The Archaeological Journal.

DECEMBER, 1855.

BURIAL AND CREMATION.

BY J. M. KEMBLE.

THE results attained from careful excavations in ancient cemeteries, have at length assumed so definite a form as to be susceptible of scientific classification. The substitution of observation for theory, of induction for *à priori* reasoning, has tended to throw light upon a darkness almost primeval, and to bring order into what, for centuries, had been little more than a mass of confusion. Comparison of data, capable of being tested by known and ascertained facts of history, now enables us to bring them within fixed limits of space and time; to assign various phenomena to various periods, and to reason with some security upon the races to which such phenomena are to be referred. And as one group after another has been carefully and accurately limited and ascertained, it has been eliminated from the mass which could be the object of indefinite speculation, narrowing ever more and more the circle within which uncertainty can prevail.

It is impossible not to see, that graves of a certain peculiar character, opened in various places, in Kent, in Gloucestershire, in the Isle of Wight, belong to one another; that is, to one race of men, and one period of time. It is equally impossible to separate them from certain interments found in Normandy, and in valleys of the Rhine and Danube. Unless we set out with assuming all the races of mankind to have buried their dead in the same manner at all periods of the world's existence; or, that all the races of mankind have, at some period or other, passed through precisely the same forms and modes of doing this; we cannot escape

from the conclusion, that the close resemblance in the cases referred to, implies a near connection between the peoples whose remains we are investigating, and a nearly contemporaneous practice.

The discovery of coins of known rulers in all these places, further gives us an approximate date for the period; and the history of the European races, teaches which of these, at a given time, were to be found in given districts. A coin of Justinian found in a Kentish grave, shows that the deposit cannot be earlier than the year of Christ, 527; that the coin is not an original, but a copy and much worn, further makes it probable that even this date is much too early. The same reasoning places some of the graves at Selzen also in the VIth century; while a coin of Charlemagne, in the valley of the Eaulne, brings down one interment there at least as late as the beginning of the IXth century.

At the same time, it must not be forgotten, that the occurrence of these coins, which fixes the earliest possible date of an interment, does not limit the period in the opposite direction. They may have been, and indeed most likely were deposited at periods later than the earliest years of the emperors that struck them; constant experience teaches us that coins even of different centuries occur in one grave; it is clear that the latest alone can decide the date, and even that only negatively. The interment may be later, cannot be earlier than the striking of the coin. All that has been said, applies no doubt, in perfect strictness only to the one interment in which such coins have actually been found, and to no others. But where others, similar to it in every detail, are opened on the same spot, and present throughout the same appearances, it is impossible not to conclude that they are nearly contemporaneous, and the remains of people who had one constant mode of disposing of their dead. The burthen of proof certainly lies with him who would deny this. It is in fact more probable that graves nearly identical in details, and placed on the same spot, should be those of one race, than that accident should have brought together two races having precisely the same funeral dispositions in one spot. We therefore naturally class together the contents of graves which occupy the same ground, and present the same peculiarities; and we assign them to the same period,

allowing, of course, as much time as can, according to circumstances, be calculated to have been requisite for the accumulation of the interments observed. And here history may possibly supply the means of fixing the limits within which even this accumulation must be restricted. One interment at Londinières is unquestionably later in date than the foundation of the Carolvingian empire; that is, than the year of Christ, 800. But at that time, and from it, for a century downwards, the only people who could be settled at Londinières were Franks: we therefore reasonably conclude the cemetery there, in which a grave is found to contain a coin of Charlemagne, to be a Frankish cemetery. Again, as the Franks could not be found at Londinières before the year 460, we must place the gradual accumulation of the dead in that cemetery between the dates so ascertained. It is clear that the only error here could be that of placing both the beginning and end of the period too high; we have ascertained, in truth, only the date before which *no* Frankish interment could take place, and the *one* Frankish interment, which is defined by a coin of Charlemagne, did not take place. The coin of Charlemagne may have been deposited long after that emperor's death: the Franks may not have made a settlement in Londinières till long after the time of Clovis: the events could be in neither case *earlier*.

In this manner we are justified in assuming that the interments which occur under precisely similar circumstances in the neighbourhood of Londinières, at Parfondeval, Envermeu, Douvrend, belong to the same race and period, viz.: the Franks at the time approximated to. Again, when our date is limited by the era of Justinian, as it is at Selzen, we enquire, what race could occupy the valleys of the Middle Rhine at that period? and our conclusion is, that it could only be a Frankish population. A grave in Kent, limited by a coin of the same emperor, could only have received the body of an Anglo-Saxon.

Again, when we proceed to compare the interments in these various districts with one another, we are led to further conclusions. We find so striking a resemblance in details, in graves from Kent, from Normandy, and the Rhine, that we are irresistibly compelled to see in all these, only the records of strictly contemporaneous races, yet of such as had adopted one nearly uniform mode of disposing of their

dead. When we find them using the same, or very similar weapons, the same, or very similar ornaments and domestic utensils, we are confirmed in our conclusion, that we have before us the remains of different branches of one great race, namely, the Teutonic, about a certain defined period, namely between the Vth and Xth centuries of our era. For the present then we will call the interments of this character, the Teutonic or Germanic group, and classify it by the occurrence of large iron spears, iron umbos of shields, double-edged iron broad-swords, without hilts, guards, or pommels; large single-edged cutlasses, knives of different sizes, and iron javelin-heads; drinking vessels of glass and wooden buckets set with bronze; finally brooches and fibulæ, cruciform and circular, buckles and clasps, the whole ornamented with precious metals and stones, or pastes and niello of elaborate patterns; beads of glass and amethysts, and a few rare ornaments of silver. But above all, we distinguish it by the absence of *cremation*. In all these interments, the corpse has been deposited, with or without arms and ornaments, lying stretched out or in a cowering posture, in a coffin or without a coffin as the case may be, but always UNBURNT. This group comprises, in short, "The Unburnt Germans of the age of Iron."

But another class of cemeteries has also been observed, whose characteristic peculiarity is, the interment in urns of various patterns, of human bones calcined and reduced to ashes by the action of fire. Accurate comparison has shown that in spite of this one great difference, there are points of resemblance between the interments of this and the foregoing group. The ornaments which accompany the urns are found to be not dissimilar to those deposited with the unburnt skeletons; the remains of weapons are rare, and this is accounted for by the fire by which the bodies themselves have been consumed; but when they do occur, even in fragments, they are found to correspond with those of the first group.

The question now arises, Can we proceed with these, as we did with the foregoing; can we arrrange them also together, and have we any secure starting-points in history or chronology to direct us? The answer must be in the affirmative. We are not entirely without them, but they are not so obvious and easy to seize as those that we had

previously to deal with, and require rather more intricate combination to become perfectly intelligible and satisfactory.

The Anglo-Saxon is only one of three races who are known, from history, to have, at different times, held sway in this island, and to any one of which, these remains might *prima facie* be attributed. But the claim of the Romans vanishes at once, because we are amply supplied with the means of comparing these interments with those of Romans, here and abroad, and they are found at once to differ in almost all essential conditions. Of the Kelts we know extremely little, but still that little does not correspond with what we observe in the interments under review. Anglo-Saxons alone remain.

