

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.