THE PRESENT PHASE OF PREHISTORIC ARCHÆOLOGY, BEING THE OPENING ADDRESS OF THE ANTIQUARIAN SECTION AT THE DORCHESTER MEETING.[1]

By PROFESSOR BOYD DAWKINS, F.R.S., F.S.A., F.G.S.

CONTENTS.

1. *Introductory.*

In choosing a subject for the address to the Antiquarian Section of the Institute, it has occurred to me that the present phase of prehistoric archæology is fitting from the point of view both of the time and of the place. Since I last had the honour of occupying the chair at Scarborough in 1895, archæological interest—if I may use the term—has been principally directed towards the beginning and the end of the Prehistoric period, and more especially towards the study of the events which happened in the beginning of the Neolithic age on the one hand, and on the other towards the frontier dividing the Prehistoric period in Middle and Northern Europe from the Historic period in the Mediterranean region. In the former connection the materials for generalisation are being rapidly collected, and are available for criti-

[1] Read at Dorchester, August 3rd, 1897.

cism; in the latter, thanks to A. J. Evans and others, we can now bring the inhabitants of the British Isles in the Prehistoric Iron age into close touch with the civilisation of the Adriatic and Ægean seas at the dawn of history, at a time when there were great westward migrations going on in the South, similar to those that have given rise to the existing nationalities in Middle and Northern Europe. It is manifest that the time is opportune to discuss the value and define the scope of the researches which have opened up these questions. The place, too, is opportune. We stand here within the lines of a Roman fortress, and we are surrounded by the relics of the ancient inhabitants of the ages of Bronze and Iron—the countless tumuli of the downs, and the group of fortified strongholds that kept watch and ward over the land of Dorset, a land that was in communication with the Continent long before the Roman arms were felt on the shores of the English Channel.

2. *The Relation of the Prehistoric to the Pleistocene Period.*

Before we can discuss the problems offered by the study of the beginning and of the end of the Prehistoric period, it is necessary to clear the ground by defining what is meant by the term "prehistoric." For me it covers all the events which took place in the interval between the Pleistocene and Historic ages.[1] It is the last but one of the great biological divisions into which the Tertiary period naturally falls. It is mapped off from what went before, not only by the absence of all the extinct mammals except the Irish elk, but by the appearance of the short-horned ox, the sheep, goat, the domestic hog, and the dog, hitherto unknown in Europe—in a word, by the introduction of the domestic animals. Some of these reverted to their aboriginal wildness, and shared the forests and prairies with the indigenous wild animals. Their remains in the refuse-heaps and burial-places, as well as in the surface deposits, peat-bogs, alluvia, and submerged forests, mark the Prehistoric from the Pleistocene age. They were derived, as I have proved elsewhere,[2] from the South-east, and introduced into Western

[1] For further details see Boyd Dawkins, *Early Man*, p. 257 *et seq.*

[2] *Op. cit.*, c. viii.

Europe by Neolithic herdsmen migrating westward and northward, and ultimately reaching the British Isles. The arts of husbandry and gardening, of spinning and weaving, of carpentry, of boat-building, of mining, and of pottery-making were brought in at the same time and probably from the same source. They form a striking contrast with the few primitive arts, such as sewing, and the manufacture of personal ornaments and rude implements of the chase, possessed by the Palæolithic hunters of the Pleistocene, although the latter were infinitely superior in the delineation of animals both in the flat and in the round, in drawing and in sculpture. This striking contrast in arts is, in my opinion, the necessary result of the great revolution in geography, climate, and distribution of animals, separating the continental Britain of the Pleistocene from the insular Britain such as it is in its main outlines to-day, which took place, as we know from geological considerations, at the close of the Pleistocene period, and in an interval of unknown, but probably vast, duration. In this direction, therefore, the Prehistoric period is divided "by a great gulf fixed" from all that went before.

