

Sacred John W.B.

June 29, 1867,

Dear Sir

I expected to have been able to reply to yours of 6th. ult. long before this, but circumstances have prevented my getting the carved head photographed upon now, and therefore I regret, that I might send you a correct copy of the original along with ~~with~~ what ~~remarks~~ facts I have been able to elicit in regard to it.

I expected to have sent you the photographs a month since; but owing to the stone lying in the Museum of the Mechanics Institute, in order to get permission to remove it to a photographic studio to have a picture of it taken, I applied to some of the Museum Committee; but ~~that~~ without success; I kept keeping on dragging about for three or four weeks referring me from one to another, I too tardily came to the conclusion that delay would prove defeat; so I

thought it best to take the bull by the horns,
I took an artist up to the museum of
the Institute and had it taken there.

It has cost rather more than I ex-
pected; the photographer charging \$3 per
dozen; and as there would have been no
diminution in price for a less number I got
a dozen struck off; which I forward to you
herewith, excepting one card which with
your permission I shall retain for myself;
as I presume the eleven will be more
than you will require.

I examined the Utopia medallion
(which is in the N.A. Society's Museum)
carefully but could not detect a single
mark of a tool, such as would be made
by a steel cutting tool; the cutting of the
medallion is very well done however, very
sharp clear & cleanly cut; yet I think it
all might be done with fluid instruments.

On the rock on which the head
is carved (from Kings Co. near the Neuner
Ocean's River) I found what I thought
looked like (three) small tool marks,
about such as a ^{stone} mason's chisel would
make yet about $\frac{1}{2}$ in to $\frac{3}{4}$ in. long & $\frac{1}{16}$ in deep;

yet the stone was soft when they were made & they could easily have been done with the finest implements. I could not see any marks of chipping or of fire on either of the specimens. The Medallion is flattened somewhat on the face, as fire would do; but I think it is due merely to exposure to atmospheric and vegetable agencies; the face of it being uppermost when found & somewhat moss-grown; the under side of the medallion is ~~not~~ quite bright in color like not very different from a piece of fresh Wren rock, save a little weathering. On the upper side the medallion is weathered considerably on the rim at the upper & lower sides as exhibited in the Photograph.

I believe I wrote you in regard to the block on which the human head is carved, that the pebbles of face was chiefly composed of Carnelian pebbles. Upon bringing it out to the light (it stands in a dark corner of the museum) I found I was entirely mistaken in that; and that what I had supposed to be Carnelian or ^{which are common in the S. California conglomerate} agate pebbles, proved to be a coating of reddish-yellow oil paint laid on very thick (on the face only) and having a gloss on it, looked

very like roughly polished carnelian.

When in the light a scratch of my knife quickly dispelled my previous misconception. The discovery of its being painted with linseed oil rather puzzled me, as I supposed that the Indians painted in water colors only.

When up in Kings County a short time since I hunted up the old man who found it; and asked him for further particulars in regard to it.

He (it must be some 15 or 16 years since) was digging ^{for} the foundation of a dam he was about to erect about a furlong from the head of Harris Cove (on the New Brunswick R., about 14 miles ^{N.E.} from Saint John) and found the stone a foot or two feet below the surface of the ground, in the position in which it is in the photograph. With it was a small stone shaped something like a champagne bottle, but shorter and larger in the neck. He did not remember ~~whether~~ what kind of stone it was, whether like the other block or not, and if may have seen nothing more than a long water worn pebble from the conglomerate of the vicinity. ~~It~~ It has since been lost. There was also with it (above

The figure he thinks) some bones of the bones of
some animal, he thinks of a cow or some
animal about that size. He says that
they were too large to be those of a man.
and he supposed that the cow had accidentally
died there, & that thus the bones came to be
where he found them.

They and the stone before mentioned were
the only articles he found with the figure.

I asked him if the face were painted
when he got it and he said no. That the
rock was covered with dirt or earth; and
that he scraped ^{it all off} the head ~~of the~~ carved on it
with a chisel or knife or something of that
kind; and said that the paint must have
been put on it since it left him.

His having scraped the head in that way
may account for the three small tool
marks I observed on it.

He said that in scraping it, the rock crum-
bled a good deal on the surface; and particu-
larly that quite a large piece came off the
nose (a flake of rock he called it) and that the
nose was thus made much smaller.

You will observe in the photograph that

The end of the nose seems to have been broken off. He says also that in cleaning out the eyes the rock crumbled, and they were thereby enlarged. They are nothing more but roughly hemispherical holes on each side of the nose.

The rock out of which the block is composed, is the Lower Camb. Conglom. found in the vicinity (indeed underlying I think the very spot where the figure was found) composed of limestone, quartzose hard altered sandstone, & sometimes chert) pebbles, cemented by a coarse reddish sandstone paste, the conglomerate being frequently interstratified with a very coarse red sandstone. There is also a good deal of diallage, in some of the pebbles in flaky xls. of about 1/4 in in diameter.

These are all the observations that occur to me now in regard to the figure. If you would like to ascertain ^{information on} any other points in regard to it, I shall be very glad to communicate it to you, if possible; and if you would wish any further information in regard to the finding

^{it}
of it; as we are now living out of town for the
summer; I can easily see the old
man who found it and get if possible
further particulars in regard to it.

There is no trace of weathering on it ex-
cept the nose, eyes, & upper lip (which
seems to be considerably crumbled away);
all of which are due I think to the cleaning
up which the old man gave it. He is an
ignorant old Irishman, and of course
cannot tell much more about it than
the way in which he found it.

In the Lake Utaia medallion
the weathering seems to be chiefly confined
to the rim of it, though the carved part
especially the neck is also ^{somewhat} a good deal
weathered.

I remain

Yours truly
P. M. Muller

P.S. The Society has received a contribu-
tion of the Can. Geol. Survey; which I
am perusing with much pleasure.
Did you receive the Post Office order returned P.M.
to you? You said nothing about it in your letter.

Matthew
Robertson
1867