

FOURTH MEETING.

MONDAY, AUGUST 24.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK, BART., F.R.S., PRESIDENT, IN THE CHAIR.

~~~~~

The Meeting opened at Noon, when the following Papers were read :

ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE RACES OF MANKIND, AND  
ITS BEARING ON THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN.

BY PROFESSOR HUXLEY, F.R.S.

IN employing the term 'race,' I do not wish to prejudge any question which may be in dispute touching the value of the great divisions of mankind. I use the term merely as a convenient one, and if there be any who prefer to name what I call 'races,' 'species,' I raise no objection, as far as the objects of the present paper are concerned, to their so doing.

By races I mean simply the great distinguishable groups of mankind—such groups as a naturalist would form, if all mankind were put before him to be sorted according to their physical likenesses and unlikenesses. And by distinct races I mean those which do not grade into one another, except under such circumstances as make it certain, or at any rate highly probable, that interbreeding has taken place.

The number of distinct races, in this sense, appears to me to be but small; indeed, I do not see my way to the recognition of more than four, which I shall term the *Australioid*, the *Negroid*, the *Mongoloid*, and the *Xanthochroic* races.

The characteristics of the *Australioid* race are, a dark complexion, ranging through various shades of light and dark chocolate colour; dark or black eyes; the hair of the scalp

black, neither coarse and lank, nor crisp and woolly, but soft, silky, and wavy; the skull always belonging to the dolichocephalic group, or having a cephalic index of less than 0.8.

Under the head of the *Negroid* race I include those people who have dark skins varying from yellowish-brown to what is usually called black; dark or black eyes; dark or black hair, which is crisp, or what is commonly called woolly, in texture. With very rare exceptions, these people are dolichocephalic.

In the *Mongoloid* race the complexion ranges from brownish-yellow to olive; the eyes are dark, usually black; the hair of the scalp black, coarse, straight, and long, that of the body remarkably scanty. The proportions of the skull, so constant in the two preceding races, vary in this from extreme dolichocephaly to extreme brachycephaly.

Finally, in the *Xanthochroic* race, the complexion is very fair; the eyes are blue or grey; the hair yellow or yellowish-brown. In this race, again, the skull ranges through the whole scale of its varieties of proportion, from extreme breadth to extreme length.

These appear to me to be the great primary races or stocks of mankind, and all other forms which can be mentioned seem to lie between some two of these four.

Now the geographical distribution of these four primary races is extremely remarkable.

The great continent of Australia is the head-quarters of the Australioid race. From one end to the other of that vast region of the earth's surface, this form of mankind is met with, and no other.

But the aborigines of Tasmania are well known to have had very different characters, nor do we meet with Australioid people either to the east, or to the north, of Australia, nor have any been met with in the islands north-west of Australia, or on the mainland of Asia as far as Hindostan. But the Dekkan, which is so remarkably isolated on the north by the valleys of the Ganges and Indus, beyond these by the Himalaya mountains, and on the east and west by the sea, was originally inhabited, and is still largely peopled, by men who completely come under the definition of the Australioid race given above.



The so-called 'coolies' who come over in East Indian ships are like Australians, and resemble no other people; and I have seen photographs of some of the hill tribes which could hardly have been distinguished from portraits of Australians.

Beyond the Dekkan (in which, at the present time, the primitive Australioid stock has undergone considerable intermixture with an invading Aryanised population), in Persia and Arabia, I am not aware that anything which completely answers to the definition of an Australioid can be found. But in Abyssinia and in Egypt there is a smooth-haired, dark-complexioned, long-headed stock, which I believe to have nothing to do with Negroes, and which I am strongly inclined to regard as a westward extension of the Australioid race.

Nay, more, I would venture to suggest that the dark whites (*Melanochroi*, as I have proposed to term them) who stretch from Northern Hindostan through Western Asia, skirt both shores of the Mediterranean, and extend through Western Europe to Ireland, may have had their origin in a prolongation of the Australioid race, which has become modified by selection or intermixture.

The Negroid race has its head-quarters on the opposite side of the Indian Ocean to Australia—namely, in Africa, south of the Sahara, where Negroes have existed for all time of which we have any record, while north of the Sahara they are immigrants of comparatively modern days.