3. *The Relation of the Prehistoric to the Historic Period.*

It is not, however, clearly defined from the Historic period which followed after. No great climatic, or geographical, or zoological, change took place in Europe from that time down to to-day. The new Prehistoric animals introduced under the care of man grew and developed into the present domestic breeds. The small Neolithic short-horned ox, for example, lived on in Britain, and is now represented by the small, dark Welsh, Scotch, and Kerry cattle. In Asia Minor I have identified it in a refuse-heap explored by Schliemann in the ruins of Troy, as well as in a cave explored by Sir William Dawson on the slopes of Lebanon. The new arts are those from which the civilisation of Europe has been evolved in later times. And, lastly, the introducers themselves are represented in the existing population by the small, dark Iberic element in the ethnology of Spain, France, and Britain. It is obvious, therefore, that there

is no hard and fast line here, and that the term "prehistoric" has only a relative value. If, for example, the Historic period in Egypt, dating back to 4,000 years B.C., be compared with that of Britain, beginning with the invasion of Julius Cæsar, it is clear that the Prehistoric period in Britain overlaps the Historic period of Egypt. It is in this direction that the archæological interest centres, and to this overlap I shall address the latter part of this discourse. I now turn to the bearing of recent discoveries upon the interval between the Pleistocene and Prehistoric periods.

In my address at Scarborough I had to allow that all the attempts to bridge over this interval had been failures so far as Western Europe was concerned. Since that time the question has been discussed by A. J. Evans in his address to the Anthropological Section of the British Association in 1896, and by Dr. Munro in his two recent works.[1] Both hold, with some hesitation, that it is bridged over by recent discoveries in the caverns of the south of France. We will analyse the evidence in some detail, beginning with the cave of Reilhac, in the Pyrenees.

4. *The Evidence of the Cave of Reilhac* (*Lot*).

The greater portion of the contents of the cave had been removed and scattered before it was visited by MM. Cartailhac and Boule, who placed the discovery on record.[2] There were, however, some areas inside which gave the following section from the surface downwards:—

A. Dark loam with more or less stalagmite, with layers of charcoal, bones of sheep, goat, *Bos longifrons*, hog, stag, and horse, and Neolithic axes and their sockets, made of antler, splinters of flint, and fragments of pottery.

B. A stratum largely consisting of a breccia of rabbits' bones, with an occasional layer of charcoal, in some places soft and riddled with the old burrows of badgers.

[1] Munro, *Bosnia - Herzegovina and Dalmatia*, p. 314, and *Prehistoric Problems*, p. 60 *et seq.*

[2] *La Grotte de Reilhac*, pp. 68, folio, Lyons, 1889.

C. Cave earth with the usual Palæolithic implements, weapons of stone, bone, and antler, and the usual remains of Pleistocene mammals: reindeer, hyæna, and others. Molars of sheep were also found here.

D. Clay with blocks of stone and Pleistocene animals.

The superficial deposit A is certainly Neolithic, and possibly B may belong to the same age. C and D are Palæolithic: but C is, in my opinion, proved to have been disturbed in later times by the occurrence in it of the domestic sheep. The cave, like many others, offered shelter to the Palæolithic hunters, and afterwards to the men who possessed domestic animals, clearly proved by discoveries elsewhere to belong to the Neolithic period. It tells us absolutely nothing as to the length of the interval between the two occupations, and contributes nothing to the solution of the problem. I am unable to follow MM. Cartailhac and Boule in their conclusion that the interval is narrowed because the deposits shade off into each other, without hard and fast lines.[1] The strata in caverns are formed irregularly, and while in some places a great thickness of materials, including stalagmite, may be accumulated in a comparatively short time, in others there may be either little or none during untold ages. From my experience in cave-digging, and more particularly in the caves of Cresswell, I have learned the extreme difficulty of ascertaining whether a given stratum has been disturbed after its deposit. I have repeatedly met with remains of widely separated ages mingled together in the same deposit, either by the burrowing animals—foxes, rabbits, badgers—or by the hand of man. Under these circumstances, I am unable to see any proof that the interval has been either bridged over or narrowed by the discoveries in the cave of Reilhac.

