ANTHROPOLOGY AT THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION, 1869.

In accordance with our usual custom, we give a notice of the papers read at the Exeter meeting of the British Association. We shall confine our remarks in this number to the reports of the public proceedings, and await the usual official report of Sir Duncan Gibb, Bart., to the Society in November next, which will contain a narrative of the transactions that took place at the Committee of Section D (Biology). The composition of the section may be estimated from the following list.

President.—George Busk.
Vice-Presidents.—Professor Balfour, C. Spence Bate, Dr. Hooker. Sir John Lubbock, Dr. W. Ransome, E. B. Tylor, A. B. Wallace, Professor E. Percival Wright.

Secretaries.—Dr. Spencer Codd, Professor Michael Foster, E. Ray Lankester, Professor Lawson, H. T. Stainton, Rev. H. B. Tristram.

Committee.—Dr. Beddoes, H. G. Bohn, J. C. Bowring, H. B. Brady, W. K. Bridgman, C. Brooke, C. E. Broome, H. Buckley, Dr. Bucknill, W. Caruthers, Professor Cland, R. O. Cunningham, W. Boyd Dawkins, Walter C. Dendy, Professor Dickson, H. E. Dresser, Dr. Martin Duncan, R. Dunn, W. S. M. D'Urban, The Mayor of Exeter, M. P. Edgeworth, D. G. Elliott, Colonel Lane Fox, Neville Goodman, J. Galton, Sir Duncan Gibb, Dr. Heaton, W. P. Herr, H. H. Howorth, Professor Huxley, Dr. J. Hunt, Dr. Richard King, Dr. Keirburne King, Dr. L. Knij, Dr. H. Lawson, E. McAndrew, Professor McDonald, General Munro, Professor A. Newton, Rev. A. M. Norman, P. O'Callaghan, Dr. Proctor, Dr. B. W. Richardson, J. D. Sanderson, P. L. Sclater, Dr. Scott, C. Stewart, Dr. E. Smith, Dr. J. L. Stewart, Dr. Thomas, H. B. Woodward, Dr. George Wilson.

Professor Busk opened the proceedings of the section with some remarks intended to explain why he had not prepared an address to be delivered to the members of the section of which he was the chairman. It arose out of no disrespect to the section. It had been originally intended that his friend Dr. Rolleston should preside. Circumstances had, however, prevented him from attending, and it had fallen to his (Professor Busk's) lot to fill the office, and pressure of engagements had rendered it impossible for him to prepare an address. Following the precedent of former years, they had divided the section into different departments. The first, including all subjects of natural history, botany, zoology, and ethnology; and the second including subjects of human and comparative anatomy and physiology, the committee had decided to add Ethnology to the title of the first department. That subject had originally been joined with geography. Everyone would recollect the warm feelings exhibited in previous years on the subject of Ethnology or Anthropology, for it was a matter of indifference which word was used. But having ceased to be joined with geography, the members of the Biological Section thought that it was fitting that so important a subject as the study of man should not be omitted from the proceedings of the British Association. It was in truth one of the most important subjects that they could have before them. For those reasons it had been added to the section, and he begged to announce that the papers on Ethnology should be read on Monday and Wednesday next. Having said so much, the Professor retired to the Physiological department.

Mr. Spence Bate continued the proceedings with a brief address. He referred to the increase in the influence of the society since its last meeting.
at Plymouth thirty years ago. The Association had now become a power in the State, and was second to none in influence on the encouragement of science among the educated masses of the country. He alluded to the desire felt at Plymouth, Barnstaple, &c., as well as in Exeter, to welcome the Association in this county. He pointed out some features in the western counties of special interest to the members of the Association. Perhaps there was no part of England that afforded more varied contrast than might be seen in this county. The wild and rocky district of the north, the uncultivated waste of Dartmoor, together with the fertile valleys of the south shores offered every inducement to naturalists to extend their researches into their peculiar path of science. The narrow neck of land that separated the ancient Danmonia from the rest of England lay between Bridgewater and Lyme Regis, a line running nearly north and south. It was one moreover which corresponded with the most westerly limit of the nightingale. This was an interesting and unexplained fact. The influence of the geological character of soil in the growth of plants might well be studied here. Perhaps the botanist could have no more curious sight than that of Wistman's wood in the heart of Dartmoor, a grove of oaks that had been recorded in the Duchy Annals within a short period of the Roman conquest. Their roots were amongst the granite boulders. He then directed attention to certain museums which contained local collections interesting to the biologist — those of Dr. Leach and Charles Prideaux, of Kingsbridge, and also referred to the antiquities of Devon and Cornwall, interesting to the Ethnologist. On the wastes of Dartmoor and the uncultivated lands of Cornwall stood many an unrecorded monument of antiquity. Year by year they were gradually passing away. It appeared to him that it was the duty of the Ethnologist to earnestly take steps to record all of those that were in existence, to explore those which had not been examined, and to preserve all from destruction.