There are two very distinct modifications of the Negroid type in Africa—the dwarfish, comparatively light-complexioned Bushman stock, in which the females are so remarkably distinguished by steatopygy and other peculiarities; and the taller, darker Negro proper.

Nowhere north or west of Ultra-Saharal Africa is a Negroid to be found; nor is there certain evidence that Negroids exist, or have existed, in Arabia, Persia, Hindostan, or any part of Asia, except the Andaman Islands and the Peninsula of Malacca. Here a Negroid stock, different in some respects from the African Negroes, and hence termed *Negritos*, reappears; it shows itself again in the Philippines, and, beyond 'Wallace's line' in the eastern part of the Malay



Archipelago, becomes the predominant population, until in New Guinea and the great chain of islands which extends thence under the name of Louisiade, New Hebrides, Solomon's Islands, New Caledonia, and the Feejees, it is the fundamental and aboriginal form of man. In the south, the last point at which a Negrito population is met with is Tasmania.

The Mongoloid race is most typically exhibited in Central Asia, and thence extends continuously, or nearly so, to Lapland and the Arctic circle on the north-west and north; to Northern Hindostan on the south; to the Malay Archipelago, on the south-east; on the east to China, and thence over the whole of the Pacific islands (except those occupied by Negritos); on the extreme north-east to America, and thence through the whole length and breadth of that great continent.

In speaking of the people who occupy this prodigious area as of one race, all I mean to imply is that, so far as I know, no sharp lines of demarcation can be drawn among them; the extreme terms—such, for example, as the Mongols and the New-Zealanders, or the Siamese and the Indians of Eastern North America, or the Patagonians and the Esquimaux, being connected by innumerable transitional forms.

The *Xanthochroi* inhabit a far smaller area of the earth's surface than the Mongoloids. Their head-quarters are in Central Europe, whence they extend into Scandinavia and the British Islands, on the north and west; while, on the north-east, they seem at one time, if not now, to have extended their wanderings over the great plains of Northern Asia to the frontiers of China. Southwards, they are traceable into Syria, and, in a fragmentary fashion, through Northern Africa to the islands off its western coast; while, eastward, they occur as far as Northern Hindostan.

It will be observed that, granting the existence of the Xanthochroic race in its head-quarters, there is no difficulty in understanding its distribution, as the area of this race is either one continuous mass of land, or embraces islands situated at very short distances from the mainland.

Again; admitting the primitive existence of Mongoloids in South America or in Central Asia, there is nothing to prevent

them from migrating from the one locality to the other by Behring's Strait and the chain of the Aleutian Islands.

Nor does the distribution of the Mongoloids over the islands of the Pacific present any real difficulty, as the means of navigation which they possess are amply sufficient to have borne them safely through the long voluntary and involuntary migrations, which there is abundant independent evidence to show they have performed.

But it is otherwise with the Australioid and Negroid races. Where the Australian has not come into contact with other races, his only means of navigation is a raft, or a rude and fragile bark canoe. It seems incredible that if he ever possessed a better kind of boat, he should have forgotten the art of building it. Whether, therefore, Australia is supposed to have been colonised from the Dekkan, or the Dekkan from Australia, there appears to be no justification for the hypothesis that the passage was effected through the open sea. On the other hand, there is a very easy and safe passage from Australia to the Dekkan by way of the Malay Archipelago; but if colonisation took place in either direction by slow spreading from island to island, by this route, what has become of the former Australioid population in the vast tract which stretches from New Guinea to Siam?

The Negroid races present problems of a corresponding character. There is a great space, between the African and the Indo-Pacific divisions of that area, in which not a trace of a true Negro has been discovered.

Again; there is a vast break between New Caledonia and Tasmania, though the populations are closely allied Negritos; and the Tasmanians were, when discovered, so utterly devoid of the means of making a long sea journey, that we are debarred from assuming that they migrated across a very stormy ocean from the one of these islands to the other. And, by way of complicating the matter, it will be observed, if the centres of the Negro and Negrito areas and that of the Australioid regions of the Dekkan and Australia are joined by straight lines, these lines intersect one another.

The only means of throwing any light upon these singular facts appears to me to be by paying attention to the changes





which have taken place in the physical geography of the earth in comparatively recent times.

