

- From the AUTHOR.—The Rajas of the Punjab. By Lepel H. Griffin.  
 From the SOCIETY.—Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of London ; vol. iv, No. 9.  
 From the SOCIETY.—Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland ; vol. vii, part 2.  
 From the SOCIETY.—Journal of the Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland ; vol. v, part 1.  
 From the ASSOCIATION.—Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science. 1870.  
 From G. TATE, Esq.—Proceedings of the Berwickshire Naturalists' Club. 1870.  
 From the EDITORS.—Archivio per l'Antropologia e la Etnologia. By Dr. Paolo Mantegazza and Dr. Felice Finzi. Vol. i, fascicolo 1.  
 From the EDITOR.—The Journal of Psychological Medicine, vol. iv, No. 5, and vol. v, No. 1.  
 From the EDITOR.—The Food Journal for February, 1871.  
 From the EDITOR.—Nature, to date.

Col. A. LANE FOX exhibited a worked flint of horse-shoe form, armed with processes on the outer margin, said to have been brought from Mexico ; and pointed out its resemblance to a specimen from Honduras, now in the Blackmore Museum.

Mr. BLYTH exhibited a flint celt found in gravel at Tooting ; specimens of grass cloth from the Lagos country, W. Africa ; and two similar necklaces of lignite beads, one from the Andaman Islands, and the other from Lagos.

Mr. JOSIAH HARRIS read an extract from a letter from his son, Mr. J. D. Harris, of the Macabi Islands, Peru, referring to the discovery of a stratum of rags about five feet in thickness, occurring at a depth of eight feet from the surface, and extending over the whole of the North Island.

The following Paper was then read by the author :

## II.—*On the RACIAL ASPECTS of the FRANCO-PRUSSIAN WAR.* By J. W. JACKSON, Esq., M.A.I.

THE day is obviously approaching when considerations based on the facts affirmed, if not revealed, by Anthropology, will seriously influence the purposes of statesmen, and permanently modify the councils of princes. Dynastic interests are no longer the supreme element in human affairs. The wishes of peoples as well as the desires of their rulers have now to be consulted. The rude ambition which would despise racial landmarks is now admitted to be of that unsafe kind which does o'erleap itself. Thus, perhaps, it is not too much to say that a merely imperial agglomeration of diversely descended peoples, held together only by the iron vinculum of the sword, such as Austria once

presented, could not now be established; or, if founded as a result of overwhelming military force, could not be rendered permanent. A power thus constituted would soon crumble to pieces of its own weight, and from want of all true cohesion among its constituent parts. The tendency to this is seen even where the nucleus of an empire is composed of one decidedly and numerically predominant people, as in the case of Russia, while in the instance of Turkey, where the governing race are merely immigrant conquerors, the ethnic diversity of their subjects is proving hopelessly fatal to the very existence of the State.

Monarchs and their ministers, however, are not the only persons who find the race-question too strong for them. Theoretical legislators, like Bentham, and political economists, like John Stuart Mill, together with all those zealous, but rather injudicious, philanthropists who deem it necessary to the success of their benevolent undertakings to deny the radical diversity, while they imply if they do not affirm the mental, if not the physical equality of races, are beginning to admit that ethnic specialities are something more than a surface phenomenon; structure being connected with, and so in a sense indicative of, character. In truth, events, and those, too, of the gravest character, are every day forcing anthropological facts upon the notice of the public, and compelling even the most indifferent, or the most unwilling, to reflect on the specialities of race. And now, as if to confirm us in our views as to the paramount importance of ethnic data, we have the almost pre-historic conflict between Celt and Teuton renewed, not only in all its former force and virulence, but with a certain increase of intensity, due perhaps in part to the scientific appliances and locomotive instrumentalities of modern civilisation, which has thus done more to arm the combatants with weapons and provide them with opportunities for mutual destruction than to diminish their ferocity by the culture of those arts, which, according to certain literary authorities, both ancient and modern, are so favourable to the softening of manners. Having, then, in some former papers in the *Anthropological Review* already contemplated the relations and characteristics of the Roman and the Teuton (Jan. 1866), as well as the Roman and the Celt (April, 1867), it may not perhaps be amiss to complete this division of our subject-matter by contemplating Teuton and Celt, not so much in their relation to the great imperial people of antiquity as to each other, and to the remaining peoples and nationalities of Europe and the world.

To the true student of anthropology few things are more patent, and nothing is more mortifying, than the limitation of

his knowledge. In every direction anything approaching to profound investigation leads him to impassable barriers. Look where he may he is everywhere confronted by insoluble problems, by facts of which he has not ascertained the cause, and results of which he does not understand the processes. And among these mortifying limitations, none are more remarkable than his inability to discover the origin and assign the primal habitat of that Aryan race, of one of whose many families he is presumably a member. Nay, the later history of these families, the age when, and the place where, they commenced as distinct varieties, is still matter of controversy, or rather of the vaguest speculation, in which opinion dominates fact, and preconceived ideas assume the place of ascertained data. It is no wonder, therefore, that we cannot even pretend to trace the origin of the Celtic and Teutonic families of Europe. It will be well, indeed, if we should, even by remote approximation, succeed in defining them.

In "The Aryan and the Semite" it was shown that one speciality of the Hebrew division of the Semitic family, consisted in their geographical position, in virtue of which they could not be easily or even directly invaded and colonised by the ruder Negroid tribes on the south, or the coarser Turanians from the north; one result of this more favourable position being a higher type and greater purity of blood on their part than on that of some of their Amharic and Aramaic kinsmen. Now, a similar remark is applicable to the Celts of Gaul, and, I may add, of Britain, as compared with other Aryan peoples of Europe. They are shut in from Tartarian invasion on the north and east by the Slavons and Teutons, and from Moorish invasion on the south by the Iberians, the result of which is that they present a higher nervous type, and are consequently endowed with more sensibility, susceptibility, and intensity of thought and feeling than their neighbours. This more powerful development of the nervous system as contradistinguished from the osseous and the muscular, constitutes indeed the distinctive characteristic of the Celt; that by which more especially he is separated as a variety from the heavier Teuton and harsher Iberian, and in which he transcends the classic ancients, and equals, if he does not surpass, the modern Italian. Now a people so constituted cannot fail, when civilised, to be brilliant and imposing in their era of national energy and force; but they will be liable to periods of fearful collapse, which would eventually become irremediable but for their racial baptism and renewal through the conquests and colonisation at appropriate ethnic periods, by the stronger Teuton.

