

bones. A comparison of the skull with a cast of one of the most beautiful classic busts in the Townley collection, seemed to the enthusiastic craniologist as though he had acquired the actual skull of the head from which the ancient marble was copied; and when placed alongside of the only Greek skull in his collection, the Georgian was superior to it, the Greek being next in rank.

Hence it was that Blumenbach adopted his Georgian skull as a typical cranium, for the most perfectly developed division of the human species. In the same decade in which the Georgian skull appears, the term *Caucasian* is introduced in connexion with it; and along with this term of classification appear also those of Mongolian and Ethiopian; and these, with the epithets Malay, and American,—subsequently added,—formed the names of a quinary division of the human species, which he conceived his physical researches to have established. By the term Caucasian, Blumenbach meant no more than the adoption of a convenient name for his highest division of the human species, the typical characteristics of which were most completely epitomised in his symmetrical cranium. But the associations and historical traditions connected with Mount Caucasus, supplied a tempting basis for theory and speculation. The mountain range was assumed by some as the central point for the origin of mankind; and the epithet derived from it is now associated with so many extravagant ideas, and so much loose and confused classification, that the vague uncertainty it has acquired is abundantly sufficient to justify its abandonment. When, however, Dr. Latham substitutes the term Dioscurian for Caucasian, in its limited sense as applicable to the inhabitants of the actual area of Mount Caucasus, he does so not only from different data to those employed by Blumenbach, but even in defiance of such analogies as their ascertained physical conformation seems to suggest. He accordingly admits that he occupies exceedingly debateable ground. “So long has the term Caucasian been considered to denote a type of physical conformation closely akin to that of the *Iapetidæ*, *i. e.* pre-eminently European, that to place the Georgians and Circassians in the midst of the *Mongolidæ*, is a paradox. Again, the popular notions founded upon the physical beauty of the tribes under notice, are against such a juxta-position; the typical Mongolians, in this respect, have never been mentioned by either poet or painter, in the language of praise.” Perhaps, however, the facts which justify Dr. Latham in saying of