On Monday, August 23rd, the following papers were read:—

On the Primitive Condition of Man, by Sir John Lubbock. — The author commenced by expressing a fear that some introductory observations made by the chair- man would lead his audience to expect a paper of a more general character than the few remarks he should make would prove to be. It would be remembered that he read a paper at the Dundee meeting "On the Origin of Civilisation and the Primitive Condition of Man," in answer to opinions and arguments which had been brought forward by the late Archbishop of Dublin. The Duke of Argyll had replied to him in a paper in Good Words, which had since been collected into a volume entitled Speculations on the Primitive Condition of Man, and obtained a great circulation. In that paper the Duke of Argyll had misunderstood some of his (Sir J. Lubbock's) views, and he was anxious, before that large meeting, to present a few remarks in reply. He then proceeded to say that the Duke of Argyll had also attacked Professor Hurley for proposing to place man and the quadrupeds in one order of mammals, and considers that, though this course would be justified if we considered merely the anatomical characters, it is precluded by the immense difference in intellectual power. Sir John, however, pointed out that this was a dangerous argument, since, if man was to form an order by himself on account of his mental superiority, it would be impossible any longer to maintain the unity of the human species, since they must allow a proportionate weight to the immense differences existing between different races of man. Sir John congratulated himself that the Duke, though maintaining Whately's theory as to the primitive condition of man, abandoned the arguments on which, in the opinion of that eminent logician, that theory mainly rested. He then defended himself against the Duke's criticism, that he looked on all brutal customs as primordial, and pointed out that the Duke misunderstood his argument, which was that a definite sequence of habits and ideas might be traced, and that certain customs still lingering in civilised communities told a tale of former barbarism, rather, however, on account of their simplicity than of their barbarity. The Duke's theory that savages are "mere outcasts of the human race" was then criticised as incompatible with the in-
mense area until lately occupied by tribes in a state of barbarism, and it was shown that the Brazilians, occupying a rich and fertile country, were lower than the Esquimaux tribes on the shores of the icy sea. In old times, as now settlers of new countries were, in Sir John's opinion, not "mere outcasts," but men of energy and enterprise. The Duke had asserted that "all Sir John's facts, when properly understood, told against him," which he endeavored to prove by giving three instances, taken, however, by a curious oversight, not from Sir John's Memoir on the Primitive Condition of Man, but from a different work. The author, however, showed that these cases did not really tell against his view. For instance, the Duke maintained that the Tasmanians, who had no boats when discovered, must originally have possessed some, "because they could not have walked over the sea!" but the same argument would apply to the kangaroo, the echidna, and other animals which inhabit both Australia and Tasmania, and whose presence proves a former land connection between these two countries. The Duke, proceeded the author, though admitting the antiquity of man, does not, I think, appreciate the geological changes which have occurred during the human period. The only other case which he quotes is that of the highland Eskimo, who had no weapons, nor any idea of war. The Duke's comment is as follows: "No wonder, poor people! They had been driven into regions where no stronger race could desire to follow them. But that the fathers had once known what war and violence meant there is no more conclusive proof than the dwelling-place of their children." It is perhaps natural that the head of a great highland clan should regard with pity a people who, having "once known what war and violence meant," have no longer any neighbours to pillage or to fight, but a Lowlander can hardly be expected seriously to regard such a change as one calculated to excite pity, or as any evidence of degradation. In my first paper I advanced an argument the condition of religion among the different races of man, a part of the subject which has since been admirably dealt with by Mr. Tylor, in a lecture at the Royal Institution. The use of flint for sacrificial purposes long after the introduction of metal seems to me a good case of what Mr. Tylor has aptly called "survival." So also is the method of obtaining fire. The Brahmin will not use ordinary fire for sacrificial purposes—he does not even obtain a fresh spark from flint and steel, but reverts to, or rather continues, the old way of obtaining it by friction with a wooden drill; one Brahmin pulling the thong backwards and forwards while another watches to catch the sacred spark. I also referred to the non-existence of religion among certain savage races, and, as the Duke correctly observes, I argued that this was probably their primitive condition, because it is difficult to believe that a people which had once possessed a religion would ever entirely lose it. It is hardly necessary to explain to any one that I did not intend to question the possibility of a change in, but a total loss of religion. This argument filled the Duke with "much astonishment." "Surely," he says, "if there is one fact more certain than another in respect to the nature of man, it is that he is capable of losing religious knowledge, of ceasing to believe in religious truth, and of falling away from religious duty. If by 'religion' is meant the existence merely of some impressions of powers invisible and supernatural—even this, we know, cannot only be lost, but be acutely disavowed by men who are highly civilised." Yet, in the very same page, with that curious tendency to self-contradiction of which I have already given several instances, the Duke goes on to say, "the most cruel and savage customs in the world are the direct effect of its 'religions.' And if men could drop religions when they would, or if they could even form the wish to get rid of those which sit like a nightmare on their life, there would be many more nations without a religion than there are found to be. But religions can neither be put nor cast off like garments, according to their utility, or according to their beauty, or according to their power of comforting." With this I entirely agree. Man can no more voluntarily abandon or change the articles of his religious creed than he can make one hair black or white, or add one cubit to his stature. I do not deny that there may be excep-