Have we not in these few remarks a key to the history of

France, whether in ancient or modern times? The centre of at least the continental portion of the great Celtic area of the west, it seems, in conjunction with Britain, to have suffered from the collapse of energy and vigour, which in due sequence succeeded that period of greatness during which Brennus marched on Rome. Not that we regard this last event as marking the culminating period of prehistoric Celtic power and culture, which probably synchronised with, if it did not precede, that now almost monumental age of civilisation, of which we have such a living picture in the *Iliad*, and which we find represented on the tombs of the Egyptian kings, when the war-chariot constituted the most salient feature on the battle field, and when, at least in India, Chaldea, Assyria, Egypt, Gaul, and Britain, a high and holy priesthood, under whatever title, whether as Brahmans, Magi, or Druids, exercised a sacerdotal sway, of which that of the Romish clergy in the middle ages, was but a feeble echo. Without affirming with my friend, Mr. Luke Burke, that the Celts originated this early phase of civilisation, I think we are fully justified in affirming that they shared in it; Gaul and Britain constituting an integral portion of the area over which it prevailed.

We may now begin to understand the ethnic significance of the Roman conquest of Gaul. It was only possible as a result of that moral and physical collapse of the Celtic peoples which had succeeded their period of pre-historic power. But both the collapse and the conquest and colonisation which followed it, were partial as compared with that greater ethnic movement which accompanied the fall of the Roman empire, and eventuated in the immigration of the Franks. These conquests and colonisations from the south, however, demand much greater attention than they have yet received from anthropologists. We have been so accustomed, from what may be called our school histories, to regard the great conquering immigrations as necessarily coming from the north, that we can hardly realise the ethnic fact that Phœnician, Carthaginian, Roman, and Moorish conquest and occupation proceeded in an opposite direction. That of Rome, with which we have now to do, was a part of the great north-western movement of empire and civilisation, which constitutes the world-history of the last four thousand years. And we are not perhaps far wrong in saying that its effects were moral rather than physical, and are at present more manifest in the language than the ethnic type of the modern Gaul. Quite certain it is that Gaul was not racially regenerated by the Roman conquest. On the contrary, her people, in common with nearly all the European and Asiatic provincials, were left, as perhaps they were found, in a state of ethnic effeteness and prostration. The only true racial baptism of the Gauls within the period of

authentic history was that of the Teutons, mostly under the name of Franks, though by no means confined to that particular stock. Not so thorough and effective as that of England by the Saxons, Jutes, and Frisians, or that of Scotland by the Scandinavians, it nevertheless enabled France to take her place among the regenerated countries of western Europe, and even to worthily fulfil her exalted vocation as the *quasi* imperial centre of modern civilisation. This, perhaps, demands some little explanation.

From the dawn of history to at least the decline and fall of the Roman empire, civilisation seems ever to have tended to focalise its intellectual refinement and material resources upon some one centre, and so become for a time the especial appanage of one peculiarly favoured and imperial people. Assyria, Persia, Greece, and Rome are instances in point. Now, in a theological and ecclesiastical sense, no doubt, the Papacy was the successor of the latter. But socially and intellectually, if not also politically, the imperial mission, in so far as it has devolved on any one country, has been discharged by France; and she has done this, let us remember, upon the ethnic vigour and renovated racial force obtained through her Teutonic baptism.

But the colonisation of a Celtic area by Teutonic conquerors, however effective at the moment, can only be temporary in most of its effects; the sole permanent result apparently obtainable from the colonial extension of an alien people over a foreign area, being the mental and physical renewal, and in favourable cases, perhaps, the racial growth and development of the native and appropriate type of the country. Thus it is that the French of to-day, after twelve hundred years of Frankish occupation, are still the Gauls so vividly portrayed in the pages of Cæsar's "Commentaries"—more civilised and more cultured, but still the same impulsive, excitable, and variable people they were in the age of the mighty Roman. This brings us to the especial subject-matter of our present paper, namely the ethnic condition of the French people, and its relation to the momentous events with which we are cotemporary.

In some former papers, more especially the one on "Race in Religion," (October, 1866) I have endeavoured to show that the Celt, though less adapted to a theological mission than the Jew, and less artistic than the Greek, is nevertheless, from the refinement and spirituality of his nature, and the intuitive character of his intellect, to be accounted as among the most gifted of the sons of men. Beyond all question he is the most susceptible. Now a people so constituted will be especially liable to exhaustion, both individually and collectively, from the too rapid expenditure of their vital force, whether through their

passional impulses or intellectual activities, and will consequently need a more frequent or a more thorough baptism from their muscular correlates, than in the case of races less sensitive or less gifted. Now if these remarks are at all applicable to the Celts as a whole, they are emphatically true of the French,—being, as we have remarked, the key to their entire history. As a farther illustration of my meaning in this sentence, let me refer you to those portions of my former papers, already published in the *Anthropological Review*, in which I have endeavoured to show that the Celtic, like the Classic area, is duplex and bipolar; the French, in this epicycle of a previous era, representing the Greeks, while conversely the English are a maritime and insular reproduction of the Romans.

It is doubtful whether we yet fully understand the Gothic conquest of the Roman empire. For the most part we behold it through the spectacles of monkish chroniclers, and so unduly exaggerate the barbarism of the conquerors, and the evils of the conquest. Both the language and institutions of the Romanesque or Latin nations demonstrate that the invasion was less destructive than it is usually represented. But if less destructive, then, perhaps, we are justified in saying less recuperative. Now these remarks apply in an especial manner to Gaul, where the infusion of Teutonic blood over a large portion of its area was barely sufficient for founding a feudal nobility, as the Frankish lords of a Celtic peasantry. It was otherwise in Normandy and some of the Rhenish provinces, where the Teutonic infusion was adequate, as in England, to the ethnic regeneration of the great body of the people. The subsequent history of France thus becomes easily explicable. The Celtic population, refined but not regenerated by the Roman conquest, yielded like the other provincials to the great Gothic inundation, which, however, in their case was rather a military conquest than a true racial immigration. Two results followed. The old civilisation, as in Italy, being but imperfectly submerged, soon re-appeared; but conversely, the old ethnic effeteness, being also but slenderly supplemented, has again become manifest, and the French are once more Celts, exhausted by an era of empire and civilisation, and so awaiting their inevitable baptism of bone and muscle at the hands of their Teutonic, and perhaps, also yet more remotely, their Slavonic neighbours.

As thus succinctly stated, I am well aware that this must sound very much like a plausible hypothesis, opportunely propounded to account for passing phenomena; but in truth it is not a new idea formed under the influence of recent events, but a conclusion deliberately arrived at from ethnic data many years since, and either alluded to or directly enforced, not only in

several of my papers in the *Review*, but also in my work on Ethnology, published in 1863, where, under the head of "France," I have pointed out the probability of an ultimate reconquest and re-occupation of Gaul by Teutonic invaders.

