showing the forms of mental disease and the causes of insanity, are returns of the total numbers in asylums, and not of the admission for the year. No percentage is given of pauper lunatics to paupers, or to the general population. What possible excuse can there be for this retrograde action? The returns, however, of the expenditure, consumption of food, and cost of wages are as usual most explicit and useful. We trust that on the completion of the labours of the Statistical Committee of the Medico-Psychological Association, and the adoption of their report, an attempt will be made to induce those engaged in the compilation of these most important and laborious tables in some degree to assimilate the subjects of their research so as to render them of scientific value for all parts of the United Kingdom.

Anthropology: An Introduction to the Study of Man and Civilisation. By Edward B. Tylor, D.C.L., F.R.S., with illustrations. Macmillan, London, 1881.

No writer on anthropology is listened to with more respect than Dr. Tylor. No one has done more than he to advance "the science of man and civilisation," which is what he understands by anthropology; and his last work on this subject—the one now under notice—will add greatly to his reputation. It would be difficult, indeed, to find a book so full of instruction, and yet so pleasant and easy to read. He calls it an introduction to anthropology and he correctly describes it as not dealing with strictly technical matter, out of the reach of ordinary well-educated readers. As an "introduction to anthropology," however, Dr. Tylor's volume will be found to be very complete; while the avoidance of strictly technical matters in it is certainly a merit, and will greatly increase the number of those who read it. "The various departments of the science of man," as Dr. Tylor points out, "are extremely multifarious, ranging from body to mind, from language to music, from fire-making to morals, but they are all matters to whose nature and history every well-informed person ought to give some thought." It is, therefore, very desirable that the science should be presented to the public as Dr. Tylor presents it in this volume.

All this, and much more, in praise of the work may be said, and yet objection may be taken to some things in it,

and a wish felt that the information it furnishes on some points had been fuller and more precise.

For instance, it would have been well if Dr. Tylor had shown more clearly what he understands by the beginnings of the historic period, to which he so often makes reference. He says that "the historic ages are to be looked on as but the modern period of man's life on earth," but the length of that period is not more definitely alluded to than as "the few thousand years of recorded history." It is not made clear, however, what Dr. Tylor means by "few," nor what he means by "recorded history." And perhaps it would have been well to have pointed out that, as regards particular areas of the earth, the prehistoric is sooner entered in one area than in another; and, further, as regards some of these areas, that the prehistoric is certainly separated from the present time by hundreds and not by thousands of years.

Dr. Tylor does not indulge in sensational statements as to the vast antiquity of man on the earth. All he asks for the duration of the prehistoric period is that it must at least have been long enough to bring about changes far greater than any known to have taken place during historical ages. But it is clear that the causes of change may be, and probably are, more active in one epoch than in another, and that the time required to bring about a change may, therefore, vary greatly in different epochs, so that we cannot even guess at the length of the prehistoric period through any knowledge we have of the time required to effect changes during the historic period.

The life of the men of the mammoth-period, Dr. Tylor says, was not man's primitive life; but even of the remoteness of that period, which is comparatively late, no certain knowledge is yet to be had. "Some geologists," Dr. Tylor tells us, "have suggested twenty thousand years, while others say a hundred thousand or more, but these are guesses made where there is no scale to reckon time by." They are liberal guesses in a popular direction, and those who have made them have not always made it as clear, as Dr. Tylor does, that they are mere guesses and have little or no scientific value.

Dr. Tylor, however, is not always so fair and cautious. For example, he accepts as true many statements in books of travel, which to indifferent readers are at best of doubtful accuracy, when such statements give support to his views. It is not difficult to understand how this should happen;

but it is difficult to understand why Dr. Tylor should be at pains to show that little value should be attached to the statements of travellers when these tend to weaken his views; as, for instance, when he belittles the favourable notices given of the condition and character of savages by Shomburgk, Kops, Sir Walter Elliot, and others. "Of course," he says, "these accounts of Caribs and Papuans show them on the friendly side, while those who have fought with them call them monsters of ferocity and treachery." It would be interesting to know what, on their side, the Caribs and Papuans called those with whom they fought—those civilised Europeans who invaded their country, robbed them of their property, massacred their young men, and debauched their young women. There are more ways than one of looking at savage life, and in doing the savage justice, it is by no means necessary to fall "into the fancies of the philosophers of the last century, who set up the *noble savage* as an actual model of virtue to be imitated by civilised nations."

When Dr. Tylor says that "it is an important fact that in every region of the inhabited world ancient stone implements are found in the ground," surely the statement needed some qualification, because there exist areas in which no search has yet been made. Again, when he says that "we may see how generally skin garments used to be worn by the vast number of skin-dressing implements of sharp stone found in the ground," and refers the reader to a specimen (Fig. 54, c., p. 187), it is surely desirable to point out that this is only a guess at the use of stone implements of this form. Then again, is it going too far to doubt the usefulness of the following effort to trace the early progress of an art?

