

**Address to the Ethnological and Anthropological Department of the
Section of Biology at the Liverpool Meeting, 1870 / by John Evans.**

Contributors

Evans, John, 1823-1908.
Royal College of Surgeons of England

Publication/Creation

[Liverpool?] : [British Association for the Advancement of Science], [1870]

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/d2hxx8b9>

Provider

Royal College of Surgeons

License and attribution

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by The Royal College of Surgeons of England. The original may be consulted at The Royal College of Surgeons of England. where the originals may be consulted. This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

113
36

ADDRESS

TO THE

ETHNOLOGICAL AND ANTHROPOLOGICAL DEPARTMENT

OF THE

SECTION OF BIOLOGY AT THE LIVERPOOL MEETING, 1870.

BY

JOHN EVANS, F.R.S., F.S.A.,

HONORARY SECRETARY OF THE GEOLOGICAL AND NUMISMATIC SOCIETIES*.



LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—

In taking the Chair in this department of the Biological Section of the British Association, I may perhaps be allowed to offer a few remarks as to what appear to me the subjects that properly come within our province, the present condition of our knowledge of those subjects, and the methods we have at our command for increasing that knowledge.

In the great confederation of the sciences of which this Association seeks to be at once the representative, exponent, and advocate, it is indeed difficult to assign hard and fast boundaries to any of the different branches of human knowledge, which are grouped, for the sake of convenience, into different sections. The wide area of the sciences is not like that of our inhabited world, broken up by various natural boundaries into numerous kingdoms or empires, each speaking its own tongue, and striving to maintain its independence of its neighbours, even when not directly antagonistic to them; but rather resembles that of some great globe without any such geographical divisions, occupied, it is true, by various races, each having a distinct centre, where its own peculiar language is spoken with the utmost purity, but around those centres gradually intermingling with the other surrounding races, so that in the border land between any two such points it is often difficult, if not impossible, to say to which of the two races the inhabitants belong, or to assign any fixed limit to their respective provinces.

Taking, for instance, pure Geology as representing such a centre, we find it in one direction merging in Geography, in another in Chemistry, and in others in Palæontology, Biology, and various other sciences. There must, indeed, always be questions in which the students of any two great branches of science will find a common interest, and which neither can claim as peculiarly their own.

So it is with Ethnology and Anthropology, which form our peculiar province. On the one side this passes into Biology, the science to which we are here affiliated, while on another it shades off into Geography, or again into Geology, while some portion of its frontier lies towards two other provinces that at present seem almost excluded from the federation of the sciences—those of History and Archæology. With boundaries of necessity so ill-defined, it appears to me that the method of treatment of the subject, rather than the actual subject itself, is to be regarded as the principal qualification for the admission of any memoir as properly coming within the jurisdiction of this department.

Our main, central point—the history of the origin and progress of the human race—must, however, be that around which all our thoughts must revolve, and towards which all our investigations must be directed.

And yet even here there must be some limitations. With all that comes within the province of History properly so called, with emperors and kings, their generals

* This Address to the Department of Ethnology and Anthropology by the Chairman, John Evans, Esq., was accidentally omitted from the Report of the Liverpool Meeting. It ought to have been inserted in p. 143; it will now form part of the Appendix.

and ministers, their wars and ambitions, we have nothing to do, except so far as by any possibility they may be illustrative of the progress or methods of thought and life of any great branch of the human family. Neither do I think that any purely anatomical or physiological question, unless immediately connected with the origin or development of the human race, or with the characteristics or sequences of its different varieties, is so well adapted for this department as for that of Botany and Zoology or of Anatomy and Physiology; while mere general descriptions of newly discovered countries and their inhabitants may find as fitting an audience in the Geographical Section as here, and possibly may be communicated to both.

The subjects which may with propriety be brought under our consideration may perhaps be approximately defined as follows:—

1. All that relates to the antiquity of man, or the origin of the various races of mankind.
2. All that illustrates the progress and development of human civilization; and,
3. All that concerns the condition of the less civilized portions of the human race, even if not immediately connected with any general question of its origin or progress.

What an enormous field these subjects embrace can only be estimated when we come to consider the means we have of investigating them, and how much we have still to learn, notwithstanding the efforts of the numerous labourers who now for many years have been employed in this field of research.