5. *The Evidence of the Deposits at Mas d'Azil.*

Nor is the evidence more satisfactory which is offered by the refuse-heaps on the banks of the Arize and in the

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

rock shelter of the Mas d'Azil (Ariège).[1] The section is as follows:—

A. Superficial stratum with Neolithic axes and objects of bronze and iron.

B. Earth with deposits of wood ashes, and containing flat harpoons made of stags' antler.

C. Earth mingled with ashes and large blocks of stone, containing flint flakes, scrapers, perforated teeth, bone pins, awls, chisels, and harpoons, similar to those of B. Here also were found pebbles painted with red ochre in spots and lines. Bones of horse, ox, and other animals were met with, as well as grains of barley and stones of various fruits, among which was the cultivated plum (*Prunus domesticus*).

D. A black layer with flat harpoons of stags' antler, similar to those in stratum C, and flint implements, and Palæolithic remains, including round-shaped harpoons, similar to those in the stratum below. It is obviously a mixed deposit, containing articles of different ages.

E. A deposit containing Palæolithic implements, with reindeer and other Pleistocene mammalia occupying the floor of rock.

In this case, as before, I can only see evidence of sequence, without anything to mark the interval between the strata. The presence of barley in C is conclusive that C is not earlier than Neolithic, because it was one of the cereals introduced into Europe by the Neolithic farmers, and still more is its Neolithic age emphasized by the presence of the cultivated plum. The curious harpoons found both here and at Reilhac. and considered by MM. Cartailhac and Piette, and with some hesitation by Dr. Munro, to mark a pre-Neolithic stage of civilisation, occur in the refuse-heaps of Neolithic lake-dwellings in Switzerland, such as Wawyl, Mooseedorf, and Cortaillod. They have been met with in this country in the Victoria cave near Settle,[2] and more recently in a cave near Oban,[3]

[1] M. Piette, *Congres Int. d'Anthropologie et Archeologie Prehistoriques*, 1889, p. 203; *L'Anthropologie*, vi, p. 276, vii, p. 1 and p. 385.

[2] Boyd Dawkins, *Cave-hunting*, p. 112.

[3] Anderson, *Proc. Soc. Antiq.*, Scot. XXIX, p. 211.

and in both are referable to the Neolithic age. In a word, neither at Reilhac nor at Mas d'Azil is there any trace of a civilisation intermediate between the Palæolithic and Neolithic, but of one characterised by the possession of the domestic animals and cultivated plants, and clearly belonging to the latter. I cannot suppose that my colleagues, who consider that these two cases bridge over the gulf between Pleistocene and Prehistoric ages, are prepared to accept the further inevitable conclusion from their argument that there were clearings in Southern France in the interval between the Pleistocene and Prehistoric ages in which there were plum orchards and fields of golden barley.[1] These are the signs of a civilisation immeasurably higher than that which could have been possessed by a race of Palæolithic hunters, ignorant even of the dog, in their advance upwards towards the Neolithic domestic culture.

6. *The Discoveries in the Caves of Mentone.*

Let us now turn to another group of discoveries. The evidence obtained from the caves of Mentone,[2] based upon the human skeletons discovered from time to time since 1858 down to 1894, is taken by A. J. Evans to prove that here, if nowhere else, the interval between the Palæolithic and Neolithic ages is bridged over, and that here, in the Pleistocene period, we have the beginning of the existing population of the Ligurian coast.[3]

"It is true," writes A. J. Evans, "that in an account of the interments found in 1892 in the Barma Grande Cave, given by me to the Anthropological Institute, I was myself so prepossessed by the still dominant doctrine that the usage of burial was unknown to Palæolithic man, and so overpowered by the vision of the yawning hiatus between him and his Neolithic successor, that I failed to realize the full import of the evidence. On that occasion I took refuge in the suggestion that we had here to deal with an earlier Neolithic stratum than any hitherto recorded—'Neolithic,' that is, without the Neolithic.

[1] For a complete list of the plants see *L'Anthropologie*, vii, p. 1.

[2] For principal references to the literature of the Mentone caves see A. J. Evans, *Journ. Anthrop. Inst.*, xxii, p. 287 *et seq.*

[3] Address to Anthrop. Sect. of Brit. Assoc., 1896.