"One asks," Dr. Tylor says, "How do men first hit upon the idea of making an earthen pot? It may not look a great stretch of invention, but invention moved by slow steps in early culture, and there are some facts which lead to the guess that even pots were not made all at once. There are accounts of rude tribes plastering their wooden vessels with clay to stand the fire, while others, more advanced, moulded clay over gourds, or inside baskets, which, being then burnt away, left an earthen vase, and the marks of the plaiting remained as an ornamental pattern. It may well have been through such intermediate stages that the earliest potters came to see that they could shape the clay alone and burn it hard."

Is it not quite as probable that the steps were just the

reverse of those here indicated, and that the man accustomed to shape clay alone into vessels may have bethought himself getting a good form by plastering it over a gourd and then burning the gourd out, or of getting a decorated surface by moulding it inside a basket and then burning the basket off? We are sure that Dr. Tylor will not take offence if it is asked whether a "guess" like that just quoted, as to the steps leading up to the making of a pot, might not be properly called one of the fancies of the philosophers of the present century.

The clear and important distinction between culture and civilisation is not always maintained in Dr. Tylor's volume. "Human life," he says, "may be roughly classed into three great stages, Savage, Barbaric, Civilised," and he proceeds to define these. The *savage* state, he says, is that in which man subsists on wild plants and animals, and neither tills the soil nor domesticates animals. There is certainly low culture here; but he adds that small clans of men in this state may exist, which involves a low state of civilisation, the dawning of the *civitas*, or the banding together of men for the common weal. The *barbaric* state, according to Dr. Tylor, is that in which men have taken to agriculture and the domestication of animals. There is clearly here a higher culture, but there is also a higher civilisation, for another feature of the barbaric stage, according to him, is the establishment of settled village and town life, that is, a larger and closer binding of men together for the common good and a fuller realization of the *civitas*. The results of the establishment of the settled village and town life, Tylor says, are immense in the improvement of arts, knowledge, manners, and government. In other words, culture is the result or outcome of the civilisation. *Civilised life*, Tylor says, begins with "the art of writing, which, by recording history, law, knowledge, and religion for the service of ages to come binds together the past and the future in an unbroken chain of intellectual and moral progress." This seems to be nothing but high culture, but it is evident that there is a want of precision and completeness about this definition. It is difficult, indeed, to see what is meant by saying that "civilised life may be taken as beginning with the art of writing," which is the whole of Dr. Tylor's definition. It cannot mean that those Englishmen, who are ignorant of the art of writing, are not living in a state of high civilisation and enjoying its advantages. The fact is that all Englishmen live in the same state

of civilisation, though no two of them have exactly the same culture, and though among them there are men, to be counted by the million, who are profoundly uncultured, and who are as ferocious and brutish as any savages in the world. Men join together to form the *civitas*, and a state of civilisation is the state of an aggregate; but culture belongs strictly to the individual, who is able to get it in consequence of living in a state of civilisation. Dr. Tylor writes, and writes admirably, but, notwithstanding this, he would surely lead a life in the barbaric stage if he joined a savage tribe of the Brazilian forests, becoming a member of it. It cannot be doubted that he would then lose the advantages of the high state of civilisation in which it is his good fortune now to live, though he might keep his culture.

Dr. Tylor points out that it would be wrong to conclude that civilisation is always on the move, or that its movement is always progress. "On the contrary," he says, "history teaches that it remains stationary for long periods, and often falls back." In connection with this subject, he makes the following very important remark:—"To understand such decline of culture, it must be borne in mind that the highest arts and the most elaborate arrangements of society do not always prevail; in fact, they may be too perfect to hold their ground, *for people must have what fits their circumstances.*" The italics are not Dr. Tylor's; they are used to give emphasis to the concluding thought.

Though this notice of Dr. Tylor's "Anthropology" has dwelt chiefly on points to which objection was or might be taken, it is the notice of a book of rare merit and value, which should be in the hands of every physician engaged in the treatment of insanity.

Philosophical Classics for English Readers. Edited by William Knight, LL.D. Blackwood and Sons, 1881.

This new series proposes to deal with the principal philosophical writers of modern Europe, from Bacon and Descartes onwards. Descartes, Butler, and Berkeley have already been issued, and we can speak in strong terms of approbation of the manner in which their lives and opinions are treated by their respective editors. We hope this laudable attempt will be rewarded by a large circulation. The books merit it. We intend to review them individually in subsequent numbers.