Thus contemplated, the ethnic history of the Frankish conquest of Gaul is easily understood. A body of comparatively rude, though brave warriors, settled down as victorious and invading colonists among a people not only more civilised, but also more nervous and organically refined than themselves—as a result they soon adopted both the religion and the language of their subjects; unfortunately, in process of time they also adopted their manners and morals, and so became the most gallant and accomplished, and perhaps, with the exception of the Italians, the most profligate nobility in Europe. This was the condition of the French court from at least the decline of chivalry to the revolution, although even as early as the days of St. Louis, a decidedly Celtic type of character is perceptible in the nobility, and more especially what we should call the gentry, of France. The Teutonic element in the south and centre was becoming absorbed, and as a result feudalism disappeared, and was superseded by clanship, the clan in this instance, however, being the nation, and its chief, the Grand Monarque.

The age of Louis XIV was to France what that of Pericles was to Athens, and that of Augustus to Rome,—the culminating point of a mingled race; that is, the period when a subdued but gifted people of high nervous temperament, having thoroughly re-absorbed their alien conquerors, once more emerged into their appropriate activity and splendour of intellectual manifestation, characteristic of their type in its periods of positive energy and creative power. In saying this, it must not be supposed that we would rigidly limit modern Gaul's period of intellectual supremacy to the reign of her most distinguished monarch. In letters it extended to the death of Voltaire; in science to that of Cuvier. During the latter part of the seventeenth and most of the eighteenth century, the scholars and *savants* of France ruled the more cultured classes of the civilised world as acknowledged autocrats. Even in the youth of men not yet more than elderly, Paris was the world's centre of scientific activity, whereto the most advanced minds of England and Germany willingly resorted for the completion of their higher education, and whence issued those ideas and systems which have acted as the great moulds of thought to our own time. But, alas, how is all this now altered. Where are the successors of D'Alembert and Lavoisier, of Cuvier and La Place? Where are the rivals of Racine and Corneille, of Bossuet and Voltaire? There are still plenty of men of talent, but

where are the colossal master-minds, each a sun in his own sphere, who made Paris not only the glory of France, but by universal acknowledgment the intellectual metropolis of modern civilisation. They have departed, and left none worthy to fill their exalted thrones and draw that reverential regard once so loyally accorded to the leaders of French intelligence, as men beyond dispute in the vanguard of European progress.

Now it is worthy of remark in this connection, where our purpose is to show the gradual absorption of the Teutonic, and the emergence of the Celtic type, that whether in her present decadence or in her palmiest days of intellectual splendour, the literature of France was not Germanic but essentially Gallic in character, being distinguished by beauty and polish rather than depth and earnestness; the form being obviously regarded as of more importance than the matter; the graces of style holding the first place, grandeur of thought and sublimity of sentiment the second. It is the same with French art, which, less pure and therefore less elevated than the Greek, is nevertheless eminently decorative and ornamental in its lower phases, being the product of refined taste rather than creative power. Similar remarks are applicable to French music, which, faultless as regards glaring defects, is nevertheless wanting in depth of feeling and power of expression, being obviously the product of a mental constitution less vast and massive than the German. We suppose it is almost needless to say that French diplomacy is also eminently Gallic, being distinguished rather by fine tact and delicate finesse than by that profound subtlety so characteristic of the Italians.

We can readily understand that a people thus characterised would be eminently brilliant in their military undertakings, their successes, however, being generally short-lived, and more productive of present glory than of solid and lasting advantages. These qualities were manifested under the great Marshals of the Grand Monarque; but they culminated, and we may add collapsed, under the First Napoleon, while unfortunately they collapsed without culminating under the Third.

The French, then, are and have long been Gauls, not Franks. They would, doubtless, eventually have become so, through the slow but sure process of racial absorption and amalgamation, whereby alien intruders on a foreign area are eventually lost in the native type. But two events of comparatively recent occurrence have materially contributed to and doubtless hastened the completion of this result. We allude to the massacre of St. Bartholomew and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes on the one hand, and the revolutionary slaughter of the French nobility on the other. By the first a large number of those who inclined



to the doctrines of the Reformation, which as a Teutonic movement doubtless attracted the Teutonically constituted minds of the country to its standard, were either slain or expatriated, while a similar fate attended the remains of the Frankish nobility at the hands of the ferocious republicans of 1793.

Do we not see the effect of these destructive processes in that absence of master-minds by which France has been unhappily characterised during the last generation? This dearth of all commanding genius having at last manifested itself not only in the sphere of thought but also of action, so that the greatest military power in Europe has suddenly, and we may almost say shamefully, succumbed in one short campaign, partly, no doubt, from the frightful corruption pervading every department of the imperial Government, but in part also from the lamentable fact that France in her hour of crisis has found no soldier competent to the true leadership of her gallant legions. She has brave men, but she has no generals. The country whereto our ablest officers once resorted as the especial school in which to learn the art of war, is now without a single strategist to marshal her forces. Is she not also without a single statesman competent to the guidance of her fortunes? Neither is this phenomenon altogether new, for at the first revolution, after the death of Mirabeau, what remained for France but a choice between chaos and the Corsican—whose nephew, alas! has not proved a reproduction of his uncle.

Is there not a fatal evidence of weakness in this repeated resort of a great people to foreign leadership? Had not Rome her Cæsar, England her Cromwell, and America her Washington under the like trying circumstances? Why, then, was France compelled to have recourse to the Buonapartes, and why, when the second proved a failure in her hour of need, has she shown herself so pitiably devoid of all true self-help in his absence? There is, we fear, but one reply. France is not what she was in literature, science, or art, in statesmanship, diplomacy, or war; and so denuded of her great men, devoid of those elements of genius that once made her the envy and the admiration of surrounding nations, her soldiers are defeated, despite their valour, in every battle; and she who was the terror is now an object of pity to the civilised world.

Having thus surveyed the French, let us now glance at the Germans. The Teutons have done great things in the world. As we have said they conquered the Roman empire, and they inaugurated the Reformation. Tall of stature and large of limb, fair-haired and blue-eyed, they present us, more especially in the Scandinavian variety, with the beau-ideal of robust, vigorous,

and large-hearted humanity, dwelling in a temperate clime. They are framed on a grand scale, and are obviously intended as providential instruments for the effectuation of vast deeds and the utterance of profound thoughts. They are as yet but in the morning of their blushing youth, which, however, gives promise of a most heroic and imperial manhood. They are the reserve force of the West, which always comes into play when the more nervous races have been exhausted by the morbid excitement of their corrupt civilisation. They are the osseous and muscular pole of European humanity. To them we owe the regeneration not merely of Spain and Italy, but also of Gaul and Britain, after the decline of ancient civilisation. Modern Europe is largely of their making. Its feudalism was of their founding, and its institutions bear everywhere considerable traces of their influence. It is impossible to over-estimate our obligations to such a race. They made mediæval Italy to differ from Greece, and it is their larger presence in Britain which differentiates her from ethnically exhausted France.

