

Hampshire, Vermont, and Massachusetts. He enlarges (and very properly to) upon his extended experience with the paleolithic implements of the world. He expresses, without hesitation or doubt, that these implements were the intentional work of man; that they were not made by, nor did they belong to the Indian of that country. He says, page 385:

But no such traces of Indian occupation has the most painstaking investigation revealed to me in many places where I have found the new types of rude implements in considerable quantities.

Again, page 388:

It will be noticed that all of these rude and simple tools have been fabricated out of the hardest, heaviest, toughest kinds of rocks that the region where they are found can furnish. They are commonly made of white or milky quartz, or quartzite, felsite, or of some very compact variety of syenite or granite. Often they have been fashioned out of a pebble from the glacial drift, which still retains a portion of its original surface or crust. This circumstance proves that they must necessarily be post-glacial in date, whether they have been found deeply bedded in the earth or upon the surface of ploughed fields.

Professor Haynes sums up his argument:

I infer the former existence in New England of a race of men different from and less advanced than the Indians, because I have found in many localities, where none of the ordinary traces of Indian occupation could be discovered, a large quantity of stone implements of ruder types and coarser make than those habitually used by them. Whether these are actual relics of primeval man, i. e., of a race who lived long anterior to the Indians, or whether they are the work of the degraded descendants of an earlier people who had succumbed to the Indians, I do not undertake to pronounce.

The difference between Professor Haynes and myself is that he is unwilling to attribute these implements to a paleolithic period. He insists that to be evidence of this the implements in question should be found in the river gravels, or in a corresponding geologic stratum. I know that in many countries where the existence of a paleolithic period is undoubted, the implements (principally Chellian or of the earliest epoch) have been found on the surface, and they are identified as such, by comparison with others found in the river gravels. My experience with these implements in the two continents justifies me in identifying those found in America as belonging to the same stage of culture to which the Chellian implement of France and England belonged, and, consequently, enables me to call them paleolithic implements.

James J. H. Gregory, Marblehead, Massachusetts, February 6, 1888. Has found *caches* containing half a peck one foot below surface.

J. F. Frisbie, M. D., Newton, Massachusetts, February 16, 1888. Has none. Newton Natural History Society has a few. They are found quite abundantly in this vicinity. Many Indian relics found in this city and adjoining town—Watertown.

Samuel Henshaw, Boston, Society Natural History, Berkeley street, Boston, Massachusetts, February 9, 1888. Has no rude implements. "Our collection was presented to the Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology at Cambridge in 1867."

Samuel A. Green, Massachusetts Historical Society, 30 Tremont street, Boston, Massachusetts, February 14, 1888. Has a collection of rude implements, found at Groton and along the bank of the Nashua River.