"But the accumulation of fresh data, and especially the critical observations of M. D'Arcy and Professor Issel, have convinced me that this intermediate position is untenable. From the great depth below the original surface of what in all cases seem to have been homogeneous quaternary deposits at which the human remains were found, it is necessary to suppose, if the interments took place at a later period, that pits in many cases from 30 to 40 feet deep must have been excavated in the cave earth. But nothing of the kind has been detected, nor any intrusion of extraneous materials. On the other hand, the gnawed or defective condition of the extremities in several cases points clearly to superficial and imperfect interment of the body; and in one case parts of the same core from which flints found with the skeleton had been chipped were found some metres distant on the same floor level. Are we then to imagine that another pit was expressly dug to bury these?"

The whole question hinges on the age of the cave earth, and on the further question as to whether it has been disturbed or not. Is the cave earth of Pleistocene age, and is it now in the position which it occupied in the cave at the close of the Pleistocene age? The presence of extinct animals gives an affirmative answer to the first of these questions, while the second is, in my opinion, negatived by the fact that "the floor had been lowered by natural agencies before any excavations had taken place."[1]

This conclusion is strengthened by the presence of domestic animals, such as the goat,[2] at about 8 metres from the present surface. The interments themselves were undoubtedly made close to the surface at the time, and, in my opinion, were covered up afterwards by the drift of cave-earth from caverns at higher levels during heavy rains.[3] Were they of Pleistocene age, the hyænas, which abounded at that time in these caves, would have eaten up the human remains, exactly as they ate up all the other mammals which were their contemporaries. It is a significant fact that no characteristic Pleistocene mam-

[1] Evans, *Journ. Anthrop. Inst.*, xxii (1893), p. 289.

[2] Evans, *op. cit.*, p. 294.

[3] M. Verneau (*L'Anthropologie*, vi, p. 539) is of opinion that the stratum in question has been *remanié*.

mals have been proved to belong to the age of any one of the interments, and that Neolithic axes have been found in the cave earth near the surface. So far as I can read the evidence, the whole group of interments in these caves belongs to the Prehistoric age, because of the occurrence of remains of domestic animals in the cave earth. They are probably older, as A. J. Evans concludes, than the Neolithic interments on the Ligurian coast, because neither polished stone axes nor pottery have been found along with the human skeletons. It does not, however, follow that they do not belong to the Neolithic phase of culture. The goat[1] is already in evidence, and before deciding on this point it will be necessary to have a complete catalogue of the bones of the animals found along with the interments.

The interments themselves present, as Mr. Evans points out, features of peculiar interest, well worthy of our attention. In all the bodies were buried resting on their side, and were covered with a layer of red ochre. Around their necks, wrists, and possibly ankles, were strings of perforated sea-shells (*Nassa neritæa* and others) and pendants of bone and teeth. Within reach were flint knives. There was no trace of pottery. The people who buried their dead thus were tall and long-headed, and identical, according to M. Issel, with the dwellers in Liguria from the Neolithic age down to the present time.

7. *The Burial in the Rock-shelter of Cro-Magnon.*

The same tall, long-headed type is presented by the skeletons discovered in the upper stratum in the rock-shelter of Cro-Magnon.[2] They were found along with similar ornaments of perforated sea-shells and pendants made of ivory, probably obtained from a mammoth tusk close by. From the iron peroxide on one of the skulls, it may be inferred that they were also covered with red ochre. They were buried in *debris* resting on a refuse-heap of Palæolithic age, and are therefore, in my opinion, of later date. They are, however, regarded as Palæo-

[1] The *Capra primigenia* (Gerv.) is merely a provisional name applied to large remains otherwise not to be distinguished from the domestic goat (Gervais, *Compt. Rend.*, 1864, t. 58, p. 236).

[2] Lartet and Christy, *Reliquiæ Aquitanicæ*, p. 62 *et seq.*

lithic by the principal French authorities, such as Quatrefages, Hamy, and others, on very much the same unsatisfactory evidence[1] as that of the caves of Mentone. Since the interment the *debris* from the cliff above has accumulated over the rock-shelter to a thickness of 4 metres.