Now if we set out with the tentative presumption, that these urn-burials belong also to that great Teutonic stock which occupied the west of Europe, and ruled for centuries in this island, we may reasonably expect to find analogous phenomena in the other lands where branches of the same stock were also, from generation to generation, masters of the soil. Positive history teaches us, that the Anglo-Saxons emigrated into this country from the northern districts of Germany. If, then, these are Anglo-Saxon burials, it is not absurd to expect similar burials in the lands from which the Anglo-Saxons came.

But here we are met by a difficulty *in limine*. Although for more than three centuries urns have been sought for and dug up in the north of Germany, it is only within a very few years that they have been properly preserved and described. They were noticed, indeed, even in the XVth century, and the explanation of them sorely puzzled the heads of the naturalists of that day. On the whole, the popular theory was, that they were natural productions, pullulations of the earth like bulbous roots; and a confirmation of this was found in the asserted fact, that they mostly made their appearance in the month of May.[1] Grave authors, especially clergymen, discussed this point in sermons from their pulpits: for among other corollaries, it had been deduced that as the pots could be good for no Christian use, they must be productions of

[1] This is by no means improbable. The loosening of the earth during the winter and early spring, may easily have caused slight land-slips in the sandy hills on whose western slopes such cemeteries are usually found. They do so here and there till this very time.

the devil: very probably the remains of a dim tradition of their original use, strengthened by the superstitious views entertained of them by the peasantry, and which are not at all extinct even at this day.

The *spontaneous* theory certainly received a rude shock, when it was remarked that even if clay pots could pullulate, the bronze earrings and burnt bones they contained could not: and one far-seeing naturalist fancied he had solved all difficulties by suggesting that they might have been brought by a whirlwind from India or Africa, and deposited in Germany; which he proved by showing that whirlwinds often did transfer portable things from one place to another. Meanwhile, the truth had become pretty clear to some of the country pastors, and by degrees the fact was recognised, that these were in reality the mortuary urns of older races. But works like the "Antiquitaeten Remarques" of Rhodes, and Herrmann's "Maslographia," while they cleared away an immense deal of error, heaped the subject over with an immense mass of superfluous, and in this case, mischievous erudition. Mortuary urns became the property of the learned, and were treated of with an ample allowance of the pedantry which was then fashionable. The misfortune was that books were multiplied, containing a vast deal of Greek and Hebrew, Coptic, and Samaritan, which had nothing to do with the matter; but in which the great object which we seek, an accurate description of the articles found, was not thought of any moment. In general, in these books the rude woodcuts of urns and their contents are as little capable of giving us a true conception of their form and nature, as the vague and exaggerated language which those woodcuts were intended to illustrate. Worst of all, it was rarely thought necessary to give an accurate account of the *where* and *how* anything had been found: in fact, these inveterate curiosity-hunters kept the locality of their mines as much as possible from the knowledge of their rivals. However, for some years a better appreciation of the matter has prevailed, and the archaeologists of Germany have gone about their work in a careful, systematic, and satisfactory manner. And hence, although it is to be regretted that a good deal of what was recorded while the means of observation were plentifully supplied, is not to be implicitly relied upon, I think we have a sufficient amount of trustworthy evidence for our purpose.

The mortuary urns discovered in Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridge, Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, Sussex, and other counties, with bronze ornaments and the remains of iron implements, are of a very marked and peculiar character, which cannot well be mistaken, or confounded with that of other urns, discovered without such adjuncts. Urns of precisely similar form, and with exactly the same peculiarities, have been discovered in Jutland and parts of Friesland, on the borders of the Elbe, in Westphalia, in Thuringia, in parts of Saxony, in the duchies of Bremen and Verden, the county of Hoya, and other districts on the Weser : in short, in many parts of Germany east of the Rhine, west of the Upper Elbe and Saale, and north of the Main. They have, therefore, been found in countries which were occupied by the forefathers of the Anglo-Saxons. The latest of these discoveries, is that made in the course of last year at Stade on the Elbe, in the kingdom of Hanover, and as this is well known to myself in most of its details, I will describe some of the points of resemblance between it and the results of English researches. The urns are mostly of a dark brown or dull black clay, rudely executed, and never turned on the lathe : the foot itself being seldom quite flat, and here and there ornamented with a cross. They are often distinguished by a number of bulges in the sides, which have been, for the most part, produced by pressure of the clay from within. Some are nearly globular, with a slight rim for a neck, and disproportionately small opening : others are ornamented with one or more raised rims or fillets round the neck ; and these fillets are often marked with oblique lines, rudely scratched, or dots, apparently made with the tip of the finger. Others have knobs applied to different parts of the neck and the belly. The occurrence of handles is extremely rare.[2] The general form of ornament consists in circular lines round the neck, drawn very irregularly with the finger or a stick, and triangular figures below the shoulder, in the openings of which above and below are stars of dots (generally six disposed round a central one) made by the tip of the finger. And sometimes they are stamped with small circular or rhomboidal patterns, produced with the end of a stick, in

[2] Among eighty urns from Stade in the Museum at Hanover, only one has a handle. It is a small pitcher-shaped vessel, with the usual ornaments of triangular lines and stars of dots.

which a rude cross or star has been cut. The custom common elsewhere of covering these urns with saucer-shaped vessels or bowls of clay, does not prevail here, but many of the urns have covers of their own, carefully fitting *into* the neck, and ornamented on the top with what seem rude figures of birds and animals. Any one who will take the trouble to compare the figures in Mr. Neville's Saxon obsequies with this description, will see at once the striking resemblance borne by his urns to those at Stade. The same applies to those in the British Museum, from Eye in Suffolk, and from Sussex, to those in the Antiquities of Derbyshire, and to others in the Archaeological Journals and Archaeologia. The following description, by Professor Henslow, of urns found near Derbyshire, almost exactly represents the form of those found at Stade :—" They are all wrought by hand without the use of the lathe, out of a dark-coloured clay, frequently mixed with fragments of felspar ; they are very slightly baked, though some have been so far so as to have acquired a reddish tinge. The majority are dark brown, passing either to black or a dark green tint. Many are ornamented with a few lines or scratches arranged in different patterns ; and some are more highly embellished by the addition of stamped patterns, such as might readily be formed by notching the end of a stick, or twisting a small piece of metal into a spiral or zig-zag pattern. Several of the urns have projecting knobs or bosses. Most of these bosses have been formed by merely pressing out the sides of the urn from within, whilst it was in a soft state ; but in some cases they were found of a solid lump of clay, which has been stuck on the surface of the urn."

If we continue our comparison, and examine the articles found with these urns, we shall find an equally striking agreement between the German and the English interments. In both we find the remains of glass vessels and beads, which have been exposed to the action of a strong fire. In both occur combs of ivory or horn, which are also not very unusual in graves of the " unburnt " group. In both we find small shears and tweezers, with earpicks attached ; ornamented discs of bone, and a multiplicity of bronze buckles, remains of fibulæ and clasps, ornamented with the same or very similar patterns. The identity of these interments cannot then I think, be denied.