tional cases of intellectual men entirely devoid of religion, but if the Duke means to say that men who are highly civilised, habitually, or frequently, lose and scornfully disavow religion, I can only say that I should adopt such an opinion with difficulty and regret. There is, so far as I know, no evidence on record which would justify such an opinion, and, as far as my private experience goes, I, at least, have met with no such tendency. It is, indeed, true that from the times of Socrates down to those of Luther, and perhaps later, men in advance of their age have discovered particular religions and particular myths; but the Duke of Argyll would, I am sure, not raise a desire for reformation with the scornful disavowal of religion as a whole. Some philosophers may object to prayers for rain, but they are foremost in denouncing the folly of witchcraft; they may regard matter as aboriginal, but they would never suppose, with the Redskin, that land was created, while water existed from the beginning, nor would any one now suppose, with the South Sea Islanders, that the Peers were immortal, but not commoners. If, indeed, there is “one fact more uncertain than another, in respect to the nature of man,” I should have considered it to be the gradual diffusion of religious light and of nobler conceptions as to the nature of God. The lowest savages have no idea of a Deity at all. Those slightly more advanced regard him as an enemy to be dreaded, but who may be resisted with a fair prospect of success, who may be cheated by the cunning, and defied by the strong. Thus the natives of the Nicobar Islands endeavour to terrify the Deity by scarecrows, and the negro beats his fetish if his prayers are not granted. As tribes advance in civilisation their deities advance in dignity, but their power is still limited; one governs the sea, another the land, one reigns over the plains, another over the mountains. The most powerful are vindictive, cruel, and unjust; they require humiliating ceremonies and bloody sacrifices. But few races have arrived at the conception of an omnipotent and beneficent Deity. It certainly appears to me that the gradual development of religious ideas among the lower races of men is a fair argument in opposition to the view that savages are degenerate descendants of civilised ancestors. Archbishop Whately would admit the connection between these different phases of religious belief, but I think he would find it very difficult to show any process of natural degradation and decay which could explain the curious errors and opinions of the lower races of men, or to account for the lingering belief in witchcraft and other absurdities, &c., in civilised races, excepting by some such train of reasoning as that which I have endeavoured to sketch. In conclusion Sir John pointed out the remarkable similarity between savages and children, remarking that in our own times, however, we might trace up the gradual progress of civilisation, for that the history of the individual was an epitome of that of the race. But it was unnecessary to multiply illustrations. Every one who had read much on the subject will admit the truth of the statement. It explained the capricious treatment which single white men had received from savage potentates; how they had been alternately petted and ill-treated, at one time loaded with the best of everything, at another neglected or put to death. The close resemblance existing in ideas, language, habits, and character, between savages and children, though generally admitted, had usually been disposed of in a passing sentence, and regarded rather as a curious accident than as an important truth. Yet from several points of view it possessed a high interest. Children and savages love toys and pets. Sir John particularly instanced the rattle which was used by some savages as an emblem of authority. Tossing halfpence as dice, again, which used to be a sacred and solemn mode of consulting the oracles, is now a mere game for children. So again, the doll is a hybrid between the baby and the fetish, and, exhibiting the contradictory character of its parents, becomes singularly unintelligible to grown up people. Mr. Tylor had pointed out other illustrations of this argument, and I would refer those who feel interested in this part of the subject to his excellent work. Better understood it might have saved us many a pang from the loss of Captain Cook down to the Abyssinian war. It has also a direct bearing on the subject of the present
discussion. The opinion is rapidly gaining ground among naturalists, that the development of the individual is an epitome of that of the species; a conclusion which, if fully borne out, will evidently prove most instructive. Already many facts are on record which render it, to say the least, highly probable. Birds of the same genus, or of closely allied genera, which, when mature differ much in colour, are often very similar when young. The young of the lion and the puma are often striped, and fossil whales have teeth. Leidy has shown that the milk teeth of the genus Equus resemble the permanent teeth of Anchitherium, while the milk teeth of Anchitherium again approximate to the dental system of Merychippus. Rütimeyer, while calling attention to this interesting observation, adds that the milk teeth of Equus caballus in the same way, and still more those of Equus fossulæ resemble the permanent teeth of Hippotherium. Agassiz, according to Darwin, regards it as a "law of nature that the young state of each species and group resembles older forms of the same group, and Darwin himself says that "in two or more groups of animals, however much they may at first differ from each other in structure and habits, if they pass through closely similar embryonic stages, we may feel almost assured that they have descended from the same parent form, and are therefore closely related." So also Mr. Herbert Spencer says—"Each organism exhibits within a short space of time, a series of changes which, when supposed to occupy a period indefinitely great, and to go on in various ways instead of one way, gives us a tolerably clear conception of organic evolution in general." It may be said that this argument involves the acceptance of the Darwinian hypothesis; this would, however, be a mistake; the objection might indeed be tenable if men belonged to different species; but it cannot fairly be urged by those who regard all mankind as descended from common ancestors; and, in fact, it is strongly held by Agassiz, one of Mr. Darwin's most uncompromising opponents. Regarded from this point of view the similarity existing between savages and children assumes a singular importance, and becomes almost conclusive as regards the question now at issue. Lord Dunraven, as the president of the Caernarvon Archaeological Association, said last week in his opening address:—"If we look back through the entire period of the past history of man, as exhibited in the result of archeological investigation, we can scarcely fail to perceive that the whole exhibits one grand scheme of progress, which, notwithstanding partial periods of decline, has for its end the ever-increasing civilization of man, and the gradual development of his higher faculties." I confess, therefore, that after giving the arguments of the Duke of Argyll my most attentive and candid consideration, I see no reason to adopt his melancholy conclusion, but I remain persuaded that the past history of man has on the whole been one of progress, and in looking forward to the future we are justified in doing so with confidence and with hope.

