

and other specimens of "*industrie primitive*;" but having examined his eighty engraved plates, with hundreds of figured examples, we venture to say that any man may provide himself, blindfold, with equally good evidence of antediluvian and preadamite art, in the first heap of broken stones he stumbles over!

And what, let us now ask, is the position of this science of Ethnology, which undertakes to dictate to all older *ologies*? It is, as we have said, in its veriest infancy. Ethnologists are not as yet agreed upon the simplest common terms. Scarcely two of them can be warranted to mean the same thing when they employ such simple words as *race*, *family*, or *species*; to say nothing of *Arian*, *Touranian*, *Mongolian*, *Berber*, and the like, once more discussed here. The relative importance of philological, physiological, and archæological modes of investigation are so little determined, that the, craniologist slights the philologist, and the linguist in turn scorns the cranioscopist. Is such then a time for the students of this young and deeply important science to waste their energies in bootless controversies on questions, which, if truth were once established on a commonly recognised scientific basis, would vanish like the mists of dawn, before the sun? Such is the utter want of any conformity in the use of a received terminology, that in this very work, we find the term "*Caucasian*" employed by M. Maury (p. 84,) as equivalent to what he calls "the white race," and again by Dr. Meigs, (pp. 219-257,) confessedly unscientifically, as the most convenient one available under which to group such a miscellany as Norwegians, Fins, Germans, English, Irish Celts, Slaves, Jews, Egyptian Fellahs, Thuggs, &c. Mr. Gliddon again has his own views on it (p. 563,) as a term of mystifying vagueness in Ethnography; or with the Count de Rechberg (p.p. 624, 625,) restores it to the only definite meaning it seems capable of, as "the highest type" among the multiform inhabitants of Mount Caucasus. What the present recognized scientific value of the word is, we defy any one to say. So with "*Pelasgian*"—if possible, a still looser and more debateable term. "Dr. Morton," according to Dr. Meigs, "used the term *Pelasgic* too comprehensively. The Circassians, Armenians, and Persians, should not be placed in this group." In his estimation, however, it appears that, "Ancient Romans, Greeks, Affghans, and Græco-Egyptians," all properly class as *Pelasgic*. Dr. Latham on the contrary, classes both *Persians* and *Affghans* under one "*Persian Stock*;" the modern *Greek* he would agree with Mr. Gliddon in recognizing as, to a great extent, Slavonic. The seemingly