

locked up at the Royal Society for years after his death." The Rev. McEnery's reports on Kents Cavern were finished about 1826, and Professor Huxley having been born in 1825 must have been always under age and without influence in the Royal Society whilst McEnery's paper was supposed to be "lost," but really kept in the background by influence of the Rev. Dean Buckland, who ascribed the occurrence of anything like human implements to burials of late date, as I myself have heard him affirm at a meeting of the Geological Society.

The reference to Professor Huxley in the paper alluded to above is probably only one of the evidences of the hasty character of the paper; but at first sight it appears, not only uncalled for, but unkind.

Some of his friends, like the writer of this critique, will regret Sir H. Howorth's inability to recognize the actual classification of eoliths as practically established by Prestwich, and illustrated in his own and B. Harrison's collections, as well as in the Museum of the Geological Survey, Royal College of Science, the British Museum (Natural History Branch), and elsewhere. Also, it is lamentable that he cannot appreciate Prestwich's lucid explanation of the geological history and settlement of the eolithic gravel of the Chalk Downs, as reproduced in Mr. Bullen's pamphlet, to which he alludes as having read.

To other shortcomings we need not refer; it is a pity that there should be any, for the author is doubtless an industrious gatherer of facts and notions, evidently so when he seems to have searched one set of about twenty volumes, "1829-50" (1), for the history of Ami Boué's discovery of bones near the Lahr (p. 339).

T. RUPERT JONES.

#### EOLITHIC IMPLEMENTS.

SIR,—Sir H. H. Howorth, F.R.S., has done me the honour of mentioning in the GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE for August my little paper on the above subject.

Like Balaam, having set himself to curse Israel, he has instead blessed them altogether. On p. 342 he says (assuming their identity with palæoliths), "Such remains are claimed to have been found at that horizon [the Forest Bed] in Norfolk by Mr. Abbott and Mr. Savin, in Dorsetshire by Dr. Blackmore, and they have been also reported from the same horizon at St. Prest in France and in the Val d'Arno, north of Italy, in each case the remains of human workmanship being accompanied by those of *E. meridionalis*. I believe these finds are quite genuine." (Italics mine.) The implements referred to as Dr. Blackmore's, pl. iii in my paper, have, as a matter of fact, an eolithic facies, and Sir H. H. Howorth's admission concedes all that for which Sir Joseph Prestwich's followers contend. "I thank thee, Roderick, for that word!"

Sir Henry mentions five men as upholding eoliths, including their original discoverer, Mr. Benjamin Harrison, and that paladin of

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. Obstinacy, 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