It is needless for me to cite names which have now so wide a reputation; but any one who will contrast our present amount of knowledge (limited though it be) of the history of man with what was known concerning him even so lately as twenty years ago, will see how much has been accomplished during that period, as compared with the hundredfold greater period which has elapsed since the days of the old Greek philosophers, the results of whose inquiries sufficed for the curiosity of so many subsequent generations. For though in earlier days there were some, at all events, who were not content with the prevailing views as to the origin and antiquity of man, and as to the course of human civilization, yet they were unable effectually to influence the general current of opinion, and their speculations, when occasionally they are now, as it were, disinterred from their writings, seem like some recent organisms accidentally imbedded in one of the older rocks, or at all events to present what some Geologists have been pleased to term "prophetic types."

The same has been the case with other sciences. In earlier days Astronomy and Geology have, each in its turn, had to contend with the enormous *vis inertiae* of unthinking popular opinion, in both cases backed up by a theological opposition founded on the too literal interpretation of scriptural statements. In each instance, however, scientific truth has eventually triumphed, and the subordination of the earth to the sun, instead of the latter being a mere satellite of our globe, is no longer regarded as derogatory to the dignity of its human inhabitants, nor as inconsistent with the purposes of Creative Wisdom; while an antiquity for the earth, immensely in excess of the formerly orthodox six thousand years, is now admitted by all, in whatever manner they may reconcile the fact with Biblical chronology.

In the same manner we have now, I think, arrived at a point when it is almost unanimously admitted by all candid inquirers who from the extent of their studies are competent to form an opinion on the subject, that the family of man dates back to an epoch far, far more remote than the sixty centuries or so, allowed by Bishop Ussher's chronology; that the universality of the Noachic deluge can no longer be maintained; and that there has been a progress (more or less interrupted, it is true, in different places and at different periods) in the arts and appliances of human industry, from the first appearance of man up to the present time, and therefore that human civilization is progressive, whatever may be its relation to the human mind and intellect.

These views, moreover, supported as they are by direct evidence accessible to all, are held not merely by a select few, but by a large and increasing number of those interested in various branches of science, so that it does not require any peculiarly sanguine temperament to regard them, if not as actually established truths, yet,

at all events, as in a fair way of being no less generally accepted than any of the fundamental doctrines of Astronomy or Geology.

To have overcome prejudices even to this extent, and to have a free course for future investigation, is, indeed, a great step gained; but how much have we still to learn, and what an infinity of details have still to be inserted before any single picture of human progress, taken from any point of view, can be regarded as complete! We know, for instance, how extremely ancient, as tested by all ordinary chronology, are the old river-gravels and cave-deposits of Western Europe, containing relics of human industry associated with the remains of a fauna now for the most part either totally or locally extinct; but who can determine their antiquity in hundreds or even thousands of years? Who can say whether these relics, ancient as they are, represent in any degree the earliest human occupation of this part of the globe, much less the first appearance of man upon the earth? Who, moreover, shall say whether the human occupation of this and neighbouring countries on the Continent has been continuous from the days of the old river-gravels until now? Or, if so, where are we to find the transition from the Palæolithic to the Neolithic period? Or, again, how are we to correlate the quartzite implements from the lateritic deposits of Southern India with those of flint, but of similar forms, from the old river-drift of Europe? Who shall determine whether all the various races of mankind have sprung from a single source or from different centres, or where to place the original home or homes of their first parents?

Or, again, turning to more modern times, who can assign a date for the knowledge and use of the various metals in different parts of the world, or say how far in each country the discovery of their properties and use was indigenous or introduced by contact with neighbouring peoples? Or who can trace the origin of numerous customs, civil and religious, which we find prevailing in so many countries when first they are brought within our knowledge by historians and travellers?

Such are but a few of the problems placed before the student of Anthropology and Ethnology; and to many of them it seems probable that it will be long before any satisfactory answer can be given. The difficulty of a subject ought, however, only to be an incentive for patient and diligent inquiry; and we must not despair of any of such questions being solved. They are, at all events, at once more hopeful and of a higher order than those proposed of old as to "what song the Sirens sang, or what name Achilles assumed when he hid himself among women;" and yet, according to Sir Thomas Browne, these, "though puzzling questions, are not beyond all conjecture."

What means, then, have we at command towards solving these and numerous other questions bearing on the origin and progress of mankind? Whatever they may be, the principal, if not the only safe method, is that by which all true advances in science have been effected, and which, since the days of Bacon, has so largely extended the confines of human knowledge—I mean the diligent observation and collection of facts, from which, in due time, some general laws may be induced, so that these, in their turn, may serve to explain other facts, until gradually a system may be built up in which all phenomena find their proper place, and become mutually illustrative one of another.

