

great antiquity. He did not quite understand what his friend Dr. Hunt had said about speech. He had made remarks upon the difference between speech and instinct—

Dr. HUNT—You stated that there were men without speech, and with only instinct, and I asked how you could class these creatures as men?

Mr. CRAWFURD replied that he had not stated any such thing, and Dr. Hunt had only misconceived what he did say. He said that there was capacity for speech, but they could not speak, because they had never learned. In the same they could not use gunpowder or steam engines, because they knew nothing about them.

Sir SAMUEL BAKER observed that he was very glad to see anthropologists and ethnologists on such good terms with one another. They reminded him of a distinction which an Arab chief once made. An anthropologist and an ethnologist were apparently one,—just the same,—with a little difference.

*Skin, Hair, and Eyes as Tests of the Races of Men (previously read in London),* by Mr. JOHN CRAWFURD.—He remarked that the skin, hair, and eyes, taken either separately or conjointly, formed but a very ambiguous test of the races of men, seeing that some of them are common to several races in all other respects widely different. The complexion or colour of the skin, so far as the integuments were concerned, was the most conspicuous distinction of race. It was white, of many shades in Europe, including the neighbouring portion of Western Asia. There was no evidence that a black or brown native race ever existed in Europe, or a native white race in any other part of the world. The eye, in a great measure, followed as to colour and complexion. With respect to position, the eye was more or less deep seated, or had more or less prominent properties, which did not appear to be characteristic of any particular races. In the European races, and those of Western and Central Asia, it was horizontal, while with the Chinese and races of Tartary it lay obliquely in its socket, the inner angle being depressed, while the outer was elevated. This character, however, belonged more or less to other races equally with the Chinese, so that it was not of much value in the discrimination of races. Some had fancied that colour in men depended on climate, or that a powerful sun made the complexion more or less black, while a weaker one left it to improve in fairness in proportion to its feebleness. This popular error arose out of the narrow experience of our ancestors. The author then went on to state that on the continent of Australia the native inhabitants are of the same unvarying black from Cape York in the 11th degree of latitude to Tasmania in about the 43rd degree. They had here, then, an exclusively black complexion, while in other parts of the world, with corresponding climates, they had fair, brown, yellow, and black complexions. Such incontestable facts as these disposed at once of the hypothesis of climate being the cause of colour in the human complexion. If, then, the variety of colour were not the effect of climate, from what cause was it derived? This was one of the inscrutable mysteries which they could not solve any more than the varieties of colour in the lower animals. In con-

clusion, he remarked that Nature had made colour a distinction of species in the lower animals, and it had done the same, although not less definitely, in the races of men, and in both cases men were equally ignorant of the grounds on which it has done so.

Mr. CRAWFURD then said he would be glad to hear any remarks on this paper, and first he would ask for the opinions of the founder of the Anthropological Society.

Dr. JAMES HUNT was most happy to accept the invitation to make a few remarks on this interesting paper on one of the greatest difficulties in the whole range of the science of man. Mr. Crawford had wound up his paper by saying that as yet science was unable to account for the distinction of colour. Well, they had been at that for the last half century; attempts had been made to correlate the different races or species of men with the particular physical condition by which they were surrounded. Still, up to the present there was very little advance or sound generalisations arrived at. Dr. Prichard had said that climate would account for it, and endeavoured to illustrate this, but before he concluded his labours had to acknowledge that we could not tell how the distinctions in mankind had been produced, and to content himself in putting forth speculations on how they might have arisen. There were not such differences between bare skulls that they could not be used as a basis of classification; and he held that of the colour of skin, eyes, and hair, the structure of the latter was the most important for this purpose. Mr. Crawford held that there were exceptions, and he pointed out these; and though he did not know that gentleman's present opinion with regard to the number of special creations of man, which he required to explain the present differences in mankind, he knew that four years ago Mr. Crawford believed forty to be necessary.

Mr. CRAWFURD: I have sixty now.