But if we are inclined in England to attribute them to the Anglo-Saxons, much more must we attribute them in Germany to the race from which the Anglo-Saxons came. Roman they cannot be in Germany, for they are found where Romans never came. Slavonic they probably are not, for they are found in countries where the Slaves never had lasting settlements; and bear no resemblance whatever to what is commonly found in lands where the Slaves were settled from the commencement of our historical period. Keltic they are not, for there is no record of Kelts in north Germany at all; and what little we do know of Keltic art, has nothing in common with these forms. But if they are none of these, they are German; and if they are German, so are the similar ones in England: in other words we have here a second group, namely, that of "The Burnt Germans of the age of Iron." And two classes of interments are shown to belong to the Anglo-Saxons: one in which cremation was, one in which it was not practised: assuredly a difference of such importance that we are bound to use all our efforts to account for it.

There seem to me but two ways in which this can be done, and only two hypotheses by which the facts observed can be co-ordinated. We may assume a difference of custom among different races, or the same race at different periods. We may suppose Jutes, and Angles, and Saxons, and half a score more subdivisions of the Germanic race, to have had throughout modes of interment, essentially differing upon this one point. The criterion will be, if we find certain customs invariably prevailing in certain districts, which can be shown to have been invariably occupied by some one or more of these particular subdivisions of races. If we cannot do this, our hypothesis will be insufficient, and the whole superstructure will break down. Or we may assume an identity of custom in the race, varied only, first in progress of time, and next by causes internal or external, which can be assigned. On this assumption it must be proved or made probable that all the races in question had originally one and the same custom; that they all relinquished it at the same or at different times; and that sufficient reasons can be assigned, either derived from the nature of the custom itself, or from causes external to its nature, to account satisfactorily for such a change.

Practically stated, the matter resolves itself into the two following propositions :—

I. Different tribes of Germans, all being pagans,[3] respectively adopted and kept up the one form of burial to the exclusion of the other.

II. All the different tribes of Germans, adopted first one and then the other form, in progress of time, and in consequence of internal or external influences.

When we have decided upon these two points, a third question, not yet involved in the premises, will still remain to be considered. It may, namely, be asserted that no such accurate distinction exists as has here been assumed in order to place the case fairly for argument; but that the various forms are so often found so intermingled, that we must pronounce all decisions obtained by the way now attempted to be pursued, nugatory. I shall take this question, also, in its proper place, and that will be when I have disposed of the second thesis above stated.

I. If it could be shown that the Jutes of Kent, the Isle of Wight, and Hampshire, were the only Jutes in England, and that their peculiar mode of burial, as found in the graves of Kent, was invariable ; if it could be shown that the Angles of Mercia, Northumbria, and East Anglia, had an equally invariable custom differing from the Kentish ; if it could be shown that the Saxons in Sussex, Wessex, and Essex, and so forth, had another, we should still have to show that the populations on the continent, from whom respectively these so-called different tribes or races came, had from the first the same customs as their descendants perpetuated in England. None of these things can be done. I have started for the present with the admission of Beda's division of the Germanic occupiers of Britain, into Jutes, Angles, and Saxons, although I have no doubt of its being merely traditional, and totally irreconcilable with the way in which the occupation gradually took place : I take the liberty of referring to the introductory chapter of the "Saxons in England." Beda

[3] My reason for inserting these words here, is the wish to simplify the discussion. It is assumed much too hastily that because burial with arms and ornaments unquestionably was a pagan custom, all such burials are pagan. Nothing can be further from the truth. Washing the dead was a pagan custom. Are all the dead that are washed therefore heathen ? Though some of the error which exists respecting English interments of early date has, in fact, this false assumption for its ground, I reserve the discussion of it for another occasion, wishing here to confine myself strictly to the terms in which the question of cremation has been put.

spoke only in the eighth century, more than 280 years after the events he described, and of parts of England with which he was personally unacquainted. And he took care to qualify what he said with an "ut ferunt." I am not disposed to lay great stress upon the historical value of a tradition nearly three hundred years old, recorded before the eighth century, and introduced merely incidentally by an ecclesiastical historian; but I am nevertheless prepared to admit that some greater influx of Germans than usual, upon the eastern and southern coasts of England, took place about the middle of the fifth century of our era, and attracted the attention of contemporary authors, as for instance Prosper Tyro: and following these, I am content to believe that a considerable troop, principally, perhaps, of Jutes or Frisians did then land in Kent, probably also in the Isle of Wight, and subsequently thence in the present hundreds of East and West Mene, in Hampshire. I must, however, on other grounds, claim other parts of England for the same population. The earliest Kentish charters, which are unfortunately much later than we could wish, present remarkable resemblances of dialect to the Saxon, known to us from many good and earlier authorities as Northumbrian; and no doubt both of these show peculiarities which especially belong to the Frisian in its earliest known form, but which do differ a good deal from the oldest forms of Saxon. Tradition placed the scene of Hengest's first great victory at Stamford, in Lincolnshire, and assigned the foundation of the kingdom of Northumbria to his son and nephew. It is therefore very probable that the people whom Hengest represents, viz., the Jutes or Frisians from Jutland, and the still more southerly parts of the Elbe countries, did occupy the eastern coast of England from Kent upwards, through Essex, Suffolk, Norfolk,[4] Lincolnshire, and so on northward, stretching perhaps in their ships to the Isle of Wight and across the Solent to the opposite coast. Now in the parts of England beyond the limits

[4] Nothing can possibly be more Frisic than the towers of the Norfolk churches along the coast,—real fortresses as they were in time of need. But the great characteristic of Frisian blood is *dikeing* out the sea. The Saxons did nothing of the kind. The Frisians did it wherever they came. Like a Newfoundland dog of good race, that will, for no reason on earth, spend hours with its head under water trying to drag stones out of a canal, a real Frisian will build dikes even if you drain his land for ever. The Saxon retreats before the sea; the Frisian shuts it out, without budging from his place, and braves all dangers. Let any one who doubts look at the dikes in Holland, in Kent, and in Lincolnshire.

assigned to the Jutes by Beda's very insufficient classification, we find abundance of burials which differ entirely from those prevalent in Kent; we find cremation and urn-burial, in a much greater proportion than among the men of Kent and in the Isle of Wight.