The regions in which these facts are to be collected are neither few in number nor uniform in character. The ground we tread on, the words we utter, the appliances we use, the animals we tend, and the plants we cultivate, may each and all in their several spheres afford evidence of the antiquity and progress of our race; while the manners and customs of barbarous tribes, and of those in the infancy of civilization, afford the best criteria for judging of the condition of man in similar stages of culture at all periods, however remote. For, though, probably, existing savages may to some extent have benefited by the experience of thousands of foregone generations, and may even have acquired some modification in their mental condition, as compared with that of their remote ancestors, yet, so far as we at present know, there is no evidence of any great radical change in human nature between the earliest times and the present day, while all discoveries (such as those made in the Swiss lake-dwellings) which give us glimpses of the inner and

domestic life of early periods, lead to the conclusion that the argument from analogy is one which may safely be employed in investigating the history of man.

The great fact, however, which we cannot too steadily bear in mind, is, that we of the present day, our words and works, and all the surroundings of our life, are merely the last links in one long, complicated, though continuous chain, which connects us with our remotest forefathers, their language, implements, and associations. We must never forget that each generation, with all its accompaniments of whatever kind, forms a link in that chain, and stands in the most intimate and close relationship with that which went before and that which immediately follows it; and further, that though in countries now possessed of civilization its rate of progress may have varied, or even alternated with retrogression into barbarism, yet that these changes have been by no means sudden, but that all external civilization and all human appliances, whether modern or ancient, have been the result of more or less slow evolution from a lower stage of culture, and from ruder or more simple forms; while, in case of their decay or degradation, it has been by a gradual process of longer or shorter duration.

It is this continuity in all the accessories of the external life of man that renders any knowledge we may gain concerning their form and character at any given remote period, of such value in reconstructing primitive history, and which renders the study of the development of even modern appliances, and of their relation to the culture and mental condition of those who use them, so illustrative of the different phases of civilization.

To explain my meaning, let us take a few instances from the various regions I have already mentioned as some of those in which facts concerning our history are to be gleaned. What, for instance, could be more instructive than a complete view of the origin and derivation of all the fruits, vegetables, and cereals now cultivated in Europe, and of the date of the first introduction of each? How many of them should we not find to have been gradually developed by dint of patient culture, during successive generations, from some comparatively unpromising stock, hardly susceptible of being recognized by an inexperienced eye as being of the same species as its highly cultivated descendant! How would the number of trees, plants, and vegetables, cultivated by man, be reduced, were we able to trace back the pedigree of each to its wild progenitor, and strike out those which had not an antiquity of more than three or four thousand years! True, we should find that, among the inhabitants of the Swiss lake-dwellings, at a time when the use of metals for cutting-implements was apparently unknown, the list of cultivated vegetable products comprised more than one kind of wheat, barley, and millet, flax, peas, and possibly apples, pears, and plums. But whence, when, and how were the others derived which have been introduced since that time? and how long had any of them been in cultivation in other parts of the world? Were we able to carry back our researches to a period as remote from the days of the Swiss lake-dwellings as these are from our own times, how much further should we find this list diminished? and how far back in time should we have to go before it entirely disappeared? How interesting would it be to ascertain the earliest form under which our cereals, such as wheat, were cultivated; but how much more so to become acquainted with the mental and physical condition of man before any cultivation of vegetables for food or clothing had been adopted!

Or, again, turning to our domesticated animals, what a history of human progress could be written were we able to trace each, through all its various stages, back to the first of its kind brought into close companionship with man, and to learn when and how this took place! The modifications, not only in character but in form, which some animals have undergone under domestication, are so extensive that we are tempted to assign an enormous length of time for their having been subjected to human influences in order to produce such results. And yet some animals, such as the dog (now so varying in size, character, and appearance as to render it difficult to fix its actual ancestry) and the sheep, appear to have been unknown to the men of the River-drift Period, and even to those of the Reindeer Period of the South of France. With the relics of man of those times no bones of domesticated animals have as yet been found; but the extinction and migration of the wild animals occurring in our River- and early Cave-deposits are probably con-

connected with the aggressions of their human fellow-creatures, whose history might be illustrated by theirs. So much light, however, has been, and still is being thrown on the early condition of man by the researches of able naturalists in the animal remains which are so commonly associated with ancient human relics, that it is needless to dilate on the advantages likely to be gained in this fruitful field of research.

