



On a Rude Stone Monument in Kent.

Author(s): A. L. Lewis

Source: *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. 7 (1878), pp. 140-142

Published by: [Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2841379>

Accessed: 15/06/2014 03:35

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Suburu, Accad. a sculpture, referring possibly to the Niobe. Nymphæ is another notable name. To these must be added the neighbouring Ephesus, Samorna, Pygela, Mæander (Mdinare, Georgian, river), and a host of others. Smyrna and Ephesus were Amazon cities. Smyrna is the place most accessible from England where monuments of the proto-historic epoch, probably Khitalyidian, can most readily be seen.

Col. LANE FOX: The pottery exhibited by Mr. Martin has all the characters of Roman workmanship; the piece of the handle of a jug, &c., the lip of a bowl especially so, the small fragment of red Samian certainly so; none of the fragments at all resemble pottery belonging to the archaic period of Greece. The observation made by Mr. Hyde Clarke as to the layers of shells being stratified more or less, seems to me not at all improbable in the view of the mass being a refuse heap or a kitchen-midden. I have cut out several kitchen-middens at different times, and have usually found such deposits to present a stratified appearance. Shells or other refuse of a particular kind are often shot down in quantities at a time, then other rubbish comes upon the top, and the weight of the superincumbent mass presses the various deposits down into seams as if laid by water.

The PRESIDENT, judging from the presence of so-called Samian ware among the pottery, the shape of some of the fragments, and the character of some wall-plaster, was inclined to regard the objects exhibited as of Roman date. He thought that the deposit was rather of the nature of a rubbish heap, such as frequently found in the neighbourhood of Roman sites, than of a kjökking-mödding properly so-called.

Mr. A. L. Lewis read a Note on a Rude Stone Monument in Kent, of which the following is an abstract.

On a RUDE STONE MONUMENT in KENT. By
A. L. LEWIS, M.A.I.

It may be doubted whether, out of every 10,000 visitors to Kit's Coty House and the fallen dolmen called the "Numbers," 100 visit the stones in Addington Park (some 7 miles off), which are figured by Camden as two circles, but which were more probably dolmens, one of which had an avenue at least 180 feet long, running in a south-westerly direction from it, and both which have been more fully described by me in "Anthropologia" (p. 511 *et seq.*).

If, however, 100 visitors out of 10,000 go as far as Addington, not more than 1 out of that 100 goes to or even hears of a yet more curious collection of stones at Colderham or Coldrum Lodge, which is about 2 miles from Addington, and one and a-half from Snodland Station.

Here, on the summit of a steep slope, some 20 feet or more above a private roadway belonging to the farm, lie thirteen stones of a medium size, almost touching each other, which may have formed the north-western half of an oval; and about 15 feet from which to the north-east lie three stones, which, if any of them are in their original positions, follow the rule for outlying stones which I have so often shown in previous papers to exist in our English circles. About 12 feet from the spot where the south-eastern half of the oval (if oval it were) would have stood, are the remains of what was no doubt a sepulchral chamber. Two stones, 9 to 10 feet long, 5 to 7 feet high, and $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 2 feet thick, stand about 5 feet apart, forming the sides of the chamber, and parts of the stones which formed the end nearest the oval also remain, but the other end projects over a small precipice about 10 feet deep, caused by the slope before-mentioned having been dug away or having slipped; and at the bottom of this precipice are scattered about ten stones of various sizes, which have no doubt fallen or been thrown down from above, where they probably formed part of the chamber or of the oval, which seem to have been two distinct erections.

While speaking of the Kentish monuments, I may mention that the proprietor of a small domain about a mile from Seven-oaks Station has thought fit to adorn it, at great expense, with (*inter alia*) a great number of large blocks of granite, arranged in circles and otherwise. At the present time there is no danger of these being mistaken for ancient monuments, but in the course of years they may become less readily distinguishable from the genuine articles, and in that case some speculation may be aroused by the unusual manner in which they are arranged; and the presence of a classic pillar amongst them may even be brought forward as evidence in support of Dr. Fergusson's theories. I think it may, therefore, be worth while to put on record the true origin of these spurious imitations, the construction of which is, in my opinion, as much to be regretted as is the occasional removal of original monuments from the place where they were erected to some other, for the gratification of the fancies of those who have unfortunately become their proprietors.

DISCUSSION.

Mr. HYDE CLARKE said that the name Colderham suggested the association of Cold Harbour. The application of Cold in Cold Harbour, and in such names of Germanic places, remained undetermined. He had greatly extended the copious list begun by Mr. Hartshorne, and had added other members to the series. So far as

he had seen, a Cold Harbour, or a "Cold" site, was commonly near a Roman road or site: but looking to our present knowledge, he thought there was ground for further investigations. Harbour, in most cases, signified military station or camp. "Cold" was a distinctive term applied by our forefathers to the harbour and other sites. The suggestion he would make to pre-historic and archaeological inquirers was this: Is the term cold to be found, as in Mr. Lewis's case, in the neighbourhood of a pre-historic monument, and if so, did our forefathers distinguish between a Roman camp, or station, which was a Chester, and the abandoned pre-historic camps, or stations. Although he had stated now and previously that Cold Harbours were situated near Roman roads and sites; yet these would in many cases represent pre-historic or Sumerian sites, for just as the Roman civilisation was destroyed by the English invaders; so was the previous civilisation of Sumerian epoch destroyed by the Celts in Britain and Ireland.

Mr. LEWIS said, in reply, that the name Colderham was also, and perhaps more frequently, spelt Coldrum. The greatest objection to viewing the stones in their present position, as forming part of the original plan of one monument of any form whatever, was that while those which he had called the oval and the sepulchral chamber were on a level plateau, and probably *in situ*, the remainder were at the foot of a steep slope 20 feet deep, down which they had probably fallen or been thrown.

Dr. John Rae then read the following paper:—

ESKIMO SKULLS.

I HAD the privilege of attending the series of admirable lectures so ably given by Professor Flower at the Royal College of Surgeons a few weeks ago, on the "Comparative Anatomy of Man," from which I derived much useful information, and on one point, very considerable food for thought.

I allude to the wonderful difference in form exhibited between the skulls of the Eskimos from the neighbourhood of Behring Strait, and of those inhabiting Greenland, the latter being extremely dolichocephalic, whilst the former are the very opposite—brachycephalic; the natives of the intermediate coast, from the Coppermine River eastward, having mesocephalic heads.

Why this difference? and which is the true Eskimo type?

We have no knowledge, as far as I am aware, of the Eskimos using any means in the form of bandages or otherwise, to change the shape of the skull; indeed, the heads of the Eskimo children, whenever I have seen them, have been left singularly free in