In the subsequent debate—

Sir George Grey said he had listened with extraordinary interest to the paper which had been read by Sir John Lubbock. It was marked by profound research and learning, great attention to the subject, remarkable candour, and generous and fine temper. But he found difficulty in speaking on the subject. He hardly knew what "civilisation" meant, and he hardly knew what "barbarism" meant. Living recently in London near the Royal Palace, in the heart of the most civilised nation, at the back of the house in which he resided, he had witnessed scenes of barbarism and heard language the like of which he had not seen or heard in any savage race upon the earth. With him civilisation was inseparable from religion. It really meant that if it meant nothing else. It was possible for a nation to be polished in the highest degree in arts, to be learned on scientific subjects, and yet to enfold in itself a population sunk in the deepest barbarism and ignorance. The Greeks and Romans, and Great Britain of the present day, afforded proof of what he said. He had always felt that the Archbishop of Dublin was mainly right. Regarding civilisation as the development of religious feeling, and the knowledge of man's duty to his fellow-man, he believed that no savage
nation had ever attained to that knowledge of itself. The highest state of
civilisation was the highest development of Christianity—the unselfishness
of man and regard for the welfare of his fellow-man—and he believed that
this virtue had in every case been introduced among the various races of
mankind by some race who claimed (he would not say whether rightly or
wrongly) by inspiration to have received a knowledge of its truths. In
every case where people did recognize duties of that kind, they affirmed that
they had received the knowledge in this way. He had been much among
savages, but had never seen any tendency in them to advance in the civilisation
of which he had spoken, or in the arts that were beneficial to mankind
generally. The laws and institutions of the savages which he had studied
contained in themselves a tendency to perpetuate barbarous manners and
which he had believed that the greatest evil that could befall man
would be for him to sink from the knowledge of that virtue and those
religious truths to which he had referred. The result would be, as it had been,
to fall into idolatry, which entailed innumerable cruelties and evils on man-
kind. He made no distinction between the cruelty of gladiatorial slaughter
by the Romans and the human sacrifice and bloodshed of the Polynesian
islanders. Those races that had had imparted to them the higher duties
and knowledge of which he had spoken were really the only races to be
regarded as civilised, and that civilisation was derived from a source beyond
themselves.