The Sahara, which limits the negro area of Africa on the north, is now well known to have been covered by a sea which was continuous with the Mediterranean, in times that are geologically modern. Ultra-Saharal Africa seems to have been, practically, a great island for a long period; and to the isolation thus arising it would appear to owe its peculiar race of men, as well as the singularities of the rest of its Fauna. Thus, the age of the Negro race exceeds that of the great physical change by which the bottom of the sea which lay south of the Atlas was converted into the driest and hottest of deserts.

On the other hand, it is certain that, in geologically recent times, the region which lies east and north of Australia has undergone great depression, whereby, in many cases, what were once continuous masses of land have been converted into chains of islands. Is it not possible that the isolation of the Tasmanians from the New Caledonians is to be accounted for by some such change, not greater in amount than that which we know to have occurred in other parts of the Pacific?

And if there is fair ground for believing such changes as these to have occurred in North Africa and in the Pacific, is it too rash to suppose that the present discontinuity of the Negroid and Australioid areas may be due to similar changes, which have submerged formerly existing island stepping-stones beneath the waters of the Indian Ocean?

If there be any weight in these arguments—and I cannot but think there is—the distribution of the Negroid and Australioid races of man is as strong evidence of his antiquity as the occurrence of his works in the gravels of Hoxne and Amiens.

The discussion on this important communication was opened by Professor CARL VOGT in the following terms, which are here given in a summary of his speech communicated by Professor Vogt himself since the adjournment of the Congress:—Prof. Carl Vogt '*considère le point de vue sur lequel s'est*

H

placé M. Huxley par rapport à la distribution des anciennes races humaines comme très-important, mais il doit faire des réserves quant à la classification, surtout des races mongoïdes et xanthochroïdes. Les races négroïdes et australoïdes sont beaucoup mieux et, suivant son appréciation, assez exactement définies, surtout quant aux races actuelles : il a des doutes sur quelques rapprochements avec des branches historiques anciennes, telles que les Égyptiens. Mais ces doutes à part, les études de M. Huxley prouvent bien que la distribution des deux races, que nous pouvons appeler les races primitives et anciennes, ne peut être comprise que par des rapports différents entre les terres fermes et les mers, de même que nous ne pouvons comprendre la diffusion actuelle des animaux et des plantes qu'en admettant des changements considérables survenus dans l'état de la surface du globe. Mais il est évident aussi que les changements survenus pendant l'époque dite diluvienne, et qui nous sont connus, ne suffisent pas pour cette démonstration. L'ancienne mer de la Sahara explique bien pourquoi les nègres n'ont pas franchi cette partie actuelle du continent africain pour arriver aux bords de la Méditerranée, comme d'un autre côté l'existence de communications terrestres entre l'Afrique et l'Europe à travers le détroit de Gibraltar et entre l'Angleterre et la France à travers la Manche jette des lumières sur la diffusion d'autres races humaines et animales ; mais toutes ces données ne suffisent pas, et nous forcent impérieusement à admettre que la diffusion des races primitives est arrivée à une époque encore plus reculée—savoir, dans les temps tertiaires. Or, nous avons déjà certaines données qui rendent l'existence de l'homme probable pendant la dernière période tertiaire, même en Europe, et on peut croire que des recherches ultérieures dirigées dans ces sens et faites dans des contrées non encore explorées sous ce point de vue nous fourniront des preuves positives. Toujours est-il que la dispersion par groupes incohérents, par îlots perdus au milieu d'autres races, qui est si remarquable pour les races négroïdes et australoïdes, nous force à reconnaître que leur diffusion s'est faite à une époque très-reculée, et que la continuité primitive de l'habitat de ces races a



