Kent, which was the first portion of the country to adopt a gold coinage of its own, was also the first to inscribe its coins with letters as early as 30 B.C. This is a further evidence of the receptiveness of the people. Indeed, in discussing the ethnology of Kent, it is to be borne in mind that, as the nearest point to the Continent, it has been from the earliest times to our own day the part of England to which the foreigner, whether invader or visitor or merchant, naturally gravitates; and that here, therefore, the influence of the foreigner, whether in actual admix-

ture of blood or in the adoption of his ways of thinking and acting, may be expected to be considerable. The Kentish corner of the country may therefore be expected to be in advance of the rest of it in civilisation.

My late friend Mr. Henry Shaw, in a letter which he wrote to me in 1870, lamenting the tendency of the antiquaries of that day to cram us with "remote evidences of barbarism, varied only with discussions tending to prove by evidences on the earth and under the earth that all our civilisation is of Roman origin," said: "I have no doubt that our physical beauty has been much improved by the savage soldiers, who so long ruled over us, having condescended to cross the natives, which is shown by the number of Roman noses we meet with. Where the pugs come from I can form no opinion." That very accomplished artist and authority on the dresses and decorations of the Middle Ages did not affect to be learned in races, but his humorous remark may serve to show the usefulness of obtaining exact observations on physical peculiarities.

The Roman occupation of 500 years undoubtedly effected great changes in the aspect of the country and the manners and customs of the people. Some interesting Roman interments were discovered in this city south of the Stour by Mr. Pilbrow, and are described in Vol. XLIII of *Archæologia*. In the German invasions which took place after the Romans withdrew, Kent fell, about the year 449, to the Jutes. Mr. Coote maintains that at and after the departure of the Imperial authorities the language spoken in all the cities of Britain, and by the upper and middle classes, was Latin. He founds upon this observation, and upon the testimony of Paulus Diaconus, the theory that Vortegern or Wyrtegeorn, and not Hengest, was the real leader of the Jutes and invader of Kent. He doubts whether there was a King of the Britons at this time, and does not suggest by whom the invitation, stated by Bede and the *Anglo Saxon Chronicle* to have been given by Vortegern to Hengest, was in fact given to Vortegern.

Mr. Park Harrison, in 1882, was struck, when visiting Kent, with certain peculiarities in the physiognomy of a portion of the population round Canterbury, which he

suspected might be due to Jutish blood. He collected some photographs, and fortified his opinion by that of Dr. Beddoe. He describes the peculiarity of the Jutish features as in the form of the nose and mouth. There is no nasal point or tip or bulb, but the end of the nose is rounded off somewhat sharply, and the septum descends considerably below the line of the nostrils. The lips are less moulded or formed than in the Saxon type, the lower lip being thick and deep. He thought the Jutish profile resembled that commonly sculptured in Assyrian marbles. That they were different in race-origin from the Saxons would seem to be confirmed by the circumstance that the objects found in Kentish graves differ from those in Saxon cemeteries.

Sir Henry Howorth argues that the Jutes and Frisians were the same people, and that we may therefore expect to find some resemblance between the people of Kent where the Jutes settled and those of Dumfriesshire where there was a Frisian invasion. Dr. Walter Gregor has recently been conducting an ethnographic survey in Dumfriesshire, and it will be interesting to see whether this view is confirmed. In all these matters there is much obscurity, as the terms Jute, Angle, and Saxon are used without discrimination, and the chronology of the period is confused. Sir Henry thinks that previous to the fifth century there had been a gradual colonisation, and that the Roman-British and Saxon peoples had been gradually intermixing for a hundred years before, an opinion which was held by the late Thomas Wright.

Mr. Coote, in his valuable work *The Romans of Britain*, shows that the number of the Jutish invaders or colonisers could never have been large. The geography of Jutland demonstrates that its resources in respect of population must have been small. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that they did not impose their own name upon their new country, but, on the contrary, appropriated to themselves the old native name, calling themselves Cantware and Centingas. Little more than a generation after they had made good the foundation of their new kingdom of Kent, they were too weak to retain London and Middlesex, and lost that jewel of their crown to the Saxons, who founded the kingdom of Essex. This

renders entirely untenable the theory of an extermination of the original inhabitants.

I am aware that these views are not popular, and are not even considered orthodox, but I do not think much the worse of them for that. The accepted view that the Jutes effected a complete expulsion of the Britons from Kent is not supported either by probability or by evidence. The impenetrable Weald must have sheltered many of the inhabitants, and the "merciless swords" of the savages, whom Mr. Green takes a pride in calling our fathers, however thoroughly they did their work, cannot have "swept utterly away" a resourceful and civilised population. All that Bede says is that "some, spent with hunger, came forth and submitted themselves to the enemy for food, being destined to undergo perpetual servitude, if they were not killed. Others led a miserable life among the woods, rocks, and mountains, with scarcely enough food to support life." A large discount is always to be taken from stories of bloodshed and extermination.