8. *A Similar Burial in the Paviland Cave.*

Nor is this class of burial confined to Southern and Middle France. In 1824 Buckland[2] recorded the discovery of a human skeleton in the Paviland cave, Glamorganshire, in an older accumulation of the Pleistocene age. The body had been interred resting on its side. Close to the thigh were two handfuls of perforated sea-shells (*Nerita littoralis*). In touch with the ribs were 40 to 50 ivory rods, from $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ inch in diameter and from 1 to 4 inches long, and fragments of ivory rings, which when complete were from 4 to 5 inches in diameter. Both skeletons and ornaments had been covered with a layer of red ochre. In another place were three fragments of ivory which had been cut, one of them into the shape of a human tongue, and an awl made out of the metacarpal of a wolf. Fragments of charcoal, a flint flake, and recent bones, scattered through the mass of cave earth, proved that the deposit had been disturbed by subsequent diggings. The ivory ornaments were probably made from a mammoth tusk, which was discovered in a crumbling condition in another part of the cave. Unfortunately, in the absence of the skull, the shape of the head is unknown. The long bones however, according to Falconer, imply a gigantic stature.

9. *A Similar Burial at Brünn, in Moravia.*

In grouping these three discoveries together I am only following Messrs. Pengelly and A. J. Evans. The fourth, for the details of which I would refer to Dr. Munro,[3] was made in the loess, or brick-earth, of Brunn, in Moravia. Here, in the course of digging a canal in 1891, a stratum containing remains of rhinoceros, mammoth, and other Pleistocene beasts, was met with at a depth of 4 metres

[1] Boyd Dawkins, *Cave-hunting*, p. 219.

[2] *Reliquiæ Diluvianæ*, p. 82.

[3] *Prehistoric Problems*, p. 161.

from the surface. As it was followed, a fragment of mammoth tusk was discovered resting on a shoulder-blade of the same species, and close to it the skull and some of the upper portion of a human skeleton. The rest had been removed during previous work. Along with the skeleton were button-like perforated discs of ivory and other perforated discs of stone and rhinoceros rib, ranging from 1¼ inches to 2½ inches in diameter, two discs of limestone 5¼ to 6 inches in diameter, a rude human figure of ivory, and an implement of reindeer antler. There were also 600 fragments of *dentalium*, or tooth-shell from the Tertiary strata of the neighbourhood, that had been strung so as to form a head-covering or necklet. All were covered with a layer of red ochre. The skull is long and of the same type as those of Cro-Magnon and Mentone. The smaller discs above-mentioned were probably used for fastening clothes, and the larger for spindle-whorls, like those of Neolithic and later times. The largest may belong to the so-called net-sinkers.

10. *The Ivory Ornaments made of Mammoth Tusk.*

The ivory, bone, and antler, out of which these curious relics were made, were undoubtedly furnished by the tusks of mammoth and remains of rhinoceros and reindeer in the Pleistocene stratum. Here, as in Cro-Magnon and Paviland, the mammoth ivory must have been in the same state of preservation as the tusks in Siberia, now used by the ivory-turners, instead of being in its present decomposed state. Mammoth tusks have been met with in the same perfect condition in Scotland and in Yorkshire, and capable of being put to the ordinary use of ivory.[1] Their perfect preservation at the time of manufacture does not therefore carry back the interments to the age of the mammoth, or Pleistocene, as suggested by Pengelly in the case of Paviland, and of Brünn as suggested by Schaafhausen. It proves, however, that the interval between the time of the interments and the present day was sufficiently long to allow the process of decay to go on until both tusks and ornaments were reduced to the same friable condition in these three widely separated localities: in Moravia, Britain, and Auvergne.

[1] Buckland, *Rel. Diluv.*, 179.

11. *This Group of Early Prehistoric Age.*

In this group of remains so widely spread over Europe, we are on the track of a very early Prehistoric people, belonging to a tall, long-headed race, without the knowledge of pottery and without polished axes, if negative evidence be accepted. It matters little whether we follow M. Hervé and Dr. Munro in calling them Proto-neolithic or not. They represent, according to the present evidence, the earliest element in the existing European population. They are probably the advance-guard of the Neolithic migration, which is likely to have gone on slowly and spasmodically through long ages, like that of the Celts in later times. Further evidence is needed before we can define their relation to the Iberic inhabitants, or their precise relation to the Neolithic culture ordinarily so called.