Dr. HUNT: I have not been in communication with Mr. Crawford much of late, but the addition of twenty new species in four years is, on the whole, a satisfactory rate of progress. I think this subject is one of the most important in the whole range of anthropology—I beg your pardon,—the science of man. Dr. Hunt then continued to explain that, of late years, attempts had been going on to make examinations in different countries and countries and prepare tables of the results, so that a general broad classification might be arrived at. The subject would be a matter of difficulty for many years. He had found as great difference amongst the colours of hair in Norway as there was in this country, and he hoped that by the investigations now going on they would be able to correlate the structure of most of the races of Europe. Mr. Crawford had admitted, as all must, that science was not yet in a state to show the cause of physical, mental, and moral differences in mankind; and he had said, too, that they could give no reason for such differences. In the latter he was, perhaps, going rather too far, as he (Dr. Hunt) held that man's progress in the scale of civilisation, accompanied with other things, bore a relation to both skin and hair. A dark skin, accompanied with crisp hair, was invariably a mark of mental inferiority; but he held that none of the characters on which

Mr. CRAWFURD dwelt could be relied on alone as a basis of classification. They only become valuable when combined with other characters.

Mr. CRAWFURD said there seemed to be no very material difference between the President of the Ethnological Society and the President or Director of the Anthropological Society, and he was sure they would be all very glad that such was the case. With respect to colour, Dr. Hunt assigned inferiority to dark skin. He (Mr. Crawford) would deny that. Napoleon had dark hair, and a dark skin too; and he did not conceive that a better specimen, so far as the mere humanity was concerned, had ever been produced. Of course, he meant the first Napoleon. The third Napoleon was not a very genuine Italian or Corsican; there was something Teutonic about him, too, he was told. Now, with respect to the inferiority of the black people, although the Hindoos were black they were incomparably superior and in a far more advanced state of civilisation than the brown-complexioned Malays. He would advise the Dr. to give up the black inferiority altogether, for he had nothing whatever to stand upon. With respect to the races being distinguished by hair or complexion, differences were to be found in the same family in the prosperous town of Dundee, by the same father and the same mother. Suppose a family of seven daughters. There might be cases of the kind, and he hoped there were. One had dark hair and a dark complexion; another was fair-haired; and a third was reddish, or, to be more genteel, auburn. There was not the slightest superiority in the dark-haired and dark-complexioned daughter as compared with the lighter-haired and clear-skinned members of the family. There were cases of every sort of hair and every sort of complexion being found in families by the same father and the same mother. How could they make out that?

Dr. HUNT said perhaps Mr. Crawford would point out where a race was to be found of equal intellectual power to the fairer races when dark colour was combined with crisp hair?

Mr. CRAWFURD replied that he knew of the dark colour being combined with wool, and he had known some very pretty people have curly hair. Dr. Hunt said he would not condemn every one. That was very well put on his part, for in Dundee they could find beauty and talent in every department of colour.

Dr. HUNT, in reference to Mr. Crawford's remark in respect to wool, explained that he did not make use of the word wool, because wool was not hair.

Mr. CRAWFURD remarked that hair was not wool, and wool was not hair, but they were pretty nearly the same thing. There could be no distinction drawn between wool and hair, except what was obvious to the eye. They could make the same use of the one as of the other, though he would be sorry to see wool upon a pretty young lady.

Dr. HUNT replied that a dark colour of hair and eyes, combined with curly hair, was always a mark of mental inferiority, and he challenged Mr. Crawford or any one else to bring forward an exception to this generalisation.

The discussion then terminated.