I need not refer to the landing at Ebbsfleet or the battles of Crayford and Aylesford. The Jutes never had a peaceable time here. Besides constant wars with their kindred races who had settled in other parts of Britain, they were harried by Danes and by pirates from Ireland. This corner of the country was too wealthy and too easily accessible to be left alone. They were in a very vulnerable condition. The settled part of the county passed through many political changes: at one time sub-divided among a number of petty chiefs; at another absorbed in a kingdom extending over many adjacent counties; at another extending itself along the Weald over the territories of the other tribes.

Nor need I refer to what was perhaps the principal event of this period, and is especially connected with the history of this city—the mission of Augustine. However important it was in many respects, it had no ethnological significance. The companions of Augustine were not in a condition to introduce any new racial element. No one will deny that the mission had far-reaching social and religious consequences, but for the present purpose it cannot be taken as qualifying in any way the evolution of the English race.

We can therefore pass on to the arrival of William the Norman. It is true that he did not, like Cæsar and the Jutes, land in Kent; but the Kentish men were in the front of the battle at Senlac. After that decisive battle, the punitive expedition to Romney and the capture of Dover Castle quickly followed; and Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, was made Governor of Kent. Domesday Book shows the distribution of the lands of Kent among the Normans. It has never been suggested, however, that the settlement of the Normans in their castles and territories drove out or exterminated the English, as it is alleged the Jutes drove out and exterminated the Britons. On the contrary, many English landowners remained tenants under the Norman lords. The distinction between the two races was maintained up to 1340 by the old law of presentment of Englescherie.

Since the Norman Conquest we have had many invasions of Kent, but of a friendly character. We are, indeed, subject to daily invasion as the Dover boats land their cargo of passengers. Perhaps the most interesting foreign settlement is that of the Huguenots after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, of which there is so interesting a memorial in the continuance to this day of their Protestant worship in their own chapel in the crypt of Canterbury Cathedral. The Huguenot Society does excellent work in cherishing the memory of these good men and women, and placing on record the great debt we owe them. One item in that indebtedness lies in the fact that they were the originators of the modern form of Friendly Society.

The question will probably be asked—having regard to all this mixture of races that has been going on so long—what is the use of an ethnographic survey of Kent? In order to answer it, it is perhaps desirable that I should set forth briefly what the Ethnographic Survey is, and how it proceeds. It arose out of a suggestion by Professor Haddon, addressed to various bodies that deal with Anthropology, Archæology, and Folk Lore, that for the purpose of ascertaining what man is in any district, the whole man has to be studied. You must not merely measure his skull and record his physical characters, but you must look up the history of his descent, find out from the remains of their workmanship what sort of people his forbears were, and

ascertain what superstitions and beliefs they have transmitted to him.

It is accordingly proposed to record for certain typical villages, parishes, and places and their vicinity (1) physical types of the inhabitants; (2) current traditions and beliefs; (3) peculiarities of dialect; (4) monuments and other remains of ancient culture, and (5) historical evidence as to continuity of race. The first step which the Survey Committee took was to form a list of such places in the United Kingdom as appear especially to deserve ethnographic study. A list of 367 such places was made, but no one suggested any place in the County of Kent. This neglect is probably due to the sense that the population of Kent has become so mixed by the changes to which I have referred that no village or place in it could be said to be typical.

The kind of village or place which the Committee considered would be suitable for survey is such as contains not less than 100 adults, the large majority of whose forefathers have lived there so far back as can be traced, and of whom the proposed physical measurements, with photographs, might be obtained. It is no doubt desirable to exclude places where there has been a modern intermixture of race, and it is therefore suggested that at least three generations should be clearly traced; but it would be neither possible nor desirable to exclude mixtures of race taking place in ancient times. I cannot but think there must be many places in Kent which would answer such a test as this, and would be eminently suitable for survey.

No doubt the populous places in North and West Kent would not be very serviceable for the purpose, but there are many villages in Mid Kent and East Kent where, up to these railway days, the people have lived quietly by themselves, and pursued generation after generation their labours of husbandry or other occupations without much immigration or emigration. If it be true, as I cannot but suspect, that from the earliest times to the present there has been a continuity of population, subject to frequent modification from the causes to which I have referred, but never entirely dying out, the resulting race, though it be a mixed race, will still be the expression of the soil,



and it will be well worth while to observe and record its characteristics.