The custom of Kent and the Isle of Wight itself is, however, not at all proved to have been exclusively and consistently that of inhumation with arms and ornaments, but without cremation. Even could it be shown that no other form had ever been yet discovered in either place, it would still be necessary to show that none such ever could hereafter be discovered; in other words, that those portions of England had been already so carefully investigated, so thoroughly ransacked, that it was impossible for anything new to be found there. My own experience of the way in which most extensive graveyards, filled with remains of cremation and urns, have been unexpectedly discovered, makes me hesitate extremely as to the fact that the capabilities of Kent and the Isle of Wight, in this respect, are finally and entirely known. Moreover, I learn from the Archæologia, vol. xxx., that a large barrow which was opened at a place called Iffinswood, in the first-named county, did actually contain five urns filled with evidences of cremation; from the description there given, these urns did not belong at all to the kind usually called British: while they did bear a remarkable resemblance to some forms not very uncommon in the museums of North Germany; the fact that they stood mouth downwards, proving nothing one way or the other, inasmuch as it is not at all unusual in Germany. Still more striking is the case of Sittingbourne, in the same county. From an account given in the "Collectanea Antiqua," vol. i., it is evident that the cemetery discovered at that place contained two distinct and separate portions, one filled with skeletons deposited in the usual way, with swords, spears, knives, and shield-bosses of iron, with jewelled fibulæ, brooches, and other common ornaments; the other filled with urns of the Saxon class, in which were the calcined bones and ashes of the dead. Mr. Vallance's words show what sort of urns were found. He says, "Before I learnt anything of these remains, several fragments of urns of various sorts, some of a lead colour, some of a red, the larger ones of a coarse, black earth, mixed with sand and shells,

surrounded with ashes and calcined matter, had been dug up. Some were ornamented with beadings of four or more lines, some with a zigzag pattern, some with horizontal circular mouldings about the brim, some plain, some twisted. The coarse specimens are very little burnt; and the other ornaments are done by the hand without the lathe." I could find parallels to every one of these cases from my own drawings of urns found in Germany. A single glance at the plan which accompanies the interesting paper from which I quote, suffices to show that these were not urns deposited with skeletons, but apart from them, and in a separate portion of the burial ground.

Nor less does the Isle of Wight supply evidences of cremation in a cemetery, which must be attributed to the Germanic race. On Brightstone and Bowcombe Downs, Mr. Hillier opened thirteen graves, two only of which, that lay somewhat isolated, contained unburnt skeletons, (of which the skulls were wanting, a fact of not uncommon occurrence), while the rest yielded burnt bones and ashes. In one of these was an iron dagger, and a coin of Constantine (the younger?). In another, an urn of a character that bears not the slightest resemblance to those called British; but, on the contrary, a very striking one to the Saxon urns of other localities. So that here, in a place which all admit to be Jutish, we have a different sort of interment from that observed, but not even known to be prevalent, still less exclusively used, in Jutish Kent.[5]

Still less can it be shown that the converse holds in other parts of England, which, under Beda's classification, must have received a different population, Saxon or Angle. For though numerous instances of cremation have been found in Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridge, Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, Warwickshire, which supply us with the best examples of Saxon urns, yet burial without cremation has been found

[5] Journal of Arch. Assoc. for March, 1855. I am afraid that I ought to apologise to all Saxon scholars for taking so much notice of this most shallow fancy, or of a theory which sets out with principles so entirely at variance with all that we know of the earliest occupation of Britain by German tribes. But it is the fashion to reason this way; and it is well, therefore, to put an end to the nonsense on the ground selected, though it be itself only a quagmire. I will plainly state my conviction, that a competent knowledge of the races of modern Europe, and their relation to those named in our old authorities, is a necessary, however much neglected, qualification, to speak on these subjects. Without it, in my opinion, no one ought to venture a word about these primeval burials.

there too, and in very sufficient proportions. In the cemetery of little Wilbraham (East Angle) Mr. Neville calculated somewhere about 120 mortuary urns to 188 skeletons.[6] Sussex also, which is reckoned of course to the Saxon race, (Súð Seaxan, South Saxons) supplied Dr. Mantell with urns of the same character as those of Norfolk and Stade. Church-over, in Warwickshire, had a cemetery filled with skeletons, accompanied by precisely the same circumstances as those of Kent, and at least one urn of decidedly Saxon character; but the population of Warwickshire was Middle Angle. Thus far the grounds for the first thesis appear to fail. Much more do they so, when we enquire into the condition of the question on the continent of Europe, in the lands from which the populations of which we have spoken originally came. In all these localities we find a great preponderance of cremation; in a few, both modes practised, but in a great majority of instances cremation only. This is, in one point of view, a difference from the English custom, but it is one that can be easily and naturally accounted for, and is the result of certain facts which are recorded in positive history. Still it is, on the other side, decisive; if the Jutes always buried their dead, from the first without cremation, where are the dead bodies of the Jutes upon the continent? In Jutland itself, urns with cremation are as common as interments without it, or more common. And no one will pretend that even these interments very closely resemble those of Kent or of the Franks. They are, in fact, mostly the remains of Danes, who, in much later times, wandered into the Jutish peninsula; even as no doubt some of the urn-burials are not those of Germanic, but Slavonic heathens, who, till a very late period, occupied the riverain districts of the lower Elbe. Much less can burials like those in Kent be shown to exist in the Friesish districts, or in any of those occupied till the ninth century by the Saxons. In these countries thousands of urns of the iron age have been found: I doubt whether in all *fifty skeletons* have, and even of these I may have to give an account on some other occasion, which will diminish their importance, as far as this question is concerned. In this also the grounds of the hypothesis break down altogether, and we are compelled to conclude that the first pro-

[6] Saxon Obsequies, by the Hon. R. C. Neville, pp. 11, 25.

position, viz., "That different Germanic tribes, being pagans, respectively kept up the one form of burial, to the exclusion of the other," is not supported by facts, and falls to the ground.

II. We are now driven to enquire whether the second proposition has better evidence in its favour, and whether, if affirmed, it suffices to account for all the circumstances. I believe cremation to have been originally the universal rite of *all* Teutonic races,—as well as most others in the north of Europe,—and of by far the greatest number I can prove it to have so been.[7] This proof, from history and tradition, had better be reserved for a separate enquiry, in which it will be shown that Goth, and Scandinavian, Herulian, Thuringian, Frank and Saxon, Alamann and Baiowarian all did alike *at first* in this respect. For the present, the reader must be content with the assertion, that the general expression of Tacitus is true of the whole Germanic race, and that all its subdivisions, without exception, at one time practised this rite. The reasons for it, which lie deep in the national heathendom, will hereafter also be investigated.

If, however, the first part of this argument be admitted, the second will be so also. Every day's experience is its proof: of all the races that did once burn their dead, there is not one that does so now, except under circumstances which are supposed to justify extreme and exceptional measures.[8] The only question here that can interest us, is the cause which induced one or all of these populations to give up a custom universal, and founded on deep national feelings. As far as I know, there are only two such causes possible, one a physical, one a moral cause. In the case we are investigating, the physical cause is, the difficulty of obtaining means to practise the rite, which by gradually leading to its abandonment, as certainly leads to its desecration. In one or two countries, where wood was not abundant, where the cost of the funeral pile was too great for the means of a majority of the population, cremation vanished earlier than Paganism: as usual mammon had

[7] This proof can only be given by a long citation of passages from the most various authors. I wish to reserve it for a particular work, devoted to this most interesting subject, but not entirely confined to the practice of the Teutonic races.