They are the greatest musicians in the world, the massiveness and grandeur of their nature being more especially reflected in the wondrous sublimity and power of the oratorio. Handel, Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven are still unrivalled as the masters of composition; Kant, Hegel and Fichte, Goethe, Richter, and Schiller are an earnest of their ability for philosophy and letters; while Humboldt, Oken, and Linnæus show us what they can accomplish in science. Martin Luther, the greatest reformer in the past, and Moltke, the greatest strategist in the present, are also of this commanding race. Such spirits are an earnest of the future. A people who while at an incipient stage of political and social development, have been able to produce such men, cannot fail to exercise a deep and lasting influence not only on European civilisation, but on the progress of humanity collectively. As barbarians they carved their names indelibly on the pages of history, which they will doubtless hereafter fill with the records of their united action and their disciplined power.

It has been said that what we now see in this Franco-Prussian war is the contest for European supremacy between the Teutons and Celts in their two especially representative nations; but if so, this contest did not commence yesterday. The border wars on the Rhineland were in full activity in the time of Cæsar, and but for the presence of the Romans it is very obvious that the Germans would have entered Gaul *en masse* long prior to what history narrates as the great Gothic invasion of the empire. That invasion of the political followed at the distance of a millennium by its counterpart and continuation, the Protestant invasion of the Papal empire, are adequate evidence of the

weight and importance of the Teutonic element in the racial balance of European power, and are also demonstrative of the fact that that importance is not a thing of yesterday. From the remarks already made in the present paper, and from the general tenor of my other articles, it will be readily understood that I regard this occasional supremacy of the Teutons as more immediately a result of the exhaustion and collapse of the more nervous classic and Celtic races on their southern and western border; these more nervous races being the true leaders, and pre-eminently the intellectual representatives of Europe. Now the truth or fallacy of this idea is not, like some other rather recondite race questions, a matter for the discussion and amusement only of Anthropologists, for on its decision depend our interpretation of the past, and our legitimate anticipations as to the future history of Europe. Let us then glance for a moment at this department of the subject.

Of the bipolar arrangement attaching to many, if not all the well-marked racial divisions of mankind, we have already spoken; and we have also glanced at the principle of the cycle and the epicycle. Now, if we would rightly interpret the deeper meaning of this Franco-Prussian war, our investigations must be guided by both these important principles, for each comes into play in the inquiry such considerations involve. And in the first place let us ask, is it possible for the muscular correlates of a nervous type to effectually discharge the higher intellectual mission of the latter during their period of collapse? This, translated into the special terms applicable to present and passing events, means: Can the Teutons, and more especially the Germanic division of this great race, assume the true political, social, literary, æsthetic, and scientific leadership of Europe, and through it of all modern civilisation, during the possibly impending collapse of France? Judging by the teachings of history we should say decidedly not. Neither in Asia nor in Europe has such a transference of function been effected. The only possible substitute for one nervous race is another. The imperial centre of civilisation in its stupendous march from the Euphrates to the Seine has never diverged into Tartary on the one hand, or Mauritania on the other. Neither at the collapse of classic civilisation did it take flight to the Elbe or the Danube. It simply subsided until enabled to rise again, if not on its old site, then at least on its former line, that is, in northern Italy and France. Thus contemplated, the probability is that Germany, however victorious in the field, will not be able to assume the mission of France, and lead Europe through all her manifold phases of advancing culture to her ulterior destiny.

We are fully aware that other than merely racial considerations should enter into the attempted solution of problems involving such multiform data, and such stupendous issues as those we are now discussing, and to some of these we will now succinctly allude. In the first place Germany has not quite outgrown her age of feudalism. Her unification is only now in process, and she has no capital like Paris or London to represent and reproduce the Romes and Babylons of antiquity. Such a country, then, is not yet politically qualified for exercising the important function of European centrality. She cannot truly lead the nations of western Europe, because in her own internal political life she yet follows, *longo intervallo*, in their wake. The utmost, then, of which Germany is capable in this direction, is military supremacy; and of this she was largely in possession during all the earlier ages of the old Germanic empire, indeed till the death of Charles V.

And here a great anthropological question is presented for our consideration, namely, is not this very political condition an effect, and in a certain sense, a reflection of the vast and gigantic, but as yet imperfectly matured, German mind? To answer this question, let us ask what have the Germans done? And we reply, they destroyed the political empire of ancient Rome, but *virtually* they could not erect another in its place. So they shook the Papal Church, but no one will affirm that their conflicting and sectarian Protestantism represents another. And it is the same in literature; they criticise and annotate, but they do not *create*, except in music, perhaps, as we have said, the mighty promise of their great hereafter. This summed up in other words, implies that the German mind is analytic and not synthetic in its profounder constitution. Hence it can pull down but it cannot build up, or if so, only with enormous labour, as in the achievement of something for which it is imperfectly qualified. No wonder, then, that such a people were slow in effecting their political unification. Nor must we be astonished that they have as yet assumed no true leadership in manners, taste, literature, or science. The truth is that morally, as well as physically, they are supplementary to the more matured though less massive peoples of the south and west. As they conquer and ethnically baptise the more susceptible types at their recurrent periods of racial exhaustion, so in matters ecclesiastic and literary, they come to the front when the more creative peoples are in a condition of intellectual collapse.

We are now, then, in a position to define the mental and military phenomena manifested by modern Germany. Her intellectual activity, and consequently her European influence at the period of the Reformation, were due to the exhaustion of

the Papal Church after an unchallenged reign of a thousand years. So her sudden display of energy and ability in philosophy and letters, at the close of the last and beginning of the present century, must be ascribed to the approaching collapse of the French mind in the same departments. Just as her military triumphs at the present moment may be attributed to the fact that the advancing effeteness of France, after having pervaded her higher intellectual circles, has at last penetrated to her civil and military administration; in both, but more especially in the latter, of which she was once acknowledged supreme.