Mr. Howorth wished to throw an apple of discord, or rather a Siberian
crab, into the discussion. The views that had been delivered by Sir J.
Lubbock could best be examined by the light of the knowledge they possessed
of Asiatic populations. The lesson that was taught them in Central Asia
was opposed to the views of Sir J. Lubbock. The great Manchus were those
race which had conquered China, was now represented in Siberia by Tartars in
a miserable condition. He also contrasted the original condition of the
ancient Mongolians and Turks with that of the representatives of those
races, as described, among others, by Professor Vambery. The result of this
contrast was to show that the respective races had suffered degradation
from a higher state of civilisation. He refused to consider the question of
Africa and America, because they had really no history of the aborigines
of those countries, and they had of those of Asia, to whom he had referred. He
was highly pleased with the speech of Sir George Grey. There was no
reliable account of any savage race having improved itself. Egypt and
China might be referred to, but they knew nothing of the aborigines of those
countries. But they had instances of nations having received a legacy of
civilisation from others. Sir J. Lubbock had referred to the survival of
savage customs among civilised people. Upon this he observed that there
were tribes among the New Zealanders that they had had contact with whom cannibalism was not a custom. On the other hand, the existence
among the Shamans of Asia of the rattle and the drum as instruments of
importance, however childish it may seem, was to be traced back to the
Buddhists of Tibet, and it would not be pretended that the philosophy of
the Buddhists was to be ranked with the notions of the savages whose use
of the rattle, etc., had been made so much of in support of Sir J. Lubbock's
views. Mr. Howorth believed with Sir J. Lubbock that a certain kind of
progress was going on, for when we compared Socrates with Stuart Mill,
Diogenes the dog with the present Chancellor of the Exchequer for cynicism,
and Porson, Confucius and Moses with Hepworth Dixon as an historian,
he thought that we had not fallen very far behind.

Dr. Blanc (of the Abyssinian expedition) observed that Sir J. Lubbock,
by his reference to Abyssinia, had probably meant that King Theodore was
a child. With that Dr. Blanc agreed, only that he was a very naughty
child, and he might be made the subject of a moral to show the evil of pursing
a willful career. Theodore came to his grave through acting like a
grown-up child. When he ought to have been fighting against the rebels,
he wasted two months in futile attempts to build a raft with wheels to be
propelled by hands. Once his warriors propellied it 200 yards across a lake,
but it leacked, and Theodore gave up the job. Another time, hearing of
English artillery being strong, he ordered his European workmen to cast a mortar. They cast one weighing 16,000 lbs., and lost four months in bringing it to Magdala, when it was never used. In the third place, when the English army was approaching, the advanced guard was among ordnance covered with cloth on the backs of camels; he judged they were treasure-boxes and induced his chiefs to go to the attack in the expectation of much loot. He thought the acts of Theodore confirmed Sir J. Lubbock's opinion that the savage was like a child.

Sir Walter James was anxious to call attention to the interesting analogy which Sir J. Lubbock had noticed—though it was not altogether novel, for it was to be met with in Dr. Temple's article in Essays and Reviews—the analogy that existed between the history of the individual and of the race. He agreed with that view, but he was not prepared to concur in the inference that the human race was indefinitely progressive. If the analogy were a true one they ought to bear in mind the characteristic faults of old age. The faults of savages life, it was assumed, were those of childhood. Were not the faults of ultra civilisation the faults of old age? One of the characteristic faults of old age was an over-estimate of the value of money. So, as civilisation went on, the estimate of wealth increased, and the whole system of more chivalrous qualities of our ancestors might have a tendency to diminish. He did not deny that generous and self-denying men existed among them; but they should take warning against the characteristics defects of old age that might be threatening civilisation. One test of civilisation was the value put on human life. Savages put very little value on life. But was it not a melancholy thing that there were millions of men in arms in Europe, and that either the direct or the indirect damage of human life in many ways? Turn again to the want of protection from child labour, as in our own factories. Therefore while subscribing to the analogy drawn by Sir J. Lubbock, yet they could not look forward to everything being couleur de rose. If the child was like the savage, the old man became in many respects, unfortunately, like the child. We were advancing in scientific knowledge and research, but an advance in morals was not so clear a fact. He feared the human heart was what mathematicians called a "fixed quantity," and not susceptible of improvement like other parts of his nature.