[8] The Russians, in 1812, burnt hundreds of thousands of their own and the French soldiers and horses. We ought to have done the same in the Crimea; but, for burning, as will be seen, one must have *wood*, and where you have not enough to warm and house yourself, you will hardly waste it on your dead.

got the better of all national and religious feeling; and burning having once vanished as a rite, became degraded as a principle. No sooner did the people cease to burn, not only its heroes, but its own children in Scandinavia, than it began to burn its malefactors. The want of wood alone—so deeply felt in Iceland that a father once sacrificed his own son to Thórr to get timber from the god for a house and throne—weaned the heathen from his ancient custom. He reserved cremation for trolls, witches, magicians, and such, as having been buried, rose again and *walked* to the horror and amasement of men.[9] It is to this that I attribute the somewhat early relinquishment of cremation as a funeral rite in Denmark especially, where wood is very rare and expensive, and somewhat later in Sweden and Norway, where the store lasted a little longer. But Scandinavia alone furnishes us with any certain intelligence concerning the relinquishment of cremation during a period of pure Paganism. No doubt Scandinavia remained Pagan, long after other European states were Christian, and might be supposed to have taken a useful example from its neighbours. Perhaps this is so, considering the nature of popular tradition; but still, when we find in the twelfth century burning thrown back literally into the era of the gods, and inhumation carried beyond the bounds of all ascertained history, we must confess that a change took place very early among our Norse forefathers in this respect.

There is only one other race of Teutonic blood, of which any question can be made, as to their relinquishing cremation before they adopted Christianity. This is the Frankish: and I must confess I labour here under want of definite materials to form a judgment. If the interment of Childeric, recorded by Chifflet, be in all points accurately described,—if this be the Childeric, father of Clovis, and not one of the very many later Merwingian princes of the name, calling themselves kings *ex nobilitate*,[1]— if the Salic law in its oldest manu-

[9] The evidence of this must also be sought elsewhere. The church burnt witches also, but burnt them alive *as relapsed heretics*. The Norseman who had learned to bury, though a pagan still, burnt the dead upon very different grounds. Fire—the all holy—broke their spells.

[1] Everybody born of a king, and therefore kingly, called himself a king, whether he had a kingdom or not. Tournay might very well be an appanage of any Salic house. The whole affair rests upon the authenticity of a ring *dubiæ fidei*. But the place lies on the road from Cambray to Soissons! Of course it does; it therefore could not be the appanage of a scion of the conquering family?

script form be older than the conversion of Clovis,—why then the Franks must have found very little wood in the cultivated plains of Belgium! Or being brought into near contact with Christians, and with the Romano-Gallic priesthood, they may, following a common habit, have adopted forms and ceremonies which were impressed upon them as all-important, instead of others in whose efficacy they had perhaps already begun to doubt, and which, to say the least of it, were dear. The Church almost always came at the right moment, and there was plenty of it in the Gallo-Roman provinces, when Clovis thought them worth taking and likely to be taken.

The next, or moral cause, is of much greater moment to us. The want of wood cannot explain the giving up an old religious rite, universally, and nearly at once, by large bodies of men. In fact, want of wood—a very merely material consideration—should not have been mentioned at all, if I did not firmly believe that in the vast mass of the vulgar, by which I mean the selfish in all ages, the religious idea is absolutely bounded by the circumstance of gain and loss; and that, if it was cheaper, we should find a vast majority of people, very glad to burn their dead at the present moment.

In Asia, there are people who do not defile fire with the work of burning matter,—corpses: these throw their dead anywhere, except into the flames. Some commit them to a sacred river; some expose them to the atmosphere. There have been people that gave them to wild beasts, and the wild beasts that eat their dead were sacred. But with the exception of the Scandinavians, who having once given up their custom of burning, may possibly have introduced strange variations in the disposal of the dead (many of which I find hinted at by Arnkiel and others, but cannot in any reasonable way trace), I know of no Teutonic people among whom any particular religious sect arose, or could well have arisen without our knowing it, whose doctrines would lead to the abandonment of the ancient rite of cremation. Among the men of our race, I find no trace of sacred rivers, which it was pious to people with carcases, or of holy wolves whom it was good to feed with the flesh of the departed. I find, in short, in Europe, only a heathendom, which as long as it could develope itself undisturbed, committed its dead to

a sanctifying fire, and a Christendom which partly on other grounds of its own, but chiefly because cremation was *heathen*, insisted upon the relinquishment of cremation. The religious idea itself which lay in heathendom was necessarily in those days the ground of Christian hostility to it, and nothing was so bad in the eyes of the highest thinkers, the most earnest apostles of the new faith, as what was good and generous in that of the old. The bad parts they could have held cheap; these would have died of themselves. The noble parts, which had a life and vitality of their own, they must combat or use. And this we know them to have done; although they seem, in a worthy impatience, to have lost sight of the truth, that paganism was an introduction to Christianity, its antecedent, but not necessarily its antagonist; and attached more importance to mere forms than was necessary, or even on their own principle of *amalgamation*, desirable. However, history assures us that one great point to which they devoted their attention, was the substitution of inhumation for cremation; and that, as in later days, transubstantiation—a subsidiary question—became the test of Catholic and Protestant, so here, burying with or burying without burning was made the sign of distinction between two different faiths. Wherever Christianity set foot, cremation was to cease. The thing itself was, no doubt, of as little moment in the one case as the other: politics were most concerned, and religion used as a mask or engine.

My readers will all be well aware with what extreme and justifiable caution the missionary clergy dealt with all dangerous heathen doctrines and practices. They never mentioned them, if they could only help it, in any public document. What their letters to one another may have contained, what their conversations with one another may have turned upon, we do not know. But they took very good care to say nothing officially about anything which they wished to have forgotten. In the law of Kent, called Æðelberht's—the first Christian king,—there is not a word about the heathendom to be eradicated, or the Christianity established, except, indeed, the position the bishop and priest were to hold in the new Christian polity. And it is not till late periods that the actual heathendom of the Anglo-Saxons is at all mentioned as subject of legislation; and these are rarely genuine Germanic rites, being nine times in

ten, absurdities of the Romanizing clerics, who were happy to transfer to Saxon pages the trash they had found in their own Italian or Eastern models.

It is not therefore out of the laws in general, that we get our information as to the steps taken to put heathendom out of countenance. In all the mass of English legislation, there is not one word about cremation in any law: and I am struck with amazement when I read in Beówulf so many passages which have reference to it as a rite, and a noble one, applied to the funerals of heroes and kings. Still the absence of all mention of it does not disprove its existence, any more than the same ground would disprove the prevalence of other superstitious observances, which are first distinctly alluded to some centuries later. This can only show, that in the time of Cnut, the circumstances of the case were so changed that there was no further scruple about the distinct prohibition of certain forms of heathendom by name. There was in fact among the Anglo-Saxons, at the time of their conversion, no such predominant power in the state, as to allow of interference with the national customs and faith by authority. Whatever was to be done must be accomplished by persuasion and example. The utmost an Anglo-Saxon king could have ventured would be to give the missionary a safe-conduct and command respect for his person, as a king's officer or messenger, a right which was essentially inherent in the crown. If the King dispatched a *Missus*, his person would assuredly be respected, whatever might be the success of his message; and this I have some reason to think was the mode adopted. We know that it did gradually produce its fruits in the conversion of the heathen, though hardly in so short a period, or by such thousands at once, as the legends of the time would persuade us. A conqueror like Cnut could proceed somewhat more strongly to work and bring a very different authority to bear upon a population long accustomed to obedience, and in truth long professing Christianity. What in Æðelberht or Rædwald would have been a dangerous attack upon the national faith and freedom, was in Cnut only a proper solicitude for the purity of the religion which the nation had long adopted. But the case was very different with Charlemagne in his dealings with the Saxons on the continent—the Old Saxons, as Beda for distinction calls them. These had for nearly thirty years