été rompue et coupée par des changements de niveau sub-séquents, par la formation de bras de mer là où il y avait des terres fermes, et de terres là où il y avait des mers. Si ces raisonnements sont justes, on peut aussi les appliquer aux deux autres races. La continuité actuelle de leur dispersion, et conforme à l'état actuel de la surface terrestre, prouve que cette dispersion s'est faite dans une époque beaucoup plus récente, lorsque les rapports entre les terres et les mers étaient déjà fixes comme nous les voyons aujourd'hui. Vis-à-vis des autres races australoïdes et négroïdes ce sont donc des races relativement modernes. Mais il faut faire ici une réserve importante. Les deux dernières races adoptées par M. Huxley n'ont pas la même valeur que les deux autres. Il est impossible de les caractériser avec la même précision. M. Huxley y a même réuni des types tout-à-fait disparates, réunion contre laquelle il faut protester. Ainsi jamais M. Huxley fera croire à M. Vogt que les Eskimaux à tête si allongée soient de même race que les Lapons à tête si courte. Il faut donc reconnaître que ces races mongoloïdes et xanthochroïdes, comme les appelle M. Huxley, sont des races mixtes—c'est-à-dire, des produits de mélanges de races primitives, dont il faut chercher les souches, et que même ces deux races, considérées comme mélanges, ne suffisent pas pour donner une place convenable à tous les types humains tels que nous les connaissons aujourd'hui. En laissant de côté l'Amérique, sur laquelle M. Vogt n'a pas des études suffisantes, la population actuelle de l'Europe et d'une grande partie de l'Asie doit donc être considérée comme composée de types dérivés de souches primitives, mais dont les caractères ont été modifiés d'un côté par le mélange et de l'autre côté par le perfectionnement successif. Enfin, ces considérations prouvent de nouveau combien il est nécessaire, dans l'état actuel de la science en général et de l'anthropologie en particulier, d'examiner les races au point de vue de leur origine, de leur histoire et de leur développement, et de combiner les résultats obtenus avec les données fournies par d'autres branches de la science et surtout de la géologie, au lieu de se borner à l'examen des races en elles-mêmes et à



leur état actuel, comme on a fait généralement jusqu'à présent.

Professor PAUL BROCA then spoke as follows:—Si j'ai demandé la parole au sujet de l'importante communication que vient de nous faire M. Huxley, ce n'est pas, je me hâte de le dire, pour combattre le fond même de sa théorie. Bien au contraire, j'ai éprouvé un véritable plaisir en entendant la voix autorisée du savant professeur développer des principes généraux qui sont les miens. Ainsi j'admets, comme M. Huxley, l'inégale antiquité des types humains, et sans oser rien affirmer sur les époques successives de leur formation, je pense que ces différents types se sont répartis inégalement et par couches superposées, comme par une sorte de stratification ; j'admets en second lieu, avec notre savant collègue, que cette répartition a dû s'effectuer antérieurement aux révolutions qui ont donné à nos continents leur configuration actuelle, et j'en conclus sans hésitation qu'un océan peut séparer deux peuples sauvages, deux populations complètement ignorantes dans l'art de la navigation, sans que nous soyons autorisés par là à nier toute communauté d'origine entre ces deux groupes humains. Donc, je le répète et je m'en félicite, les principes de M. Huxley sont les miens, et nous sommes d'accord sur la doctrine ethnogénique générale. C'est dans les détails que nous nous séparons sur plusieurs points qui, il est vrai, ne manquent pas d'importance. Je lui demanderai donc la permission de lui présenter maintenant quelques objections. M. Huxley réduit à quatre le nombre des souches primitives de l'humanité. Cela me semble un peu arbitraire, et tout au moins non suffisamment démontré. Quant à moi, en ma qualité de polygéniste, je reconnais bien l'existence de plusieurs groupes primitifs distincts ; mais combien y en avait-il dans l'origine ? combien en a-t-il disparu ? et combien en reste-t-il aujourd'hui ?—voilà ce que je n'oserais certainement pas dire d'une manière positive. Aussi M. Huxley me semble-t-il un peu hardi lorsqu'il nous retrace aujourd'hui à grands traits une division du genre humain qui n'est pas d'ailleurs sans analogie avec celle de Blumenbach, puisque, comme celle du naturaliste allemand, elle