In all these discoveries I see nothing to link the Palæolithic man of the Pleistocene with the Neolithic man of the Prehistoric period. The one stands on the far, the other on the near, side of the great gulf, marked by changes in the geography, in the climate, and in the zoology of Europe. On the other hand, the archæologists who cling to the Palæolithic age of the human remains found in Cro-Magnon hold that they are Palæolithic, and that the present population of Europe dates back from a time when the cave-men hunted the reindeer and trapped the mammoth in Middle and Southern France.

12. *The Neolithic Culture introduced into Europe west of the Rhine by Iberic Peoples.*

Whether the stages of civilisation marked in Northern and Western Europe by the use of polished stone, bronze, and iron, were the result of slow evolution going on among tribes inhabiting the plains of Europe and the uplands of Scandinavia from the Pleistocene age, so ably discussed by Huxley,[1] still remains a vexed question. *Quot homines, tot sententiæ.* They were undoubtedly the result of a slow evolution somewhere. I would suggest that it took place in a region inhabited by the River-drift men, who were ignorant of the arts of design—

[1] *Nineteenth Century*. November, 1890.

in Asia Minor or Southern Asia—rather than in that of the artistic Cave-men in Middle and Northern Europe. In this manner the contrast between the art of the latter and of the Neolithic peoples may be explained. For me the fact that the ancestors of most, if not all, of the domestic animals are unrepresented in the wild fauna of Europe is conclusive that it was not here. The dog, as Darwin has shown, is not the descendant of the wolf, but of the jackal, mingled by interbreeding with wolves and foxes. The domestic *Bos longifrons* has no relation either to the bison, or to the urus, of Middle and Northern Europe. The sheep and goat have been derived from a wild ancestry unknown in the area under discussion, and one of the breeds of domestic hog in the Neolithic age (*Sus palustris Rütemeyer*) has an origin in some region either in Middle or in Southern Asia. The larger of the breeds of hog are derived, like the domestic horse, from stocks indigenous in Europe, but the fact that these stocks are also indigenous in Middle and Northern Asia forbids the assumption that they passed under the dominion of man in Europe, and not in Asia. Looking at the matter purely from a zoological standpoint, it is clear that the domestic animals were introduced from the south-east. The evidence of the cereals, and even of the associated weeds—the corn-flower, for example—points in the same direction. The association of both domestic animals and cultivated plants with the Neolithic stage of culture, not only over the whole of Europe in the Prehistoric age, but also in North and South America as far down as the discovery by the Spaniards, is sufficient to identify them more closely with that stage of human progress, than with any other. We may then safely group all archæological finds in which the domestic animals occur as Neolithic or later until clear proof be given that they are older than Neolithic. If they are older than Neolithic they still belong to the Prehistoric, and not to the Pleistocene, age. In deciding their age zoological considerations must have their due weight.

The question as to whether this civilisation slowly filtered northwards and westwards among the indigenous tribes already in possession of Britain, France, and Spain,

is one which cannot be answered with any precision. In these three countries it is clearly identified with the non-Aryan Iberic inhabitants, who are in my opinion—and Serghi holds practically the same view—of southern and eastern derivation.

13. *The Original Home of the Aryans uncertain.*

Whether the original home of the Celts (Goidels) who invaded France and Spain in the Neolithic, and Britain in the Bronze, age was in the plains of Germany and Russia, or those further to the east and south, is a question which has little or no bearing on the ethnology of Europe west of the Rhine. In this region, as in Britain, they are an invading race, and they represent the first wave of the Aryan migration, to be followed long ages afterwards by the Brythonic wave. Professor Rhys' view[1] that the latter were a more mixed race than the former, based on philological considerations, is probably true. The Goidel is clearly defined by his tall stature, lofty forehead, broad cheek-bones, blue and grey eyes, pent-house brows, aquiline nose and large mouth, fair complexion and hair, from all other races in Ireland and Scotland. The Brythons of Wales do not present any such uniformity, but just such a mixture of types as that suggested by Professor Rhys.