The Rev. H. B. Trestram observed that the line of progress had not been continuous. What had become of the old civilisation of the Assyrians? With respect to savages, it must be said that to their credit that they were commonly equal in conduct to the code under which they lived. The Arab had an extreme veneration for truth, which his code enjoined, although he would kill a man without compunction.

Mr. A. R. Wallace contributed a lengthy speech to the discussion. He regretted that the Duke of Argyll was not present to reply for himself to Sir John Lubbock's admirable paper. In his Grace's absence he said he would take some points in his favour that might be made. No doubt, as a general principle, the evidence pointed to a decided and tolerably steady advance of mankind in all those arts of life, the grand sum of which determined civilisation. At the same time, there were a great many matters in which there seemed to be some objection to this view. There were one or two cases that seemed to show a degradation or loss of civilisation. The ancient remains found in America showed the existence of a race at a time not very long past which were decidedly superior to any native aborigines now in North America, inasmuch as they worked copper mines, which none of the present races did. There were also elaborate temples and works of art to attest a wide-spread civilisation once existing on that continent, and now lost. Then, again, there was a sort of special pleading in the argument of Sir John Lubbock's, that if the native Australians were the degraded descendants of a race half-civilised, the European settlers ought also to become degraded. But the European settlers were not cut off from their race, which altered the case considerably, and rendered the argument fallacious. Suppose that a European colony were entirely isolated from their race, then, he thought, there was almost a moral certainty that in the course of centuries they would suffer a considerable amount of degradation, and
hardly be recognised as the descendants of a civilised people. Therefore, he believed that the lowest races of mankind owed their low condition not to their retaining the type of the original state of man, but because they had suffered degradation from a more civilised race. In a discussion on civilisation it was almost impossible to keep morals out of the question altogether. The people who were advanced in intellect and arts, but low in morality could hardly be considered civilised. Therefore, although he believed the two things were, to a great extent, distinct, he was inclined in this question to place more weight on morals than on intellect, while Sir J. Lubbock would put more weight on intellect than on morals. It was indisputable, in regard to arts, that man was improving, but he would hardly say so much with regard to morals. We could trace backward to pre-historic races the diminution of the arts of life till we arrived at a period when the inhabitants of the world was to do no more than fashion flints into weapons and tools. But as to morals, we did not find such decided diminution as we looked backward. He had met with savage tribes destitute of the arts of life and low in intellect, but possessed of a wonderfully delicate sense of right and wrong in morals. How did they get that sense? He had met some savages who would refuse to do an action which they thought would infringe on the rights of others, and had refused to answer questions lest they should be asked a lie. He was speaking of the Dyaks of Borneo. How was the moral feeling to be accounted for? If they represented the original state of man, how came the moral sense to have grown, and the other faculties not to have grown? There was some evidence of a moral or religious sentiment existing even in pre-historic man; he alluded to the discovery in the cave of Aurignac of preparations made for the food of the dead of the pre-historic race laid in the cavern. This showed the appreciation of a future state—a feeling which showed man to be above the brute. He agreed in the early stage a feeling of love is drawn between children and savages. But was not the moral sense of children and their affection higher than their intellect? But morals were harder a scientific question; but he still thought that on its determination depended the true state of early man. They ought not to conclude that because man had advanced in the arts of life therefore he had advanced in morals. He did not say it was proved that man had not advanced in morals; but all the arguments that went to prove that ancient man was not civilised intellectually utterly failed to prove that he was not civilised morally. The evidence as yet only went to prove that the moral nature of man was only modified, not improved, under civilisation. Therefore, the argument of derivation from the lower form of life did not in the slightest degree touch the unknown region of his moral nature.