waged a war against the Franks under the princes of his house, and with more success than the purely Frankish annals willingly admit. From these annalists we learn over and over again that the Saxons were most attached to their heathendom—paganissima gens—and Charlemagne who, unluckily for his historians, during the whole time was in firm league with the pagan Slavic tribes of the Elbe, the Polabi, Obotriti, and the like, is always celebrated as a champion of Christ, a hero of light warring against darkness. At length the Franks prevailed, and Charlemagne adopted the policy of removing from the Saxon land and dispersing throughout his Frankish territories all the heads of houses with their families, who remained after the great struggle. A strict calculation shows, that about thirty thousand householders were thus expatriated. Their country—the present duchies of Bremen and Verden, and the principality of Lüneburg, as well as the lands beyond the Elbe, were given by him to his heathen allies of Slavic blood. But against the heathendom of the Saxons, who were now to be a part of the Frankish population, severe regulations were issued: while theft and murder, and other crimes which we look upon as entirely subversive of society, could still be atoned for by the customary compensations, two or three essentially heathen practices were made liable to the punishment of death: because heathendom was the bond which held the Saxons together, and nourished that national feeling which had for so many years rendered them dangerous to the Franks. Among these practices was cremation of the dead, which is distinctly stated to be the heathen custom:—"Si quis corpus defuncti hominis secundum ritum paganorum flamma consumi fecerit et ossa ejus ad cinerem redierit, capite punietur."[2] The custom then of the pagan Saxons, as of most other pagan races in Northern Europe, was to burn the dead; that of the Christians to bury them.[3] Now,

[2] A. D. 785. Pertz. iii., 49.

[3] Sidonius Apollinaris, for instance, speaking of the Gauls, about 486, says the heathen were burned, the Christians buried (Ep. iii., 12.) I do not cite this as an authority, but merely to show how constantly the same ideas were connected together. They were so, no doubt, because it was a positive fact of general, if not universal occurrence. The following passage would be more to the purpose, if we could be perfectly sure of its genuineness. "Promiserunt Saxones cum juramento quod infra annum cum suis, quotquot nondum baptizati, baptismum suscipient . . . . quod paganias suas volunt dimittere, quod sacrificia hominum et bestiarum, cremationes hominum mortuorum, incerta auguria et divinationes infidas derelinquent." A.D. 784. Pertz. iv. (Capit. Spur.)

when we couple with this passage, the fact already stated, that all the tribes of Germany during their period of Paganism, did practise the same rite, and all did gradually relinquish it, we shall, I think, be justified in concluding that their reason for doing this was the adoption voluntarily or enforcedly of Christianity ; and consequently that it is Christianity which makes the distinction between the two modes of interment observed ; in other words the "Burnt Germans of the age of Iron" were Pagans. The numberless details of heathen life, to my mind, are strong confirmation of this conclusion. Burial was the custom of the earliest Christians for one particular reason :[4] it had always been the practice of the Jews, and following it the Saviour—a Jew, according to the flesh—had been buried : so had his oldest disciples and apostles. So that it is impossible for a moment to imagine any Christian adopting any other rite, especially one practised by the Pagan persecutors ; and there is besides reason to believe, not only that eastern ideas about the nature of *matter*, which afterwards developed themselves in Gnostical and Manichean heresies, early mingled with Christianity ; but also that superstitious notions respecting the resurrection from the dead *in the body*, were not without influence upon this point. On the other hand the heathen believed his gods to have instituted the rite of burning, nay, themselves to have mounted the funeral pile. From the ascent of the smoke he drew auguries as to the future condition of the friend that had departed. Fire too was the purifier, the medium of communication with the gods, one at least of the holy elements. A striking instance occurs to me of an interment[5] in which fire seems to have been introduced almost by stealth, although the bodies had evidently not been exposed to the full power of a pile. Some years ago at Elze, near Hildesheim, a barrow was removed. Upon its basis there were found six holes, or kists, as they are sometimes called. Five of these were nearly filled with ashes of wood, and over each a skeleton lay at full length upon its back. The sixth hole was not so occu-

[4] There were also two more. Funeral piles were expensive, and the earliest Christians were poor men. The funeral rites of Christians could not have been performed publicly, while Christianity—not yet being a tolerated religion, *religio licita*—was compelled to hide itself. But burning could hardly have been managed in private. With burial there was no difficulty, as the catacombs show.

[5] MSS. Reports in the possession of the Historical Society of Hanover.

pied, but close by it stood a small urn and a spindle-stone, the only implement of any kind discovered in the barrow. The base was enclosed with a circle of stones. It has been conjectured that this is an interment of a transition state, of Christians who had not yet entirely relinquished their pagandom; or of pagans, who though dread of the law prevented them from raising a pile to consume the bodies entirely, had devised a plan of burning at least a part of the flesh, by means of fires lighted beneath the dead, and fed with heath, sedge and ferns, whose flame would not be seen far off. In like manner the Abbé Cochet found several skeletons at Parfondeval lying upon a stratum of ashes and charcoal.[6]

I have said that there might be a third question: viz., whether our experience is such as to justify our attributing an exclusive practice to one time or race at all: in other words, whether cremation and inhumation may not have been practised together. In time, no doubt they might; and this is all that our discovery of urns with ashes and skeletons in the same cemeteries will warrant our saying. But contemporaneous or not, on the same spot or not, the urn-burials are Pagan; the burials without cremation, in England,—are Christian. If there be any equivocation in the matter, it lies the other way: a few half-converted Christians may for a while have clung to the rite of burning; but I do not believe any Pagan Saxon to have buried without it. The *rite* of burning was heathen, and could only be given up when heathendom itself was shaken to its foundations, as it happened in Scandinavia. I can explain the first case, by the very imperfect organization of the clergy in the first years of the conversion. They did not live in the country among the people themselves, but went their rounds, from place to place, as missionaries, residing cenobitically under the protection of the kings, upon their vills or estates, and sometimes in the towns, where any such existed. As far as Anglo-Saxon history teaches us, nearly a hundred years elapsed between the advent of Augustine and the regular establishment of anything like parish churches. So that I find no great difficulty in the supposition that here and there a professed Christian may have been dispatched on his long journey *more paganorum*, simply because no Christian priest happened to be by to prevent it. Moreover, during nearly

[6] La Normandie Souterraine, p. 308.