The story told by all the appliances of civilized man, whether in ancient or modern times, and in a less degree by those of barbarous and semicivilized nations, is invariably one of progress, even though many of the forms in use may be mere resuscitations of what have been developed in more ancient times under probably somewhat analogous circumstances. There can, indeed, be no doubt that every material object we use, however recently invented, bears upon it the reflection, more or less distinct, of something which has gone before; so that, in fact, each newly invented appliance is but the descendant from some other of earlier date, and though varying from it in a greater or less degree, yet still deriving its form and character by the way of legitimate descent. The rifled cannon of the present day is a modified descendant of the smooth bore; and this (if history is to be believed) of the mortar of Friar Bacon, which, in its turn, was an improved form of the first pounding apparatus—a slightly hollow stone on which to pound, and a pebble to use as a pestle. The reaping-machine, whether of the present time or of the days of Pliny, is but an adaptation of the iron sickle, which traces its ancestry through the family of bronze sickles and knives to that of the old flint flakes.

It is, in fact, the old story, the force of which has, however, been but so recently appreciated—that of constant tendency to change, accompanied by the survival of the fittest forms for the sphere in which they are placed; and in the same way, as the most eminent living naturalist conceives is not only possible but probable, that all animals have descended from, at most, only four or five progenitors, and all plants from an equal or less number, so I think that an examination of the history of the human arts and manufactures will reduce the material appliances possessed by our first progenitors to at least as small a tale. We may, indeed, reverse the comparison of Darwin, and instead of arguing from complex pieces of machinery to organisms, regard the mechanical contrivances of man in the same manner as the naturalists of his method of thinking would regard some organism. Take the same example as he has employed—a ship with its stately masts, its numerous yards, its network of cordage, absolutely bewildering to the eye which tries to trace all its intricate connexions, and its hull, with all its internal and external arrangements; and yet we shall find that every one of these numerous parts has its particular purpose, and has been developed either by way of addition to or modification from some previous arrangement, which again had, in its turn, been a modification or addition to something which had gone before; so that the whole of that wonderful structure, almost worthy the name of an organism, has been gradually evolved by successive improvements from the simple form of the canoe of the savage, itself a descendant of a mere floating log. Moreover, a careful examination would show that during this process of evolution there have been some few unimportant parts, which, though no longer of use, have been retained either from custom or by way of ornament, and which, like the organs that have become rudimentary in certain animals, testify to the changes in structure which have taken place; and if, instead of taking some one form of ship, we take the family of ships and boats as a whole, we shall find that during the process of development certain forms have been produced which, being best adapted for the purposes they serve, have become permanent, and vary but little at the present day from what they were some hundreds of years ago. In such cases comparative perfection having been attained, progress ceases, and it is only under some alteration in surrounding circumstances that further modifications take place; but this occasional persistency of form proves, and especially in the case of implements and weapons, that what are apparently intermediate forms between two separate types, are not of necessity intermediate in point of age. Nor, indeed, does form alone always afford a safe clue as to the use or derivation of an instrument, however analogous it may be to that of

one the use and nature of which is known. What appears to be a bone pin may be only a part of a fishing-hook, or the point of an arrow; and a round-ended flint flake may have served for scraping hides, or for planing wood, or for striking a light.

In some instances, again, and especially in the case of ornaments, the rate of change may be very rapid. A better illustration of this can hardly be found than in tracing back the bonnets of ladies of the present day to the broad-brimmed hat of the last century, of which it is the direct descendant, and to which the most modern forms now show a tendency to revert.

But whatever may be the amount of persistency or of variation in form, there can be little doubt that in almost all cases the further back we trace any instrument or appliance, the simpler shall we find it, both in form and material. Local and exceptional conditions may sometimes (as was the case in Greenland) have occasioned the simple materials, such as stone and bone, to replace metal when it became scarce or inaccessible; but even in such rare instances the form of the new implements (like that of the ingenious substitutes devised by a Robinson Crusoe) will always bear the impress of the character due to the use of the previously known and superior materials, which, though absent, have not been forgot.