And now, granting the general truthfulness of the foregoing hypothesis, it may perhaps be asked, what is to be the result of this subsidence of a leading Celtic people, and the consequent military triumph of their Teutonic invaders? And we reply, the transference of European leadership to another Celtic people, lying one stage farther on in the north-western line of empire. This, of course, means the assumption by Britain of such portions of the mission of France as the latter may be compelled to surrender. And thus we are brought to the application of that law of cycle and epicycle to which we have already alluded. If France and Britain reproduce and represent on a Celtic area the Greece and Rome of history on a Classic area, then we may know somewhat of the real nature and ultimate extent of the phenomenon of national collapse with which we are cotemporary. We are not witnessing the subsidence of the entire Celtic race, but only, as we have said, a partial transference of the mission of one of its nations to another, equivalent in character and effect to the subsidence of Greece and the rise of Rome. Now Greece, during the entire period of classic supremacy, never lost either her literary or artistic mission. The latter more especially remained her inalienable possession, so that Rome at the maximum of her imperial greatness, not only sent her chosen sons to Athens for the completion of their culture, but she also invited artists from Greece both for the erection and the decoration of her superior edifices. Judging, then, by the prior event, France will still retain her leadership in manners, fashion and taste; and Paris will still remain the capital of politeness and courtly civilisation. We are perhaps justified in saying that the mission of Britain does not embrace these things, whether we regard the character of her people and her antecedents, or the destiny and function of her imperial predecessor. Not that we would be understood as demanding that the epicycle should, in all respects and in the minutest details, reproduce the cycle. This were unwise, and would show in its results that it was the mere

pedantry of philosophy. The true mission of Britain thus far has been political, colonial, commercial, and industrial. She has set the great example of representative government in combination with a constitutional monarchy and an hereditary aristocracy. Her advance in liberty has been through a process of healthy growth, and by the normal development of her native institutions. She prefers reform to revolution, and has thus set an example which Germany, Italy, and even Austria, have been but too happy to follow. Her colonies far exceed in area the entire extent of the Roman empire, and such has been their increase in population and resources, that she has not been inaptly called the Mother of Nations. Of one great republic, the foremost in the world, she can at least boast the maternity. Nor is it a small thing to say, that eighty millions of civilised men now use her language as their native tongue. Nor do we exaggerate in affirming that ere the close of the present century, more than one hundred millions of English-speaking people will be found occupying some of the most fertile countries and most favourable commercial positions on the globe. London is already the exchange of the world, and the true metropolis of commercial civilisation. In wealth, population, resources, and influence she is already imperial, and may be said from her very magnitude to imply the promise of a stupendous futurity. Of Britain it may be truly said that her merchants are as princes, and we may add, that her captains of industry are as kings.

If, then, France is losing a certain portion of her centrality, what country in Europe is so fitted for assuming it as Britain? Nay, we may go yet further, and affirm that she has already entered upon some of her imperial functions. Those familiar with my writings will know that I expect yet others to devolve upon her. Regarding England as the geographical terminus of the north-western march of civilisation, I anticipate its culmination on this island, and with this the summation and reproduction of all past imperial missions known to us throughout the historic period. I cannot of course expect others to go with me thus far, and am therefore quite willing that this should be regarded as an individual crotchet. Let it indeed be distinctly understood that throughout the foregoing paper I have aimed, not to dogmatise, but simply to suggest matter for the thoughtful consideration of our members, and of Anthropologists in foreign countries. In attempting this I may have fallen into grave errors, which, however, are of less consequence, as before such critics the chaff will soon be winnowed from the wheat, of which if only a few grains remain, my labour will not have been wholly in vain.

## DISCUSSION.

Mr. LEWIS said that there were some points in Mr. Jackson's paper on which he should be glad to hear some further evidence, as, for instance, the suggestion that racial characteristics were formed by the area in which they were found. Mr. Jackson had also spoken of a baptism of races by intermixture, but he himself had been unable to find that races did really permanently mix; and even Mr. Jackson, in his paper, spoke of the modern French as being the same as the ancient Gauls, and of the Frankish element as entirely absorbed; or, as he himself would prefer to express it, entirely eliminated. Most authorities agreed that modern civilisation was the descendant of the old Roman civilisation, which was preserved by the Roman and Celtic inhabitants of the cities as opposed to the Teutonic invaders who mostly settled in the country, and who certainly could never have introduced to the former inhabitants a civilisation which they themselves did not possess. The permanence of the Teutonic conquests he attributed partly to the ungenerous spirit in which the Teutons exacted the utmost gain possible out of any advantage they obtained; and partly to their greater fecundity, which might be considered by Mr. Jackson as a proof of racial effeteness on the part of the Celts; but, as regarded the French, was attributed by the Registrar-General to the latter marrying at a later age than the Germans.

Dr. CARTER BLAKE felt compelled to dissent from many of the initial facts on which Mr. Jackson's conclusions were based. Firstly, could it be said that the French were physically inferior to the proportions they presented some time ago? M. Paul Broca had entirely answered that allegation by elaborate tables and maps, which the speaker produced. These showed that not the slightest diminution had taken place in the stature of the French army. Secondly, Mr. Jackson spoke of the "baptism of bone and muscle" by the Franks. But how were we to be sure that the Franks and the Gauls were not both of them Celts? The Franks had been alleged to be light-haired, but such a statement really rested only on the authority of the novelist, M. Eugene Sue, in his *Mystères du Peuple*, and not on sound anthropological induction. He thought it probable that the Celtic area in classical times extended far east of the Rhine. Thirdly, Mr. Jackson spoke of the French as "the last Latin nation"; the pith of his earlier observations, however, was to prove the French Celts; and they could not be Celts and Romano-Latins in the same breath. Fourthly, had the pure Celts deteriorated in bravery? The answer was that the Bretons in the Garde Mobile, and especially the Breton sailors under Breton admirals on land, and under General Chanzy, had fought long and manfully against superior numbers of well-disciplined troops. Fifthly, had the pure Celts deteriorated in intellect? We had only to look at the French school of anatomy and of anthropology, admittedly the greatest in the whole world. The Germans might be superior as physiologists, nor would he attempt to detract from individually great German reputations; but French and Slavonic minds have produced all the great anatomical discoveries of the present century. Sixthly,

he utterly failed to see the parallel between the state of Greece under Pericles, and of Rome under Augustus, with that of modern France.