repose principalement sur la distinction des nègres, des Européens et des Mongols. Il me paraît en outre que la classification proposée par M. Huxley ne réunit pas complètement les caractères indispensables à toute bonne classification naturelle. Oserai-je le dire, j'y vois plutôt un système qu'une classification vraiment naturelle. Or, ce système a le grave inconvénient qu'un seul caractère y sert de base aux divisions principales, et ce caractère n'offre peut-être pas toute la fixité désirable quand il s'agit d'établir des groupes bien déterminés. Quel est, en effet, ce caractère de premier ordre qui doit nous servir, d'après M. Huxley, à distinguer les quatre groupes principaux?—c'est, si j'ai bien compris, la couleur des poils et de la peau. Eh bien, prenons le premier groupe, celui qui, sous le nom de '*mélanothroï*,' comprend à la fois les Égyptiens anciens et modernes, les Indous, les Abyssiniens, les Ibères, les Berbères, les Australiens et les Mélanésiens; faisons un moment abstraction de la couleur du poil, et ce groupe nous paraîtra purement artificiel; nous y trouverons en effet confondus des individus à poil laineux, d'autres à poil lisse, et à côté d'hommes à peau brune ou noire, nous y verrons l'Ibère, dont la peau est blanche. Et je ne parle pas de la forme du crâne, qui, dans ce même groupe, nous offrirait des variations tout aussi considérables; cependant je ne puis me défendre de croire que la forme du crâne est un caractère plus important, plus stable que la coloration de la peau et du poil, non pas que je nie absolument l'utilité des caractères purement extérieurs, mais la conformation crânienne me paraît être dans un rapport bien plus intime avec l'organisation, avec la nature spécifique des individus et par suite des groupes qu'ils composent. Il me semble donc hors de doute que des différences notables séparent les races comprises dans le premier groupe de M. Huxley; mais à supposer même que l'anatomie et la physiologie fussent favorables au système de notre collègue, a-t-il du moins en sa faveur la vraisemblance? Est-il possible d'admettre que de la même souche soient sortis les Australiens et les Égyptiens?—les Australiens, peuplades inférieures, placées par leurs caractères physiques



et intellectuels au dernier degré de l'échelle humaine, et tellement inférieures que tous les efforts des Anglais n'ont pu réussir à les arracher à la sauvagerie ; et les Égyptiens, race précoce, douée de tous les instincts civilisateurs, et que l'histoire nous montre parvenue au plus haut degré de culture, alors que l'univers entier restait encore plongé dans la plus complète barbarie ? Je n'analyserai pas les autres groupes un à un. J'y trouverais certainement la base de critiques du même genre. Il me serait facile de montrer que, reposant sur des signes d'une valeur tout aussi contestable, ils ne sont pas moins artificiels que le premier, et qu'à un seul caractère extérieur correspondent souvent des formes crâniennes fort différentes ; mais j'ai hâte d'arriver à un point qui me touche de plus près, car il s'agit de mon pays, et ce sera ma seconde observation. Il y a dans le système de M. Huxley une lacune à laquelle je suis très-sensible ; vous allez voir pourquoi. Notre collègue admet quatre groupes principaux ; or je vois bien, sur la carte qu'il nous a présentée, que l'un de ces groupes, celui auquel appartient l'Angleterre, s'étend sur le nord et le nord-est de la France, qu'un autre groupe, celui qui vient de l'Australie, atteint l'Afrique et l'Italie, mais entre les deux j'observe un vide assez considérable, une zone *incertæ sedis* qui comprend la plus grande partie de la France, et en particulier celle où je suis né, et je me demande avec anxiété si je dois chercher mes ancêtres parmi les Australiens et les nègres, ou parmi les peuples qui occupaient, au temps de l'âge de pierre, la Grande-Bretagne et la Belgique, et qui d'ailleurs ne devaient pas être blonds, quoique la carte de M. Huxley puisse le faire croire. Je soumettrai à notre savant collègue une dernière objection. Je me demande, quelle est la valeur qu'il accorde aux caractères crâniens, et en particulier à la brachycéphalie ou à la dolichocéphalie ? Il m'a paru qu'il en faisait grand cas lorsqu'ils venaient à l'appui de sa doctrine, et qu'il les reléguait volontiers en arrière lorsqu'ils venaient la contrarier. Ainsi, il nous a dit que la dolichocéphalie caractérisait l'un de ses quatre groupes, et que la brachycéphalie en caractérisait un autre. Est-ce donc qu'il reconnaît à ces

caractères crâniens une importance réelle? Ce n'est certes pas moi qui le contredirai sur ce point, tout au contraire; mais alors je m'étonne de trouver dans son groupe blond des brachycéphales et des dolichocéphales. Cela me semble contradictoire, et je voudrais, en matière de classification, des données et des résultats un peu plus nets, un peu plus précis.