two-thirds of a century after the conversion, apostacy was not at all an uncommon occurrence ; and no doubt one of its very first evidences would be a return to the rite of cremation. But apart from these considerations, the deposit of Christian and pagan remains, upon the same spot, does not appear at all surprising. We must only be content to abstract a little from our prevalent notions about churchyards. I have myself little doubt, that when a village was duly and formally settled, a certain portion of the mark, or boundary-land, was set apart to receive the dead. It is possible that it may have been designated merely by the erection of certain tumuli, or the placing of huge stones. For not only have I opened fifty tumuli, from 4 to 6 feet high, perfectly circular, and standing upon perfectly level ground, one after the other, and found absolutely nothing in them; but the deposit of numerous urns in one barrow, and generally in irregular stages, and with irregular intervals, proves pretty clearly, not that the tumulus was thrown up over the urns, but that holes were dug in the tumulus, and the urns therein deposited, as occasion required. The barrow was there, in fact, before the burial ; as was necessarily the case when the slope of a natural hill was selected for the purpose. And one reason for paving the surface of the burial-ground, much as our streets are paved—a thing often observed in Germany—may have been to preserve the earlier deposits from disturbance, by marking exactly how far the ground was already occupied. Moreover, it seems that on this supposition we can best account for the occurrence, which is not unusual,—of barrows entirely without deposits. They are simply such as have not been used.

Now, if such burial-grounds existed long before what we call churchyards were permitted to be established, which in this country was in the middle of the eighth century, and while these remained extremely rare (for even towards the end of the tenth, there were churches without churchyards), I can readily imagine Christians still resorting with their dead to the old locality. Indeed, they may often have been Christian enough to bury their dead, and yet heathen enough to wish them buried in places of ancient sanctity, and near the bones of their family and friends. And, after all, it is very possible that in England the new churchyards were expressly and intentionally placed upon the sites of the old cemeteries.

There were many reasons why they should, no one why they should not be so. It must never be forgotten that one of the first principles impressed upon the Roman missionaries to Britain, was to take advantage, wherever they could, of the *religio loci*. Gregory distinctly orders Augustine not to destroy the heathen temples, but to christen them and devote them to the service of God. If this could be done, I see no earthly difficulty in the supposition that they may have consecrated the ancient burial-grounds, too, as places which the people were accustomed to. The words of Gregory, in his letter to Mellitus, are as follows:[7] he is to give this message to Augustine. "Quia fana idolorum destrui in eadem gente minime debeant; sed ipsa quæ in eis sunt idola destruantur; aqua benedicta fiat, in eisdem fanis aspergatur, altaria construantur, reliquiæ ponantur; quia si fana eadem bene constructa sunt, necesse est ut a cultu dæmonum in obsequia veri Dei debeant commutari, ut dum gens ipsa eadem fana sua non videt destrui, de corde errorem deponat, et Deum verum cognoscens et adorans, ad loca quæ consuevit, familiarius concurrat. Et quia boves solent in sacrificiis dæmonum multos occidere, debet eis etiam hac de re aliqua solemnitas comminutari; ut die dedicationis vel natalitii sanctorum martyrum, quorum illic reliquiæ ponuntur, tabernacula sibi circa easdem ecclesias quæ ex fanis commutatæ sunt, de ramis arborum faciant, et religiosis conviviis solemnitatem celebrent, nec diabolo jam animalia immolent, sed ad laudem Dei in esu suo animalia occidant, et donatori omnium de satietate sua gratias referant; ut dum eis aliqua exterius gaudia reservantur ad interiora gaudia consentire facilius valeant." That Christians did resort to the old heathen burial-places is patent from another of Charlemagne's regulations: "Jubemus ut corpora Christianorum Saxanorum ad cimiteria ecclesiæ deferantur et non ad tumulos paganorum."[8]

So that the occurrence of both modes in one cemetery has nothing at all to disturb us, or to throw doubt upon the one conclusion to which all other considerations lead; namely, that the skeletons are those of Christians,—the urns, with ashes, those of Pagans. And in this very enactment lies the explanation of the fact that skeletons are so very rare upon the continent, in those parts from whence our forefathers came. As long as they remained heathen, and in their own

[7] Beda. Hist. Eccl. 1., cap. 30.

[8] A.D. 785. Pertz. iii., 49.

ancient settlements, they burnt their dead. As soon as Christianity was forced upon them, they were also removed from their old seats, and were ordered to carry their dead to the churchyards. This was a certain way of weaning them from the proscribed customs: but it is also the reason why we do not find their interments scattered about in the fields, as we do in England, where no such compulsory regulation was in force, or could be. We know that the first thing Charlemagne did was to found churches, such as they were, in the conquered lands, even though he did give them to Pagans, and we have seen that he compelled the Saxons to carry their dead to the churchyards, which it is not at all necessary to consider in the close neighbourhood of the church. In fact, even to this day, the German churchyard always lies away from the village, and generally at a very considerable distance from the church. All that the Frank Emperor desired, was to wean his neophytes from the old custom, with which he had nothing to do, and break them into a new one, imposed by his authority, and of which he would be the source and the head. Nor is it quite certain that the provisions of the law made at Paderborn, in 785, refer absolutely to the Saxons remaining in their old seats, and not to those deported by the conqueror to the western side of the Weser, a point not hitherto considered as it ought to have been. It is also to be borne in mind, that laws made by central authority are broken when that authority is not in such power on the spot as to enforce itself, if they are in opposition to the national feeling. Charlemagne may have given directions in general, the application of which was left to his counts in the counties administered by them. But this only shows what he wished to do, not by any means what he succeeded in getting done. Since the days of William the Conqueror we have had laws against theft, and have hanged a pretty good number of thieves, and yet men steal even to this day. Still they must do it secretly, or be hanged. And so I suppose heathendom was carried on. In a vast number of burials where interment is the rule, there are signs of cremation, as at Elze and Parfondeval; the body was not reduced to ashes, but it was *singed*. It was dangerous to make such a fire as would consume it: by a little management, the advantages of Christian and heathen burial might be united. I believe that we may thus best account for the

few remains of charcoal (sometimes exceedingly minute) which are often found in tumuli, where skeletons are deposited entire. A little fire was probably considered sufficient to symbolise the ancient rite; and if any doubt remained on the mind of a new convert, he took care to be on the safe side, and compounded for a little paganism to make all sure in both quarters. The priest might give him holy water to frighten away the devil;[9] the other holy element—fire—he provided for himself as well as he could.