The normal transition is, of course, from the use of readily accessible but imperfect materials to those more perfect, but requiring more skill and labour in order to procure them; and the well-known division of the stages of human culture into those of stone, bronze, and iron, is one which in all probability will be found to hold good in every portion of the globe, the occupation of which by man extends back to an epoch more than two or three thousand years remote from the present time. Much mischief, however, may be done by regarding all ancient objects of stone or bronze as of necessity belonging to the stone or bronze age, and by using these terms as if they had some chronological signification, instead of their being merely convenient forms of indicating, in a succinct manner, certain stages of culture. The misuse of these terms by some, and their misapprehension by others, has led to much confusion, and, in some cases, to an apparent diversity of opinion, where no such diversity really exists.

I must not, however, dwell any longer on this subject, but now for a few moments direct your attention to Language as one of the sources from which facts concerning man's history are to be derived.

It is, of course, needless for me to dwell on the value of language as affording perhaps the best and safest clue to ethnological affinities; nor need I do more than allude to the proofs of the antiquity of man, afforded by the variations of modern languages from their parent stock—variations which are so great that some languages of common descent have now hardly a dozen words in common, and which must have required an enormous lapse of time for their production—and yet the main features of which we find already established some two or three thousand years ago.

But even in minor details the evidence of language may prove of immense service, though such has been the nature and extent of the changes it has undergone, and so few are the monuments of some of its phases, that there is often much difficulty in extracting satisfactory testimony upon any given point. When we consider the essentially persistent nature of language, its continuity from generation to generation, each introducing but few intentional changes, and each believing that it speaks what is happily termed its mother tongue, we might, in the absence of other evidence, find a difficulty in accepting the bare possibility of such extensive modifications as it has undergone. But language, and especially unwritten language, is curiously plastic; and all changes in manners and customs, and in the appliances of life, must of necessity influence the methods of expression. When new discoveries are made, or new appliances introduced, new terms also come in; but these, like the inventions and objects themselves, are always more or less connected with something that has gone before.

In process of time these terms, which originally bore a distinct meaning in themselves, may become slightly changed in form and even in their application, so that all traces of their first derivation may be lost or partially concealed. But what

an amount of history is there crystallized in words, and what aid would be afforded in unravelling the tangled clue which guides us along the course of human progress, were we able to trace only each substantive to its origin, and fix its age and native place! Take, for instance, the names of the metals. Will the objectors to the sequence of iron to bronze say that it counts for nothing that we find Grimm concluding from the Gothic vocabulary "that in Germany bronze must have been in use before iron;" and Max Müller believing that Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and German were "spoken before the discovery of iron, and that each nation became acquainted with that most useful of all metals after the Aryan family was broken up?"

How much, however, of what lies close to the surface escapes our ordinary view! How many, for instance, in this Section have talked of *tibia* and *fibula* for years without recognizing the fact that these names show that one of those bones was that best adapted for the manufacture of flutes or pipes, and the other of pins or skewers! How many of us read our book and eat our bacon without remembering the cousinship of the two; their common ancestor, the beech, having furnished the wood for the ancient writing-tablets, and the mast for the bacon-fed hogs!

Again, who would expect to find in our own language, as spoken and written at the present day, traces of the use of poisoned arrows, which had among the Greeks and Romans long ceased in classical times, and which is always represented by authors, from the time of Homer downwards, as characteristic of barbarous nations? But a memorial of this savage custom still survives among us. From *τοξόον*, which means "a bow," or, occasionally, "an arrow," was derived *τοξικόν*, "the poison for arrows;" and this term gradually included all poisons, even those of milder form, such as alcohol, the too free use of which results in that form of poisoning still known among us as intoxication.

I must, however, no longer dwell on language as forming a region for our researches, but turn to another and fruitful field of observation—the ground beneath us. The objects of human workmanship treasured up in that great storehouse of antiquities, come indeed under the category of those appliances of man's life on which I have already touched; but the circumstances under which they are discovered form another and distinct feature in the case, and if properly observed, are of at least as much importance as the objects themselves, to which also they give a double value. What a light, for instance, has the careful examination of barrows, such as those of Yorkshire, and of cemeteries, like that of Hallstatt, thrown upon ancient funeral customs, which in their turn illustrate the life and habits of the period to which they belong! How interesting it is to find, both on the Continent and in England, the pits (we might even term them the mines) sunk by the old flint-workers to obtain a supply of the best quality of their raw material, and to observe their method of mining the chalk and working the flints! How suggestive, too, are these extensive stone-implement manufactories (whether from the flint procured by mining, as at Spiennes, or found upon and near the surface, as at Pressigny) of commerce in those primitive times, when the cutlery was of flint and not of steel!