Mr. Evans thought much of the discussion had arisen through different views being taken by the Duke of Argyll and Sir J. Lubbock of the word "civilisation." It could be shown in regard to the lowest state of man that the struggle for life must occupy so much time as to leave little or none for moral culture. He did not attach much importance to the evidence of the cave of Aurignac, but he thought there was great evidence of improvement in man. Our own civilisation was derived from the Romans, the Greeks, and, further back, from the Egyptians; and when we had gone back to the Egyptians, it was found we had arrived at a period when many of our civilized appliances were unknown. Languages of civilised people were of having been derived from languages of monosyllables which marked the uncivilised. When man appeared on earth he was deficient of domestic animals and of corn, and must have been in a state not much above that of the animals that surrounded them. It was improbable that he was in morals very far above the animals with which he was somewhat connected in those early times.

Mr. Boyd Dawkins said a few words relative to the Cave of Aurignac. As regards the supposed religious history of the people who used that cave, and who were contemporaneous with the mammoth, he had indisputable evidence that the cave contained nothing that bore on the religious condition of the ancient folk. On the contrary, he had bones in his possession taken from the cave, showing that it must have been opened after it was
occupied by pre-historic man. The bones were those of animals unknown to Western Europe until ages after the ancient folk and the mammoth were lost. He could not concur with Mr. Wallace that arts and morals were ever divorced.

The Rev. J. Ingle said that he thought that Sir J. Lubbock had misread some portion of the Duke of Argyll's book, and suggested that it would be advisable to have a definition of "civilisation" as a means of simplifying the subject before them. He should like to hear Sir John Lubbock on the question of languages and the subject of traditions. How was it that the traditions of savage people so generally spoke of their progenitors having been civilised? Again, as to the ancient civilisations, and as to the arts, ancient Rome was better supplied with water by means of its aqueducts than London was in the present day. If there was a universal law of progress he would ask Sir J. Lubbock to quote one specimen of a savage nation having advanced for itself to a state of civilisation. Without this specimen he thought the theory of Sir J. Lubbock might be rather termed a nebulous hypothesis.

The President said the discussion had been most pertinent. Mr. Wallace had told them that they should divide those two lines of enquiry—arts and morals; but he did not concur with Mr. Wallace that the question of moral history was not a scientific one. He thought it was; but the moral progress had not been studied as that of material conditions had. Sir J. Lubbock's paper was directed to the question of the material progress of mankind, and he was bound to say that in his opinion the paper had not been answered. Mr. Howorth had not met the exigencies of the case. He could assure Mr. Ingle that he was wrong in thinking that the traditions of savage were generally pointed to their having descended from civilised men; it was more commonly the reverse. He agreed with Sir John Lubbock, and disagreed with the Duke of Argyll. He would ask confidently whether there was really much difference between the good but ignorant savage of whose existence travellers had told them, and the ignorant primeval man to whom the Duke of Argyll looked back as the early representative of our race.

Sir John Lubbock briefly replied to the several speakers.

**Human Remains in the Cave of Cro-Magnon, in the Valley of the Vezère.**

Dr. P. M. Duncan read a paper upon some cave remains found in the valley of the Vezère in the course of certain railway operations. The remains have been scientifically examined by order of the French Government, and there were four distinct layers of charcoal, or hearths, with considerable intervals between them. Bones of the mammoth were found here, mixed with human bones, and also the bones of the reindeer. M. Larret, who examined the bones for the French Government, held that the men and the mammoth had existed together; but Dr. Duncan, and those who took part in the discussion, did not favour the view, and it was generally agreed that the bones of the mammoth might have been found by reindeer hunters, and carried to the cave.

**Flint Implements in the Valley of the Thames.**—Colonel Lane Fox described some researches he had made recently near Acton, Middlesex, and at various places along the valley of the Thames. He had found a large number of flint implements in such a position as to leave no doubt that the river Thames had once occupied banks one hundred feet higher than the present, and for many miles in width.

Mr. Evans said that the gravels in which the implements were found must have been deposited in the river terraces at a period wonderfully remote, yet the men who had made and used the flint implements must have lived prior to that time.

**Discovery of a Lake Island in South Wales, by the Rev. — Dumbleton.**

The paper was abundantly illustrated by drawings, and also by some piles and other articles found on the island. The description of the island showed it to be identical with the lake dwellings of Switzerland; and it appeared that there had been a tradition in the neighbourhood of a city buried in the lake. The bones found round the island were pronounced to be those of the horse, of a small species of ox, sheep, and wild boar.