One part of the Survey, that relating to monuments and remains of ancient culture, is happily complete. The valuable Archæological Survey of the County of Kent by Mr. George Payne, who is one of the representatives of the Society of Antiquaries on the Ethnographical Survey Committee, leaves nothing to be desired in that regard. The map shows at a glance what discoveries have already been made, and distinguishes by colour the period to which they belong, and by form the nature of the thing found. At a glance one can see that the whole county is dotted with earthworks, that megalithic remains are in the neighbourhood of Addington and along from Aylesford towards Chatham, that pre-Roman antiquities have been met with in many of the ancient villages, that Roman remains cluster along the lines of the great roads and the principal cities and stations, and that the Anglo-Saxon element is especially strong in the eastern portion of the county.

With such guidance, it will be easy to select the villages where it would be worth while to take physical measurements and endeavour to collect folk-lore. Investigations into dialect would probably not be very successful; but the simple directions drawn up by Professor Skeat at the request of the Committee for the guidance of the enquirer may well be borne in mind; and the evidence recently published by Professor Skeat, that the Kentish dialect retained in 1611 certain peculiarities which it possessed in 1340, and has not now, shows that information of a negative character may at least be obtained. Some suggestions as to the points to which attention might usefully be given in respect of local history are also contained in the brief code of questions which the Committee has drawn up, and which embodies in a pamphlet of twelve pages a most comprehensive and exhaustive enquiry.

The portion of the enquiry which relates to folk-lore has in other counties been to a large extent anticipated by the action of the Folk Lore Society, but not so in Kent. I think it probable that there is much Kentish folk-lore scattered about in local histories and other printed works;

but no one has yet, so far as I am aware, been at the pains to gather it together. Old Aubrey, or rather the Rev. White Kennett, his annotator, tells us that "the way of chusing Valentines by making little furrows in the ashes and imposing such and such names on each line or furrow is practist in Kent"; that women when they have kneaded their dough into a loaf cut the form of a cross upon it; that a whipping Tom was talked of to frighten maids from wandering; that "putting of iron upon barrles of drink to keep it from sowing when it thunders is a common practise"; and so forth.

In the various papers read before and published by the Folk Lore Society, I can find little relating to this county. The Rev. Mr. Birks reported to Mr. J. G. Frazer the existence of a custom in Orwell to throw water on the last waggon returning from the harvest field, and for the men in the waggon to throw water on those they met. Some weather-lore from Kent is also noted, as that the flowering of the blackthorn in April is followed by cold weather; but the other references to Kent are few; nor are many more to be found among the miscellaneous contents of the *Gentleman's Magazine*.

A writer in the *Spectator* of 8th June, 1889, recorded the extraordinary belief of an old man in East Kent that if you take a hair in summer from the tail of a horse and place it in a running stream, it will before long become a watersnake or an eel. By what occult process of nature this wonderful transformation was to be effected he did not explain. It is not easy to think that such a belief can ever have been very widely spread, even among the most ignorant. The old man condescended to particulars, and said the root of the hair would become the head of the fish.

It would seem, therefore, that in respect of folk-lore the ethnographic enquirer has almost virgin ground to work, and one cannot but think that research in this direction would be rewarded with valuable results. Mr. Clinch, in his work on Bromley, states that the custom of ringing the Pancake Bell on Shrove Tuesday was still, in 1889, when he wrote, observed at Bromley Church, and that tradition affirms that the ringer of the bell was supposed to be entitled to receive one pancake from each house in

the town. The tradition does not state whether he was required to consume them all, and with what consequences.

There must be existing in Kent memories of quaint customs which would be worthy of enquiry and record. We know, of course, with regard to tenure of land, that Kent has at this day its special tenure of gravelkind, which commends itself so much to our notions of justice, that all the sons alike shall succeed to the inheritance, and not the eldest son alone. This is a custom of which the law takes particular notice. Details of the customs relating to this tenure may be found in the *Consuetudines Kantiae*, and in Elton's *Tenures of Kent*. Kent is also distinguished from other counties by its division into lathes.

The collection of physical observations and of photographs is another important part of the Survey. For this careful instructions have been drawn up by Dr. Garson and Professor Haddon. Dr. Garson is the medical man who has been appointed by Government to instruct the officers of the Prisons Department in the system of anthropometric measurement known as Bertillonage, and in that of identification by finger prints advocated by Dr. Francis Galton. The instructions, therefore, for which he has made himself responsible, may be taken as authoritative.

All the necessary measurements can be obtained with a small equipment of instruments, consisting of a two-metre tape, a pair of folding callipers, a folding square, all graduated in millimetres, and a small set square. Such a set is on the table, and the Committee is prepared to lend such a set to any observer who may not happen to have a set of his own. The use of these instruments is clearly explained in the instructions, and a person of intelligence without medical education may soon become expert with them.