*The Supposed Aborigines of India, as distinguished from its Civilized Inhabitants*, by Mr. CRAWFURD. (Previously read in London.)—In many parts of India there existed rude and even savage tribes, differing widely in manners, customs, religion, and not unfrequently even in language, from the great body of the civilised inhabitants. People in that state of society were found only in hilly or mountainous districts, more or less inaccessible to conquest, and by their comparative sterility holding out little temptation to conquest and occupation. They were never seen in the fertile and well-watered alluvial valleys of the great rivers, which, on the contrary, were inhabited by civilised nations, however differing among themselves in manners and language. Linguists and craniologists had invented a theory to account for this state of things, which supposed the rude mountaineers to be the sole aborigines of India, while it imagined the civilised inhabitants to be intrusive strangers, who in a remote antiquity invaded India, conquered it, and settled in it under the imposed names of Aryans for Northern, and Turanians for Southern India. This view appeared to him utterly groundless, and he went into a lengthy description of the history of the people, their manners and mode of life, and quoted several accounts of the several tribes, in order to refute the view which he had mentioned. After an elaborate paper he concluded :—The mind may safely carry us back to a time in which the social state of India was similar to that of America, when the civilised tribes were few in number, and the wild or savage formed the majority. The Hindu is, beyond all question, a far more highly endowed race of man than the Red man of America ; and civilisation would probably spring up earlier, at more points, and attain a higher maturity in India than it did in America. We may even point at the localities in which civilisation is most likely to have had its earliest seats. Separate and independent civilisations would probably spring up in the plains watered by the “ Five Rivers,” in the upper valleys of the Jumna and Ganges, in the central and in the lower valley of the Ganges, and in the valleys of the rivers of Southern India, such as that of the Nerbudda, the Godavery, the Kistna, the Cavery, and the Taptee. These nascent civilisations would be independent of each other, and for a long time be as unknown to each other as were the Mexican and Peruvian. All this most probably happened long before there was an Aryan invasion, or a religion of Bramah. The state of India at such a time would be a parallel to that of America on its discovery ; the wild and savage tribes would be numerous, and the civilised few in number. Proportionate to its extent, it would have as many small tribes, speaking as many distinct languages as America itself. India has still a score of nations, with written languages, but the number of its wild tribes has not yet been counted.

General COTTON remarked that each of the races referred to was deserving a separate study. Some of them were so like each other that the inexperienced would naturally suppose them to be one of the same tribe, but so great was the distinction that the one was in actual terror of the other.

*The Origines of the Norsemen.*—Mr. H. H. HOWORTH, F.A.S.L., F.E.S., read a paper on “The Origines of the Norsemen.” He said that in a paper which he read before, he endeavoured to show how differently the ancient features of Scandinavia must be viewed in order that its influence in the distribution of the ancient inhabitants of Europe might be appreciated. He then proceeded to examine and analyse in detail some of the problems with which it was connected. The reasons for the sudden energy of the Norsemen in the eighth and ninth centuries were to be found in the commotions that were taking place at those dates. The Mahometans were then in the full swing of their conquering spirit. The Georgian and Armenian annals were full of accounts of their sweeping in among the mountains of the Caucasus, and of the new life which their arrival aroused there. The inexplicable intricacies of the Eddic faith may perhaps receive some light from an examination of the effects of a Mahomedan infusion into the strange religion of the Parthians. Not that of Zoroaster—the religion of its higher society—but what we find reflected on its engraved gems and sculptured stones. It was this alone which could explain the very extraordinary fact that wherever Scandinavian relics were found in Ireland, Orkney, Denmark, or Sweden,—there were also found heaps of the coins of the Caliphate—not many from Byzantium, few from the Latin kingdoms of the west, but absolutely thousands from the other sources. Some might be seen by those curious in such matters in Edinburgh, which were discovered along with some silver remains.

*The Character of the Negro.*—Mr. C. W. DEVIS read portions of a paper, prepared by Dr. JOHN DAVY, “On the Character of the Negro chiefly in relation to Industrial Habits” :—

In this paper the chief object of its author was the vindication of the negro, who, he believes, has been unjustly considered a sluggard and inveterately idle. The argument used is of two kinds—one is founded on the organisation of the African, insufficiently fitted for work—indeed the very cause, under a mistaken humanity, of his first importation into the West Indies, with the vain hope of preserving the feeble and cruelly worked natives ; the other resting on experience—a very extensive experience—finding that, with equal motives to be industrious, the negro is not inferior to the white man in industry. The author adduces instances of conduct on the part of negro labourers that would be highly creditable to Europeans in the same condition of life. He concludes with the expression of belief that such peculiarities as belong to the negro—as colour of skin, quality of hair, &c.—are of a kind suitable to him in his native climate, and beneficial under a tropical sun and in a malarious atmosphere, and not of a nature to allow of his being considered either as a distinct or inferior variety of the great human family ; and further, that he is as capable as the white man, under continued education, in favourable circumstances, and freed from the curse of slavery, of becoming civilised, and of making progress in the liberal arts and sciences. One fact is dwelt on as of a very promising kind—viz., that these tribes, in the far interior mountainous regions of Africa, where slavery has least prevailed, and where the climate and soil are good, are most advanced—probably as