Mr. W. C. DENDY, while expressing his admiration of the learning and deep research displayed in the paper of Mr. Jackson, regretted that its voluminous discursiveness rendered it so difficult of discussion. From the various ideas regarding the racial elements and the varieties of character arising from miscegenation, etc., ethnology was often extremely puzzling. He believed, for instance, that the musical glory of Germany was much indebted even to Hebrew associations, and was not the result of pure Teutonic genius. In referring to the war between the Teuton and the Kelt as an ethnic question, it was clear that the racial element must not be deemed paramount in explanation of its one-sided conclusion. The Kelt displayed quite as much heroism and power of endurance as the Teuton. The secret of success in the engagement is also often dependent less on the high quality of the forces than on the pre-eminent skill and strategy of their leader ; so essential is it to have the right man in the right place for the insurance of victory. The two Napoleons commanded armies of the same racial elements, the first with a more copious sprinkling of conscripts or raw recruits ; but the consummate genius of the uncle was the diametric contrast to the shallow tactics of the nephew, as displayed in the passage of the Alps, the almost superhuman prowess at the bridge of Arcola, and the redeeming of the lost battle at Marengo. The result of these conflicts, also, often hinges on the prestige of the *first success*, and we may even believe that, had the battles of Weissenburg and Forbach been won by the French, the progressive fortunes of the war, and the ultimate triumph would have been on the side of the Kelt and not of the Teuton.

Mr. LUKE BURKE, though not prepared to take so gloomy a view of the future of France as Mr. Jackson's paper had set before them, could not but confess that events seemed rapidly tending to justify Mr. Jackson's conclusions. He would be glad to believe that in the event of the collapse of France her unfulfilled mission would be taken up by England ; but if so, England would have to cast off her present parliamentary rulers and their one-sided theories of peace and non-resistance, and take more rational views of the condition of humanity in the present era of the world. While acknowledging the general accuracy of Mr. Jackson's comparative estimate of French and German intellect, he could not subscribe to the importance so generally attached to the metaphysical tendencies and writings of Germany. On the contrary, these appeared to him to indicate attributes the very reverse of those which should distinguish clear and powerful thought.

Mr. G. HARRIS said that there were two points connected with the discussion to which he desired briefly to advert. In the first place, he thought that sufficient allowance had not been made for the extensive changes which, wholly independent of race, take place in the character of nations in the course of their career. This was particularly seen in the case of both the Prussians and the French, as they each appeared during the late war, and in those under the first Napoleon. The French



soldiers had undergone an essential change in all their most important characteristics, in point of subordination, of devotion to their officers, of discipline, of endurance, in all that contributed to form efficient soldiers. It had been remarked by one speaker that this could be accounted for by the conscriptions under the first Napoleon, which had emasculated the French nation. But the Prussians had suffered from the wars which were then carried on proportionately with the French. For instance, in the Russian expedition, Napoleon took with him thirty-two thousand five hundred Prussians, most of whom were lost; and thirty-eight thousand Prussians fell at Ligny and Waterloo. The real fact is, that the characters of nations are extensively changed by various influences, as may be seen in the case of Italy, and Greece, and Spain. The other conclusion which he drew from the present discussion was, that education was more powerful in its influence than was race. Prussia had been educated, and was prepared for the late encounter, while the military education of France had been wholly neglected, and both the people and the soldiery had become enervated by luxury.

On the motion of Mr. J. KAINES, seconded by Captain BEDFORD PIM, the discussion was then adjourned until March 20th.

### MARCH 20TH, 1871.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK, Bart., M.P., F.R.S., *President, in the Chair.*

THE minutes of the last meeting were read and confirmed.

The following new members were announced: JOHN EDWARD BREARY, Esq., Madras; and WILLIAM SLOAN, Esq., Luz, Madras.

The following presents were announced, and the thanks of the meeting voted to the respective donors:—

#### FOR THE LIBRARY.

From Dr. J. BARNARD DAVIS, F.R.S.—Honduras; Descriptive, Historical, and Statistical. By the Hon. E. G. Squier, M.A.

From Dr. R. KING.—The Manx Dictionary, vol. xiii; and Letters to a Candid Enquirer on Animal Magnetism. By Dr. William Gregory.

From the SOCIETY.—Proceedings of the Royal Society, No. 126.

From the SOCIETY.—Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, part ii, No. 4.

From the EDITOR.—Nature, to date.

The Discussion on Mr. J. W. Jackson's paper, "The Racial Aspects of the Franco-Prussian War", was resumed by

Mr. J. KAINES, who asked what signs have French Celts given that they are "a decaying nervous race", needing "ethnic baptism" at the hands of the "osseous and muscular Teutons", or Germans—in what department of human thought or effort? He then touched cursorily (and very briefly) on the causes of Prussia's recent successes on the battle-field—her iron discipline, whereby her hordes were wrought into so many merely animated machines. He showed that the French were outnumbered and overwhelmed up to Sedan; and afterwards France had mainly raw levies and volunteer soldiers, who had never smelt powder, to depend upon; and these could not cope with the disciplined warriors of Germany. Mr. Kaines objected to the phrase so frequently to be found in Mr. Jackson's writings—namely, "ethnic baptisms"; and suggested that "ethnic extreme unctions" would be a better phrase. "Ethnic baptisms" was a new name for brute force, against which all civilisation protests. All laws, religions, and politics, are framed to suppress, if not extinguish it. To the statement, that modern "French literature was deficient in depth", while German literature was characterised by it, Mr. Kaines replied that Mr. Jackson had mistaken lucidity and logical order for superficiality—qualities certainly not possessed by Germans, who mistook cloudiness and mysticism for depth, and general unintelligibility for profundity. Their depth, indeed, passed all understanding: Hegel and Richter were quoted as instances of this. German philosophy was subjective mainly, and dealt with what had no existence outside the brains of the thinkers; while French philosophy was mainly objective, and dealt with things which are: hence the difference between German and French philosophers and *savans*. German works on philosophy were written by philosophers for philosophers. German *savans* were deficient in the faculty of generalisation—Oken, for instance. Max Müller admitted that the Germans were uninventive. Until the time of Goethe and Schiller, they had no poetry worthy of the name—nothing but imitations, mostly bad ones, from the French. Menzel, in his review of German literature, speaks scornfully of this. The German drama, when not romantic—*i.e.*, unreal—was maudlin: Kotzebue's plays were instances of this. German fine art was homely, photographic in detail, and deficient in breadth and ideality. German histories, in the opinion of Carlyle (no mean judge), were Dryasdust collections of facts, as uninteresting as a post-office directory, without its order and lucidity.