14. *The Ethnology of Britain at the Time of the Roman Conquest.*

Britain, when it was first known to the Romans, was peopled by three distinct groups of tribes, the Iberic, Goidelic, and Brythonic. The first came in in the Neolithic age, and are the ancestors of the small, dark inhabitants not merely of Ireland, and Scotland, and Wales, but also of many of the English counties, Yorkshire and Derbyshire in the north, Cornwall, Devon, Somerset, Dorset, and Wilts in the south. It is interesting to note that the Romano-British villagers of Woodcuts, in Cranbourne Chace, belong to this race, as General Pitt-Rivers has proved in his splendid monograph.[2] They were both pre-

[1] Rhind Lectures in Archæology, *Scottish Review*, April, 1890, July, 1891; *Philological Society*, Feb. 20, 1891.

[2] *Excavations in Cranbourne Chace*, 4to, Vol. I.

Aryan and non-Aryan. The second, or Goidelic, after their conquest of Gaul in the Neolithic age, crossed the silver streak and the Irish Sea, and repeated in the British Isles, in the Bronze age, their conquest of the continent west of the Rhine. They swept alike over the Alps into Italy and over the Pyrenees into Spain. The third, or Brythonic, passed over into Britain before the close of the fourth century B.C. They had already given their name to our island before Pytheas, the great Massilian traveller, sailed the western seas in the year 325 B.C.,—how long before we do not know. They probably belong to the group of Gallic tribes who conquered the lower basin of the Po at the beginning of the fourth century B.C., sweeping through the Alps, and passing in the following century eastwards to the attack on Greece and the foundation of the kingdom of Galatia in Asia Minor.[1] The Belgæ are also later Brythonic invaders, whose conquest of Britain was arrested by the Roman arms.

15. *The Veneti and their Influence.*

The insular Belgæ carried on a close intercourse with their Continental kinsmen, and the aid which they gave to the Armorican League was the proximate cause of the invasion of Britain. In this league, the Veneti of the Morbihan stand out as the great seafarers and merchants. Their capital, Vannes, the Venetia of Cæsar, was in the west, on the shores of the Atlantic, exactly what the Venice of the east was in the Mediterranean. The British seas were familiar to their fleets, and their leathern sails were well known in the creeks and rivers of the southern seaboard.

What was the relation of the Atlantic Venice to her sister in the Adriatic? The Veneti of the latter, according to the legend of Antenor, came from Paphlagonia, and migrated after the siege of Troy to Thrace, and thence to the region extending from the Alps to the Adriatic, a region which commanded the southern outlets of the two great trade routes through Germany to the Amber coast.

[1] According to one account, the Tectosages carried back some of the plunder of Delphi to their capital, Tolosa (Toulouse). Article Galatia, Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography*, 1878, Vol. I.

Thus the voice of tradition assigns to the Veneti the same Asiatic source, and proximately the same route, as the Tyrhenes or Etruskans, who established themselves in Italy some time close after their expulsion from Greece by the Dorian invaders in 1200 B.C. It is significant that the Etruskans were masters of these southern outlets to the trade routes up to the time of the Gallic invasion of 400 B.C. I will not venture in this place to plunge into the controversy as to the share which the Adriatic Veneti and the Etruskans had in the introduction of the Ægean, Mykenæan, and Italo-Greek arts among the farmers and herdsmen of the North. It may, however, be noted that the Etruskans were in possession of the only mining district in the Mediterranean where tin necessary for bronze is found: that of Cento Camarelli, near Leghorn.[1] They therefore occupied a commanding position in the bronze trade on the Mediterranean Sea, as well as in the overland trade to the Amber coast, in the Bronze and Iron ages.