Some personal information is asked for in order to ascertain the suitability of the individual for record and to classify him according to the various points of view in which the observation may be made useful; but these will in no way be published, and care will be taken to obviate the possibility of any annoyance being given to those measured. Other general observations have also to be

made which cannot be reduced to figures, as of the colour of skin, hair, and eyes, the shape of the face, profile of nose, &c.

In all these, the framers of the Schedule have endeavoured to give such broadly marked, general definitions as will keep the personal equation out of view. Whether a man is stout, medium, or thin there can be little doubt; so if his skin be pale, ruddy, or dark; and in like manner for the other observations. No one could feel much difficulty in assigning the right place to any subject where the definitions are so general, and no two observers would be likely to differ.

The hair is distinguished into five classes for colour—red, fair, brown, dark, and black, and three for shape—straight, wavy, and curly. The colour of the beard is classified in the same way. The eyes are distinguished into six classes of colour—blue, light grey, dark grey, green, light brown, and dark brown. For the shape of the face only three classes are suggested—the long and narrow, the medium, and the short and broad. These are sub-divided into two varieties, according as the cheek bones are prominent or inconspicuous.

For guidance in observing the profile of the nose sketches are given of the various forms defined by Dr. Topinard, the eminent French anthropologist, which represent respectively a straight, an aquiline, a concave, a high-bridged or *busqué*, and a clubbed or sinuous form of nose. There are other types also defined by that authority; but as they are mostly found in races far different from any that are met with in this country, as the Chinese, the Negroid, and the Papuan, it has not been thought necessary to include them in the code of instructions, the five enumerated being sufficient in practice.

Lips are defined as thin, medium, or thick; ears as flat or outstanding, with sub-divisions according as they are coarse or finely moulded, and according as the lobes are absent or present and attached or detached. Most of these estimates might no doubt, by an elaborate system of minute measurement and calculation of indices, have been reduced to figures; but the advantages gained by such minute accuracy would have been lost by the greater trouble and difficulty in obtaining observations, both in

respect of finding persons competent to make them, and persons willing to submit to the trouble of having them made.

The measurements for which actual figures according to the metric system are asked are those of the height of the individual standing and sitting, the length and breadth of the cranium, the length and breadth in several dimensions of the face, the length and breadth of the nose, the height of the head, and the height of the cranium. For detailed directions as to how these are to be taken I must refer to the pamphlet of instructions issued by the Committee.

It is also desirable that photographic portraits should be taken of the persons measured, and that these should be obtained on a uniform method. For this purpose Dr. Francis Galton has prepared careful directions, which, if followed, will enable his method of composite photography to be applied to them, and by this means an average type of features may be deduced. As that method, however, tends to soften down peculiarities it does not supersede the ordinary method of single photography.

Dr. Galton recommends that the photographs should be two of each person—the exact profile and the strictly full face. These are difficult to get when not taken for the special purpose, inasmuch as the photographer usually likes to pose his sitters a little obliquely so as not to get the full face nor the profile. The decision that these are the best for scientific purposes was arrived at several years ago by a Committee which worked for some time at obtaining photographs of the different races of the United Kingdom.

The collections of that Committee are now deposited with the Anthropological Institute; but although numerous, they are not so instructive as photographs collected in connection with measurements and with the other observations forming part of the Ethnographic Survey may be expected to be. Mr. Park Harrison founded upon them some ingenious inferences, but the work of the Committee was never brought to a final conclusion.

Dr. Galton adds the excellent practical suggestion that it would be a considerable aid in making measurements of the features of the portrait and preventing the possi-

bility of mistaking the district of which the sitter is a representative, if a board be fixed above his head in the plane of his profile on which a scale of inches is very legibly marked and the name of the district inscribed. This board should be so placed as just to fall within the photographic plate. The background should be of a medium tint, such as a sheet of light brown paper.

The only remaining branch of the Survey is the historical evidence. . Where a place has been selected for survey, and the physical and other observations have been made, it is essential to ascertain what the place is and has been. Accordingly we ask for information as to any historical events connected with it bearing on its early settlement or subsequent incursions; the nature of the pursuits and occupations of the inhabitants; their customs and old tenures; their constitutional aversion or propensity to change, and so forth. We also ask for the dates of the churches and monastic or other ancient buildings or remains of former buildings; the evidence derived from family names through manor rolls, parish registers, guild and corporation records, and the like. By all these means we hope to obtain a complete view of the racial characters of the people in various parts of the country, and some indication of the causes of these characters. It may be that while fresh influences have been brought into play by the succession of historical events, the persistence of original types can still be traced.

“ . . . Possint generatim sæcla referre  
Naturam, mores, victum, motusque parentum.”