Mr. A. R. WALLACE said that as M. Broca had expressed a difference of opinion with Professor Huxley, he should like to say how far he could support the views of the latter from his own personal observation. The Papuans had appeared to him to possess so many striking resemblances to the Negroes, of a mental as well as a physical character, that he had thought they must have some affinity to the Negro race. He had never, however, expressed his opinion upon this subject, because it was so entirely opposed to that generally entertained. As Professor Huxley had stated his views upon the subject, he wished to say that he agreed with him in relation to it. There could be very little doubt that the connection between the Papuans and the Negroes was closer than between the Papuans and the Australians. If this point could be proved, it would lead to some extraordinary conclusions with respect to the antiquity of man. He should be inclined to state his case much stronger than Professor Huxley had done. There were two modes of testing whether countries had formerly been joined together, and one was the similarity existing between the kinds of animals, and also of the depth of the sea between them. When these two points coexisted, the evidence was very striking that the two portions of land had been joined together. For instance, hardly a single animal was different in England from what it was in France. The sea also between them was not very deep. Hence we concluded that these two countries had once been joined together. Now there was just a similar kind of evidence existing here. The sea between New Guinea and Australia was shallow, not more than 100 fathoms in depth; the animals also were similar. On the other hand, between New Guinea and Africa there was the remotest possible affinity in their animal productions,



while one of the deepest oceans rolled between them. It was therefore certain that the connection between Australia and New Guinea was comparatively recent, while that between Africa and New Guinea, if it ever existed, was exceedingly remote. Yet, strange to say, the men of New Guinea were more closely allied to the Africans than they were to the Australians. Now we could not account for this strange distribution of man by the theory of only one series of changes in the earth. There must have been a time not very remote when Australia and New Guinea were joined, so as to allow land animals to pass from one to the other. But if we suppose man to have spread from the one country to the other at that time, then the great differences that exist between the Australians and the Papuans must have been produced since, and we have no possible clue to the resemblance of such widely separated races as the Papuans and the Negroes. Their affinity, if it really is one, implies changes of physical geography vastly greater, and therefore vastly more ancient, than those which have determined the distribution of allied species of animals. It would imply (what there is other evidence to indicate) that the antiquity of the human race is comparable with that of the *genera*, rather than of the *species*, of other mammalia.

Mr. E. B. TYLOR said that though Professor Huxley had not brought forward the evidence of language in support of his classification of races, he appeared to have taken it into consideration. His Mongoloid family corresponds to the Turanian family in language, if this term be taken in its narrow sense, as not including the Dravidian of South India. It would scarcely be safe to comprehend these in the Turanian family; and if they are not so included, then it may be generally asserted that comparative philology does not contravene, though it may not generally support, Professor Huxley's classification, for no people classed by him in one division would be removed on linguistic evidence to another.

Dr. HOOKER, F.R.S., remarked that though there were many agreements between the geographical distribution of man and other animals and plants, there were as great differences, as was to be expected when it was considered how different the means of transport were, and how differently plants and



animals may be affected by the same climatic conditions. He also believed that Mr. Wallace's great discovery of the limitation of two zoological provinces by the Strait of Lombok equally applied to botanical provinces; and if Mr. Huxley's statement that it also applied to ethnological provinces proved true, he believed that it was the only hitherto discovered physical feature in the globe that had proved to be an absolute line of demarcation between *contiguous* ethnological, zoological, and botanical provinces.

Mr. BUSK said it seemed to him perfectly evident that, as science progressed, we should have to give up some of our favourite theories. If we were to accept this classification of Professor Huxley's, we should have to give up the conclusions which many had arrived at and considered fully established—namely, that the characters of the bony remains of men afforded certain indications of the affinities of the race to which they belonged.

Professor HUXLEY, in reply, congratulated himself that his ideas had met with no more unfavourable criticism from colleagues so competent to judge them. It was by no means his intention to suggest, that the existing races of mankind might not be of much greater than quaternary age; on the contrary, he was prepared to carry them back much further. With respect to the cranial characters upon which M. Vogt and M. Broca had dwelt so strongly, he could only appeal to the indubitable fact, that those characters, constant as they may be in one group of mankind, are eminently variable in another. The skulls of a large proportion of the South Germans and of the Swiss are as short and broad as those of Tartars, while those of the Scandinavians are as long as those of Esquimaux. But surely no one will pretend for a moment that the tall, fair-haired, blue-eyed Germans and Scandinavians, whose languages differ little more than as dialects from one another, and who are connected by innumerable other ties, belong to different races of mankind. If they do not, why should the Esquimaux and the Lapp?

The following paper, the substance of which was communicated by Mr. BUSK to the Congress, has since been enlarged and amplified by the author, and is now inserted in full.