In answer to the statement of Mr. Jackson, that there had been "a dearth of French master-minds during a generation", Mr. Kaines quoted, at random, the names of the following illustrious persons. *Science*.—Comte, Broca, Boucher de Perthes, Arago, Broussais, De Blainville, Geoffrey St. Hilaire, Quatrefages, St. Claire de Ville, Pruner Bey, Bichat, Berthollet, Pouchet, De Candolle, and Biot. *History*. Guizot, Thierry, Michelet, Mignet, Carrel, Taine, Louis Blanc, Janin, Bonnechose, Martin, and Villemain. *General Literature*.—Cousin, Royer-Collard, Jouffroy, Chateaubriand, Mignet, Littré, Lamartine, Victor Hugo, Beranger, Alfred de Musset, and others. Mr. Kaines asked what a nation (or race), producing such men, gained by "ethnic

baptism" with Germans (or Teutons)? Had not French Celts everything to lose by it; the Germans everything to gain?

Mr. Jackson had made the statement that "the Reformation was a Teutonic movement." The "insurrection of the human mind against absolute power in the intellectual order," as Guizot finely called it, was contemporaneous in France (Celtic), England (Mr. Jackson says Celtic also) Germany and the United Provinces (both Teutonic). In England, France, and Holland the Reformation worked out a political as well as religious freedom—not so in Germany. Germany lacks political freedom this day, as the imprisonment of Gervinus, for writing, not a political pamphlet, but a grave history of his own country from other than the point of view of the military junkerdom which rules Germany—bears witness. In the addresses recently presented to the new Emperor of Germany the word "liberty" occurs painfully often—a thing even Germans begin to be in need of. The Germans are not only incapable, as Mr. Jackson admits, of heading the modern social movement, but they are in the rearguard of civilisation. Their "osseousness and muscularity," in which Mr. Jackson so delights, proves them to be a backward people, needing "ethnic baptism" at the hands of a more civilised race.

Mr. BENDIR observed that Dr. Blake had declined to accept Mr. Jackson's conclusion as to the ethnic exhaustion of the French Celts of to-day, because Professor Broca had collected statistics intended to prove that Frenchmen had not deteriorated in their *physique*. Two facts appeared to upset the lesson drawn from Broca's figures. The standard of height in the French army had been lowered three times in sixty years, and the population of France was not increasing of late so fast as it used to do. These facts lent some support, he thought, to Mr. Jackson's statement. Dr. Blake had called attention to the eminence of the French as anthropologists and anatomists, whilst he considered the German school of physiologists as the superior one. Difficult as it would be to connect this opinion with the racial aspects of the war, there was but little foundation for it; the science of anthropology having sprung up in Germany and flourished there ever since: the literature on that subject was fully equal in value to French anthropological literature, and the publications of the late Anthropological Society of London proved it. That learned body had issued translations of six standard works bearing on the Science of Man,—of which three were by Germans, two by Frenchmen, and one by an Italian. In anatomy also the Germans held their ground. Dr. Blake had testified to the accuracy of Spurzheim's observations on the anatomy of the brain; Owen's high opinion of Oken as a teacher of and discoverer in comparative anatomy would perhaps carry some weight; Carl Ernst von Baer, more illustrious even than Oken, was hardly ever alluded to by men like Huxley and Darwin without some epithet of commendation. But in microscopical anatomy, which now most particularly engaged the attention of all earnest students of that science, the leaders were all Germans; and the names of Virchow, Kölliker, and a host of others would be a sufficient answer to Dr. Blake, who was so thoroughly competent

to appreciate their labours. Science was, in fact, the common heritage of all civilised nations ; and for the last hundred years the French, the Germans, and the English had cultivated it with equal success. If the French were more brilliant, the Germans were more profound, and no doubt would remain so in spite of the strictures of Mr. Luke Burke.

Dr. CHARNOCK said Mr. Jackson stated that the Keltic nations of the nervous stock are effete. But which of the Keltic nations were, and which were not, of the nervous stock ? He (Dr. Charnock) looked upon the Gaels, Irish, Welsh, and Bretons to be all of the nervous stock. The author of the paper stated that the French have acquired their superiority up to the present time through a muscular baptism with the Franks ; and they must now have another baptism with German blood. No doubt at the time of Tacitus and Cæsar the Galli were a rude nation ; but so were the Germani. Both nations were pagans : Mercury was the chief god of the Germans, and did they not worship him still ? According to Gibbon, the Galli, at the epoch of the Frankish anabasis, were a polished nation ; and what did Gibbon say of the Franks ? They were barbarians, were of inconsistent spirit, and noted for their disregard of the most solemn treaties, and for their thirst of rapine. And what was the proper estimate of the French at the present day ? He (Dr. Charnock) said, and did so advisedly, that notwithstanding all that had lately happened, the French were the most refined, the most civilised, and the most intelligent people of Europe. Mr. Jackson said the English people are of Keltic origin. It was time that such a heresy was put an end to. None of the reasons that had been adduced by authors to prove this fact were of any weight. No doubt both the English and the Welsh were for the most part dolichocephalic, but Dr. Barnard Davis, who had examined skulls both of the ancient Saxons and the Galli, proved that sixteen out of the nineteen of the former were dolichocephalic, and that four out of six of the latter were brachycephalic. Instead of re-baptising the French, it would be better to baptise the Germans.

Col. A. LANE FOX said he would confine his remarks to the subject of the paper ; viz., the Racial Aspects of the War. Nations, like individuals, may be great in literature and the arts ; but, if deficient in warlike qualities, are liable to succumb to others less refined, but more powerful, than themselves : and the main question for consideration in the paper, he thought, was, whether the results of the recent campaign were attributable to racial qualities, or to other causes. As a military man, he dissented from those who had expressed the opinion that racial characteristics had nothing to do with victory. All history showed that the two nations in question possessed special qualities which adapted them differently to the purposes of war. He took the liberty of quoting from Dr. Robert Jackson's work, *On the Formation, Discipline, and Economy of Armies*, which was written towards the close of the last century. Dr. Jackson describes the military character of European nations ; and his opinion is valuable, not only as an ethnologist, but on account of his practical experience as an army-

surgeon in the field. He speaks of the qualities of the French soldier much in the same terms as those of the Gaul were described by Cæsar ; viz., impetuosity in the onset, want of consistency and perseverance in conflict, and ready recoil after discomfiture. Though of comparatively low stature, and of inferior brute force generally, he speaks of them as active and elastic : " Being well placed on their limbs, and well poised at the haunches, they move with ease and freedom, and sustain long marches with facility.... Not so firm to resist as many, and not so powerful in attack at close quarters, they are constitutionally impetuous, and susceptible of an enthusiasm which, striking by flashes, achieves great things where it is well directed." On the other hand, he describes the Teutonic races as remarkable for coolness and endurance. They meet their enemy deliberately, and preserve an unruffled temper, even in combat. Dr. Jackson speaks of the French as being uncertain in their fire ; whilst the Teutonic races, and especially the English, have at all times excelled in missile force. It is remarkable that this quality still adheres to the two races, although the French pay more attention, perhaps, to the training of their men in firing than any other nation. He (Col. Fox) had but little experience, but he had had an opportunity of comparing the English and French in the field ; and his own observations led him to concur entirely in the remarks of the able author whom he had quoted. He had heard French officers describe the warlike qualities of the two races in nearly the same terms ; and he mentioned one or two instances in which, by the accounts he had received, the same qualities appeared to have been evinced during the recent campaign. Whilst, however, concurring with the author of the paper as to the influence of race, he did not attribute the results of the campaign entirely, or even mainly, to this cause, but rather to the corruption of the French army under the Imperial system, and to the incompetence of the commanders during the early part of the war. Neither did he believe it could be regarded as a war of races. Too much, he thought, had been done by the press to conceal the fact that it arose out of the ambition of princes, from the mischievous abuse of power in the hands of a few ; and that the mass of the people of the two countries neither desired the war nor were responsible for the evils which it had caused.