Again, how much have we learned as to the habits and culture of earlier periods through cavern-researches! What a picture of primitive life have the caves of the Dordogne, and how much of the highest interest has our own Kent's Cavern supplied! But with regard to the antiquity of man, perhaps the most important evidence of all is that of the old River-gravels of Western Europe, which affords proof of the coexistence of man with the mammoth and woolly rhinoceros at a time when the beds of the rivers, following the same course as those of the present day, were at an elevation of, in some cases, ninety or a hundred feet above their present level, so that the existing valleys must have been excavated to that extent since the days when these old river-drifts were deposited.

From this view I am aware that there may be some few dissentients; but our knowledge of geological cause and effect is, I think, sufficient to justify us in pursuing the deductive as well as the inductive method in this instance. If we can theoretically show that, with a certain configuration of the land surface, a certain character of rock, a certain climate, and a certain number of years, certain effects must, judging from all analogy, have been produced; and if, in the case of these

ancient river-drifts, we find some of these data to have existed, and all the resulting phenomena to be in accordance with the theory, we may, with some degree of safety, assume that the other original conditions existed also, and accept the theory as borne out by facts.

It is impossible in any way to foresee what other discoveries the strata beneath us may have yet in store for us; but certainly there is no reason to conclude that we have as yet found the earliest traces of man upon the earth, or even on the soil of Western Europe. At the same time I must confess that the present amount of evidence of human existence in Pliocene, and even in Miocene times in France, appears to me, after a careful examination of it on the spot, to be very far from convincing. Should the remains of Miocene man be eventually discovered, it will be of the highest interest to compare his form with that of his contemporary and equal in stature, the *Dryopithecus*, which was sufficiently human in habit to retain its wisdom-tooth still undeveloped in its jaw after all its milk-teeth had been replaced by the second set.

The few examples I have given will show, to some extent, the nature of the evidence to be derived from the different fields of research which I have mentioned. It is for the most part calculated to illustrate the external life of man rather than his inner mental condition, on which, however, it also throws some reflected light. But in the same manner as our language and appliances are derived from and indissolubly connected with those of the generations which have gone before us, so it is with the laws, manners, and customs, and within certain limits, the beliefs, morals, and religions of the present day. I do not propose to take more than the slightest possible glance at this part of the subject. But how many of our legal and social customs belong to a totally different stage of society, and, like the parts which have become rudimentary in organisms, survive only as memorials of a past condition of things! As single instances, take most of the customs relating to copyhold lands—the admission to them by a rod, the service to be performed in respect of them, in fact, the whole nature of the tenure; take our armorial bearings, for which we have no longer shields; and our crests, for which we have no longer helmets; and to realize their full meaning, we must carry our minds back through centuries.

Take, again, many of our festive customs, which can be traced back to heathen times; our belief in witches, our trust in omens, and in lucky and unlucky days, and we see how many of our hereditary prepossessions are derived from a simpler stage of culture. But if this be so now, the same must have held good in earlier days; and the simplest creeds and lowest mental conditions that we meet with in historical times would seem to be but derivatives from something simpler and lower still.

The early history of mankind, and the bearing which the mental and social condition of savages have upon it, have, however, been so ably treated by Mr. E. B. Tylor and Sir John Lubbock, that I shall not attempt to enter on their domain, and will not detain you longer with these preliminary reflections, which to many of you will probably seem trite, if not tedious.

I trust that we may find more of novelty and importance in some of the Papers which will be brought before us. In discussing them, I am confident that nothing will be said calculated to injure the feelings of any who, like ourselves, are in pursuit of truth, and that all will bear in mind how difficult it is to take in the whole of any single truth at one view, and how of its many sides two contending parties may each be seeing one only, and that possibly not the most important.

ERRATA IN THE REPORT OF THE LIVERPOOL MEETING.

- p. x, after l. 32 insert ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY.
 p. xi, " 37 " ETHNOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY. [Anthropology.
 p. xv, " 25 " Address by Mr. JOHN EVANS to the Department of Ethnology and
 p. xxxii, l. 31, for Glasgow read Edinburgh.
 p. 129, Transactions of Sections, after l. 11 insert ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY.
 p. 143, Transactions of Sections, " l. 35 " ETHNOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY.