

geologists, Sir Joseph Prestwich, who first employed his vast geological learning in their defence; but the list may be largely extended, especially among the rising generation of geologists and anthropologists, not omitting, of course, Professor Rupert Jones and the late acute and careful observer Dr. H. Hicks.

Let the following extract from M. A. Rutot's letter serve as a sample of the encouraging letters received since my paper has been issued. He says: "En Belgique, il n'y a pas beaucoup à combattre pour faire admettre les eolithes comme industrie humaine. Depuis plus de 15 ans, nous sommes habitués à l'industrie Mesvinienne, et la connaissance de cette industrie nous a facilité la compréhension des industries plus primitives, eutel-mesvinienne et Reuteliennne, et aussi celle des eolithes d'Angleterre et des silex tertiaires. . . . Dans la question des eolithes vous pouvez être certain d'être vigoureusement soutenu en Belgique."

[“In Belgium, there is not much opposition to overcome in causing eoliths to be accepted as of human workmanship. For more than 15 years we have been used to the work of the Mesvinian period [l'industrie Mesvinienne], and our acquaintance with this has rendered easier the understanding of more primitive types of workmanship, e.g., Reutel-mesvinian and Reutelian, as well as that of the English eoliths and of flints of the Tertiary period [des silex tertiares] With regard to the question of the eoliths you can be sure of vigorous support in Belgium.”]

The time is approaching when there will be few or no sceptics on the authenticity of eoliths, and I thank Sir Henry for having, though unconsciously, ranged himself on their side. By the way, 'W. J. Lewis,' *GEOL. MAG.*, p. 342, must be a slip for W. J. Lewis Abbott, F.G.S. The late ardent collector of palæoliths was Henry Lewis.

R. ASHINGTON BULLEN.

“THE EARLIEST TRACES OF MAN.”

SIR,—In this article the author (Sir Henry Howorth, K.C.I.E., F.R.S., F.G.S.) taxes the upholders of Eolithic man with an assistance on their views both “in season and out of season.” His charge comes rather strangely from the author of the “Glacial nightmare,” etc., and one is at a loss to see either the force or even the meaning of it. All true workers in any science should gladly welcome from others any fresh views, even if they do conflict with previously accepted ones; and had these tended to strengthen those of Sir Henry, they no doubt would have been eagerly accepted by him, and would always have been in season even if forced.

Sir Henry admits to an obstinacy which he says has been stiffened and his scepticism increased by those so-called Eoliths. Now we all welcome honest scepticism, but surely obstinacy is out of place, and should be, in the truly scientific mind. Obstnacy, too, is generally the outcome of prejudice, and this seems to be the case in this Eolithic question.

He speaks as if the uses of all the Palæolithic implements were well known—we can only *guess* at most of them—and expects to find in the Eoliths forms parallel with them, and hence by inference

a race of men of similar habits and modes of life, and because such is not the case dismisses them with a sarcasm. All hairy animals do scratch a great deal, and even Job scraped himself, and so we may infer that scraping with a kind of 'scraper' was common in his by no means very early period. He expects man to have sprung at one bound over the vast period that separates him from the mere animal to that of the comparatively highly specialized being he was in the Palæolithic period. He thus ignores the fact that the rudest *existing savage*, who lives mostly on roots, and so needs very few tools of any kind, was far surpassed by Palæolithic man, the hunter of the Mammoth, etc.

In reference to the implements from the Forest Bed we regard them as Eoliths, and even Sir John Evans would hardly class them as Palæoliths. Also Eoliths *do occur* with the Palæoliths both on the plateau and in the valley gravels. Again, as to M. Boucher de Perthes, an exact parallelism exists between his case and that of Mr. Harrison, and one has only to substitute the one name for the other in Sir Henry's account; yet Sir Henry evidently cannot see the identity of position; one wonders much if he would have been on the side of M. Boucher de Perthes. We maintain, too, that Mr. Harrison's case is the stronger, as he has had all the past experience of others to aid him, coupled with the extensive knowledge he has gained since. Sir Henry speaks of thousands of shapeless stones with no classification; let him call and see Mr. Harrison's collection with an open mind. Is it likely that the men who find and bring these stones to those who collect them—and they do *not* bring them by cartloads—*could* do so unless they perceived that these objects had a distinctive type of their own.

But I must now leave Sir Henry to those whom he has directly attacked by name; they will no doubt answer him in greater detail and more conclusively.

F. D. BENNETT.

West Malling.

THE LATE REV. J. McENERY.

SIR,—Referring to Sir Henry Howorth's suggestion that Professor Huxley was instrumental in suppressing McEnery's Kents Cavern evidence,¹ it is important to bear in mind that McEnery died in 1841, when Huxley was 16 years of age; that McEnery's MSS. were left in an incomplete state; that they are in the possession of the Torquay Natural History Society; and that they were never in the custody of the Royal Society. The suppression of the Kents Cavern and Brixham Cave evidence is a very long story, and one long subsequent to McEnery's death. The late Edward Vivian, in 1859, in his "Cavern Researches" published the pith of McEnery's investigations, and subsequently Pengelly published McEnery's MSS. in their entirety, so far as they have been preserved, *verbatim et literatim*.

A. R. HUNT.

Southwood, Torquay.
August 10, 1901.

¹ GEOL. MAG., August, 1901, p. 340.