The following gentlemen also took part in the discussion on this paper : Dr. King, Dr. Collier, Mr. Chinnery, Mr. Prideaux, Captain Bedford Pim, and the President.

Mr. JACKSON said he hoped he should be allowed rather more than the allotted time of ten minutes to answer so many objections. As there were distinct areas for the fauna and flora of the earth, we might be quite sure! there were equally distinct areas for its human types. Hence the utter disappearance of the classic colonists of Northern Africa and the successive conquerors of Egypt. Hence, also, the gradual disappearance of the Turks from Europe, and, we may add, of the Gothic nobility from Italy, France, and Spain. The Teutons did not bring civilisation, but bone and muscle. Whether the Franks,

strictly speaking, were Teutons or not, was of small importance; Gaul was being gradually colonised from the north by a succession of Teutonic invaders for many centuries. The process was in full activity in the days of Cæsar, and Roman conquest only arrested the onward march of the invaders for a season, when it was resumed with more force than ever, and ultimately submerged the mistress of the world, as well as her provincials. France may still be a good school of anatomy; but her men of science no longer hold the commanding position they did in the days of D'Alembert, La Place, and Cuvier. Neither do her literary men influence the mind of Europe as they did in the days of Voltaire. France had not one right man in the right place, because her master-minds have disappeared. The Germans have genius, and that, too, of a grand and massive order; but their mental constitution is not adequately unitary and synthetic for exercising the exalted function of imperial centrality. The nervous susceptibility of a people is increased by civilisation, as is that of an individual by intellectual culture. But we must not despise bone and muscle, or hold a vigorous appetite in contempt. As the world is constituted, these are desirable even for an individual, and they are absolutely necessary to a people who would hold their own for successive centuries in the great arena of war and politics, where communities struggle for existence in the death-grapple of national rivalry, and where ultimately the weak succumb and the strong make good their position. It is rather a strange opinion that the Germans are not industrial. They were highly valued as workmen in France, and are regarded as among the best colonists that go to America. If the Reformation were not a Teutonic movement, then history is fallacious and geography is unreliable. Colonisation is the modern form of racial migration. Ethnic baptisms are as necessary now as of old. They are a part of the collective life of humanity. No doubt, dynastic ambition and diplomatic intrigues have had their share in bringing on this war; but it does not follow from this that it is not fundamentally and essentially racial in character and origin. Sovereigns and statesmen are not the masters, but the servants, of that power, which sternly concatenates "the logic of events". They may provide occasions, but they do not put true causes in motion; these are due to forces beyond their control. Alaric, no doubt, led the Goths to Rome, but he did so only in the sense of heading an inundation, whose well-springs and contributory streams were in full flow centuries before his birth. King William and the Emperor Napoleon, Bismarck and Moltke, were merely agents in this matter, for the transaction of an event as inevitable as the snowstorms of the coming winter, or the darkness of an approaching eclipse. It is to this level we must rise if we would contemplate the history of the past, or the political evolutions of the present, from a true anthropological standpoint. Our political prepossessions, and even our social preferences, must be cast aside as of no account in the scales of science, which depend in perfect equipoise from the golden balance of unalterable truth. I do not love France or admire the French less than some of their warmest advocates to-night. Have I not said they

are the Greeks of the Celtic area? Can I say more? But did it not happen to the Greeks that they culminated and declined, as is the destiny, sooner or later, of all the time-born? But, remember, Greece did not sink into barbarism till after the fall of Rome. She could not, for she had her own place, and with it her inalienable rights and prerogatives, implying her duties, in the classic scheme of civilisation. So France will never do more than veil a portion of her glory, while Britain, as the future representative of Celtic power and culture, comes to the front. We have also heard much abuse of the Germans, and my paper has been spoken of as pro-Prussian. There cannot be a greater mistake. I am not blind to the solid worth, the substantial virtues, the profound attainments, and the splendid organisation, civil and military, of our German cousins. But have I not said that, ethnically and geographically, they lie outside the line of empire, and that, consequently, although they have conquered, and may hereafter reconquer, unhappy France, they cannot supersede her? Have their greatest opponents to-night said more than this? But enough; as anthropologists we have but one aim, the truth as it is in nature, and to the attainment of this, let us hope that your observations, if not my paper, have in some measure contributed.

---

The following Paper was then read by the author :

III.—*On the PREHISTORIC and PROTOHISTORIC RELATIONS of the POPULATIONS of ASIA and EUROPE, in Reference to PALÆO-ASIATIC, CAUCASO-TIBETAN, PALÆO-GEORGIAN, etc.* By HYDE CLARKE, Esq.

[*Partial Abstract.*]

The question proposed for examination was the ancient extension of the Georgian (Georgian, Swan, Lazian, etc.) and other populations of the Caucasus. The evidence adopted was the ancient names of rivers, mountains, towns, and countries, in the classic geographies. Several hundred of these names were derived from Georgian words for "water" and "river", as *Mdinare*, Georgian; *Pshani*, Georgian; *Oruba*, Lazian; *Veets*, Swan (*Bedu*, Phrygian); *Gangalitz* (*Gangir*), Swan; *Tsqari*, Mingrelian. The mountain names, and those of some towns and countries, were derived from *Baal*, *Moloch*, and other "fire" roots. This language was classed as Palæo-Georgian, and a form of the Palæo-Asiatic, or General language, from which the Semitic, Aryan, Tibetan, Chinese, and other leading families of language, branched off. The structure of the language was illustrated.

The area in which these words were used was India, and India beyond the Ganges, Ceylon, Persia, Media, Bactriana, Arabia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine, Asia Minor, the Caucasus, the countries of the Danube, Greece, Italy, Spain, Gaul, Britain, Ire-