Before I close this paper I wish to call attention to a few facts strongly illustrative of what I have said. An extremely interesting and, from its further consequences, important comparison may be established between a certain set of interments in north and south Germany, the analogy of which to the cases already touched upon is clear, and instructive; I refer on the one hand to the excavations made at Sinsheim, and described by Dr. Wilhelmi; and on the other to the researches of Lieut. Genl. Count Münster, on the banks of the river Weser, in the duchy of Verden, and my own on the banks of the rivers Ilmenau and Wipperau, in the principality of Lüneburg. I need scarcely say, that the last-named localities lie in the far north of Germany, in the country which was par excellence inhabited by the continental Saxons. The position of the first-named place may, however, be less well known. It lies in the grand-duchy of Baden, not very far from Zahringen, and somewhat to the south and east of Heidelberg. It is, therefore, within the *limes Romanus*, otherwise in the country where we must naturally look for Alamanic, not Francic or Saxon populations. In Lüneburg and Verden, cremation was universal and exclusive, and although, I believe, that Count Münster, Baron v. Estorff, M. Hagen, and myself, must have opened at least three thousand interments, I can only call to mind two of skeletons, recorded by Estorff. Münster and myself never saw a trace of anything of the kind, nor could I, by the most diligent enquiries, prosecuted for seven months over a great expanse of country, learn that anything similar had been found. Count Münster never hints even having ever met with unburnt bodies, although his earnest and most

[9] This is Durandus's explanation, not mine. The Abbe Cochet quotes it very aptly to account for the urns which are so often found at the head and feet of skeletons; "Deinde (corpus) ponitur in speluncâ, in qua, in quibusdam locis ponitur aqua benedicta, et pruinæ cum thure; aqua benedicta, ne dæmones qui multum eam timent, ad corpus accedant." Ration. div. off. vii., c. 35

accurate researches extend over a period of twenty-five years! At Sinsheim, on the contrary, fourteen barrows contained upwards of seventy interments, and no one sure case of cremation; one uncertain heap of calcined bones, without urn or accompanying implement, was stated to consist of human bones, but even if this were so, bore no resemblance to a regular urn-burial. The bodies here were all deposited after the Kentish and Frankish manner, in shallow graves, dug in the natural soil from one to three feet deep; they were accompanied by swords, knives, spears, and javelins, of iron; buckles and fibulæ, hooks and rings, of the same metal; by pins, neck, ear, finger, arm and ankle rings, fibulæ, fine chains, rivets and knobs, buckle plates and thin plates of bronze; by fragments of precious stones and a great variety of beads of coloured glass. These articles could all be observed *in situ*, and the account given by Wilhelmi, which bears the strongest internal evidence of scrupulous accuracy, is valuable from teaching the exact use of many things found elsewhere in urns, and about which doubts have been entertained. Now it is very remarkable, that every single thing found by Wilhelmi, except the weapons, is perfectly identical with the contents of the urns found on the Weser and Ilmenau, and as we have not found any weapons there at all, beyond one or two bronze daggers or spear-heads, we may leave them out of the question entirely. There is not much pottery at Sinsheim, which is to be regretted: the few vases which stood at the feet or heads of the skeletons having been almost all destroyed: but two considerable portions were saved of urns, and one small one entire. These bear a great resemblance to urns found at Molzen, Ripdorf, Nienburg and Wolpe. Nothing, perhaps, is more thoroughly characteristic than the hooks and rings of iron, which served in lieu of buckles to connect the ends of a strap or belt, which passed over the shoulder, and may have served to carry the sword. These were found in a great number of urns by Estorff, Münster and myself; they were also found upon the skeletons at Sinsheim, where buckles were not numerous, any more than they are in our urns. I know of, perhaps, one hundred such hooks and rings, at Hanover, Lüneburg and Uelzen, and none elsewhere.

The fibulæ at Sinsheim, whether of bronze or iron, bear no resemblance either to the cruciform fibulæ, or the round

brooches of Kent, the Isle of Wight, Wilbraham, Fairford or Londinières or Selzen, Nordendorf and Fridolfingen. But they are so perfectly identical with those found in the north German urns, that many of them might be mistaken for the produce of the same workshop. Even one peculiarity which had struck me from its rarity in Lüneburg, namely, the finishing the fibulæ with an ornamental bead of glass, or a rosette ornament of ivory, recurred at Sinsheim more than once.

The ear-rings attached to the skeletons were of that peculiar form of which Count Münster, Baron Estorff, and myself have collected some hundreds; they consist of a single fine bronze wire, twisted in a spiral, so as to form a circular pendant about the size of a shilling. We have found them eight or ten at a time in the urns of north Germany.

The neck, arm, and foot rings, of hollow bronze, as well as the armlets of solid bronze are in form, size, and ornamentation, identical with those of Lüneburg. Especially noteworthy are one or two hollow rings of iron; of these, whose fabrication it is most difficult to understand, there are three in the Hanoverian Museum, taken from urns, one by Count Münster, two by me.

I would further add, as a most important piece of evidence, that small pieces of red sandstone, which are extremely common in the graves of Mecklenburg, were found in all the Sinsheim barrows; in both cases they have been deposited intentionally; and what is perhaps still more significant, a flint dagger or stone kelt was found in nearly every barrow, together with the skeletons, armed as they are with iron, and ornamented with bronze. But from the most important cemetery that I ransacked, viz. that of Molzen, which contained more than two hundred urns of the Iron age, and of no other, I also took a beautiful flint dagger, and a well-made hammer of hornblende. In the cemetery at Ripdorf, from which I took nearly sixty urns entire, I also found one dagger of flint and a profusion of flint chips, of the sort we call knives, some placed within, some round, the urns; and this where there is no flint to be found for miles around. Count Münster found an axe-head of stone, with a bronze pin, together in one tumulus at Nienburg under similar circumstances. It may also be observed that whereas in the Sinsheim barrows the skeletons were all found (with a single exception) on the south, the west, or the south-west sides of the base, so in the

barrows opened by me, the urns were invariably upon those sides, hardly by any chance in the east or north, which was generally occupied by a heap of stones mingled with charcoal, probably denoting the *Ustrina*. We have here then, a striking instance of two Germanic interments, differing in the sole point of cremation, every other conceivable point being identical in both.

Still I confess, that it is to me a strange and difficult matter to account for. The populations of Baden and Lüneburg cannot be supposed to have belonged to one tribe ; the distance between the Lüneburg-heath and Sinsheim is too great for fashion to have produced a similarity of customs. The Sinsheim fashion bears no resemblance to that of Oberflacht ; the ornaments found at Selzen are wanting there. The weapons found at Sinsheim differ very materially from those of the Selzen graves, the Frankish interments described by the Abbé Cochet, and the various Saxon interments opened in various parts of England. The spear with its hollow socket, rarely reaches one foot in length, and the socket is exceedingly short (rarely more than two to three inches long) differing most materially in this respect from the Saxon and Frankish weapon, but strongly resembling the bronze spear-heads of north Germany. The swords, moreover, all had sheaths of bronze.

I do not know whether it would be allowable to conclude these inhabitants of Sinsheim to be Lüneburgers, transplanted from their natural homes, either by the policy of the Frankish Emperor, or the earlier astuteness of a Roman one to serve as outposts upon the frontier of his empire. I cannot even decide upon the date to which these interments are to be referred, from the total absence of everything tending in the least to give a clue to this vital question. But in the equally complete absence of any definite signs of paganism,—for the covering up the bodies with ashes and charcoal, which was noticed in some graves, may be explained by a desire to preserve them the longer, or if not, may be accounted for, as I have done it with regard to the barrow at Elze ; and the fact that here and there fires had been lighted upon the base of the barrow, does not prove anything,—I am compelled to abide by my general result, and to believe, that be they what they might, the denizens of the Sinsheim barrows were Christian, were not deposited *secundum Ritum Paganorum*.