In every aspect of the matter the sense-organ must be present before its nerve can have a separate existence. The terms "utricularis" and "sacculars" are in all respects suitable and descriptive of the things to be named. Both of the nerves to which they are applied supply parts of the same organ complex which forms a well differentiated structure, and since both parts must have very similar functions it is certainly unadvisable to leave out of the designation all reference to the accepted idea as to the function which they subserve. Consequently, I hold that the names which I used in my memoir on the ear are the most suitable and the best grounded terms yet proposed for a revised nomenclature. The names may be used in full as Nervus acusticus utricularis and Nervus acusticus sacculars, or abbreviated to N. ac. utric. and N. ac. sac., or, since they are not liable to become confused with other nerve names, we may write simply N. utric. and N. sac. For the branches of each of these nerves we may write respectively:—

N. utric. { ramus cristæ anterioris. " " externæ. " maculæ utriculi.

N. sac. { ramus cristæ posterioris. " " cochlearis. " maculæ sacculi.

HOWARD AYERS.

The Lake Laboratory, Milwaukee, Wis., Mar. 20, 1893.

The Neanderthal Skull.

I HAVE waited in the hope that some one more competent than myself would take up this matter, but, this failing, I am induced to send a short note on the enquiry into the reality of our venerable troglodyte.

Dr. Brinton quotes very high authority in his letter; few higher than Virchow could be found. But it appears to me that the whole story was not given. We are all concerned to know the exact truth and value of these old relics of pre-historic man. But just now the iconoclasts are abroad in the land, and they may, as they have done in days past, go too far on that side.

The Neanderthal skull has never been unequivocally accepted as a type, chiefly because it stood so long alone. But a race has been named after it by some anthropologists, provisionally at least — the Canstadt, etc.

The evidence in favor of its authenticity has been before the world for many years almost unchallenged, and, with all respect to the eminent men engaged in the controversy, I submit that it is not quite in accord with logic or with scientific method to base an objection against the positive testimony of the discoverer on the mere recollection of his surviving widow nearly forty years after the discovery was made.

Waiving all other considerations, we know how treacherous is the memory of an event in which we were not deeply interested (and which we only in part comprehended) after half a lifetime has passed since it occurred. And that Frau Fuhlrott was in this mental condition is obvious from Professor Virchow's own admission, that she made this statement to him in entire unconsciousness of the weighty results involved. This of itself is sufficient to greatly reduce its value.

But there is yet another important element in the problem to be considered. In Sir C. Lyell's "Antiquity of Man" he thus describes the place: "I visited the spot in 1860 in company with Dr. Fuhlrott (sic), who had the kindness to come from Elberfeld expressly to be my guide, and who brought with him the original fossil skull." "The spot is a deep and narrow ravine. The cave occurs on the precipitous southern or left side of the winding ravine, about sixty feet above the stream and a hundred feet below the top of the cliff." He then gives a sectional view, showing an opening to the surface, and adds, "Through this passage the loam which covered the floor and possibly the human body to which the bones belonged may have been washed into the cave below." "There was no stalagmite overlying the mud in which the human skeleton was found." "The loam, which was five feet thick, was removed and the human skull was noticed near the entrance, the other bones lying farther in on the same horizon. The skull and bones had lost so much of their animal matter as to adhere strongly to the tongue, agreeing in this respect with the ordinary condition of fossil bones of the post-pliocene period."

The loneliness of the Neanderthal skull has been much relieved by later discoveries, especially by that of Professors Lohest and Fraipont at Liège, but waiving this and keeping to the main point it is not easy to understand how testimony so direct and explicit can be at once overthrown by a recollection of an uninterested party after 35 years interval. It will be at once seen how widely Sir C. Lyell's description of the ground, written by an eye-witness, differs from that given in the first letter on the subject in *Science*. Moreover, Lyell's description shows that not the skull alone, but other bones, and probably the whole skeleton, were present. Our low-browed palæolithic (?) ancestor has still enough material left to make out a good case.

E. W. CLAYPOLE.

Akron, O., March 29.

Prehistoric Coil Pottery.

IN the dim past when primeval men occupied this continent, no one knows for how long a period, they raised mounds, dwelt in caves, or built towns that are now below the surface of the earth. In all this long era they used flint or stone implements for all edged tools, hammers, axes, spears, etc. At the same time having no

COIL POTTERY.

metal pots or kettles, a rough earthen ware was used for cooking and for all other uses for which we now use iron, tin, and wooden vessels. There is somewhat of a resemblance in many of the stone implements all over the world. It is only recently that it has been discovered that there is a similar resemblance in much of the pottery of this early age, especially in the coil pottery. This pottery was made by rolling clay into long strings like cord, and while soft beginning with one end to coil it round and round, increasing the size of the bottom till it assumed the desired dimensions, then shaping it up the sides (just as straw hats are made) till the required form and size was attained (see illustration). The most extraordinary part of the investigation is that this ware made in the same manner is found in the mounds of Florida and Ohio, in the cliff-dwellings of New Mexico and Arizona, in the buried cities of the cañons of these territories, also in the Connecticut Valley and under the ancient shell-heaps of Cape Cod, Mass. What a long period of time it must have taken to have this art disseminated over so vast a territory at this early age. According to the uses these pots were intended for, so were they made large or small, thick or thin, and of various shapes. It was a common practice to use some sharp instrument to dint or work up some fanciful designs without obliterating the lines of the coil; in some cases they are beautifully marked, looking like carved black oak, others made of light-colored clay in very fine coils prettily indented forming neat designs. Some of the best ware is handsomely smoothed and rubbed to almost a polished surface before baking. All are smoothed inside, before they were dry; probably some of those