In the opinion of Strabo (iv. 195), the Veneti[2] migrated into Italy from the region north of the Alps, like the Senones, Cenomani, and Lingones, and other Gallic tribes, who carved out Gallia Cisalpina for themselves with their swords. This view is strongly supported by the fact that the Veneti, both in Gaul and Italy, had for their neighbours the three Gallic tribes above-mentioned. They are described by Polybius as differing slightly from the Celts, but speaking a different tongue, a statement which may be explained on the hypothesis that they were Belgæ or P-Celts as contrasted with the Goidels or Q-Celts of Rhys.

These facts constitute very strong grounds for the view that the Venetians of the Morbihan and those of the Adriatic belong to one stock, more or less mixed with other peoples, and that probably Brythonic, and that they derived their taste for commerce and their seafaring capacity from one and the same source. They were the great maritime power in the Western Atlantic for an unknown period before the days of Cæsar. To them is due more than to any other known people the development of

[1] Boyd Dawkins, *Early Man*, p. 405.

[2] The Veneti are probably a different people from the Venedi of the Lower Elbe, mentioned by Tacitus as rude barbarians—the probable ancestors of the modern Wends.

trade by which the Mediterranean arts were introduced into Britain. Ireland, as Montelius and A. J. Evans have pointed out, was the El Dorado of the North, and the amber of the Baltic was the objective of the two great overland routes to the Mediterranean. Through the Venetian traders the beautiful southern designs so conspicuous on the golden and bronze ornaments in Ireland might readily have been introduced, and characteristic golden ornaments of Irish manufacture have been distributed as far to the east as the Baltic. It was probably mainly through them that the southern designs and articles were brought into the lake village of Glastonbury, recently explored by Mr. Bulleid, and it is very likely that they had a preponderant share in introducing the "Late Celtic" culture which ultimately penetrated into every part of the British Isles. While, however, we emphasise the Venetian influence both in the Adriatic and in the Atlantic regions, we must not forget that the Belgic settlers in Britain were highly civilised, and that they had before been subjected on the Continent to the Italo-Greek and afterwards to the Massilian influence. The latter penetrated through Gaul along the trade routes, and, as Sir John Evans has proved from the study of the coins—such, for example, as the gold coins found in Hod fortress, near Blandford—arrived in Britain from 200 to 150 B.C. This "Late Celtic" culture, too, was based on an earlier civilisation belonging to the Bronze age, as well as to an early period in the Prehistoric Iron age.

16.—*British closely connected with Continental Tribes.*

The impression left on our minds by all these facts is that the British tribes, at the dawn of history, were in close touch with the Continental civilisation. Those in the South stood and fell with the political organisation of their kinsmen and allies in Northern Gaul. British levies fought against the Romans in the memorable sea-fight which destroyed the maritime power of the Venetians in the West, and placed Britain at the mercy of the Roman fleets. The fall of the Venice of the west was naturally followed by the invasion and conquest of Britain.

17.—*The Archæological Work of the Future.*

I turn, in conclusion, to the archæological work which lies before us.

If we take stock of our knowledge of the internal condition of the British tribes, we find that it is very small. It is based mainly on the fragments of the lost history of Pytheas embedded in the works of later writers. What do we know, for example, about the Durotriges? They are almost a mere geographical expression. Their place in British ethnology is a guess, and their manners and customs, their habitations, and their fortresses, as distinguished from those of other Celtic peoples, are equally unknown. And this is the case in a land called after their name, and abounding with remains which await the scientific use of the pickaxe and shovel. Dorset, in its entrenched villages and fortresses, is a veritable "El Dorado," from which may be extracted, by the methods adopted by General Pitt-Rivers, untold archæological wealth. We have heard from him in his address this morning the story of the discovery of two forts of the Bronze age, which has gone far to fill a blank in our knowledge of the south of England. Why not carry on the work in filling the greater blank which exists in our knowledge of Dorset in the Prehistoric Iron age? The scientific exploration of one fortress, Maiden Castle, Hod, or Hamildon, would tell us more than all that has hitherto been done or written. The gold lies buried at no great depth from the surface. If you dig it and set it in circulation, you will earn the gratitude of all future students of the history of Britain. Within the boundaries of this beautiful county you have unrivalled opportunity of noble service in lifting the veil from that portion of the past where the Prehistoric shades off into the Historic period.