

FRIDAY, MAY 11, 1883.

A STRANGE PERFORMANCE.

WHOM the gods would destroy, they first make mad. Mr. Hubert Howe Bancroft, having shown great capacity as an organizer of an encyclopaedia company, and having assumed not only to be an historian, but to dispense opinions oracularly, and to patronize and discredit distinguished writers, now throws the ethics of trade aside, and exalts himself to a place among self-praising martyrs. He gravely announces that purchasers of his earlier volumes must now subscribe to them over again in order to get the rest of the series, and sends out an extraordinary lithographed form of subscribing, in one corner of which is a list of the thirty-nine volumes, with the prices.

“ ————— 188 .

“ TO HUBERT HOWE BANCROFT, San Francisco, Cal.

“ *Dear sir,* — In token of my high appreciation of the value to the Pacific coast and to the world, of your long and arduous historical labors in a new field, and after a manner peculiar to yourself, I hereby tender my subscription to a complete set of your literary works in thirty-nine volumes, payments to be made at the regular published price as the volumes are issued and delivered.

—
“ After your signature, please designate style of binding.”

We doubt if a more flagrant piece of folly was ever perpetrated by a book-maker.

It is melancholy and significant, that while the few historical students, as tested in different centres, who are competent to pronounce on the value of Mr. Bancroft's History, are agreed in a qualified, and in some respects a condemnatory, estimate of its methods and performance, the general reviewers of the book have been simply dazed by its magnitude.

Any departure from laudation strikes Mr. Bancroft as inquisitorial, and unkind to a man who never made any pretensions to being an historian. Such a spirit is commendable and disarming; but when he becomes mad and militant, he arms his critics. Two protests against this universal flattery have struck him deeply.

These offenders are the *New-York independent*, which took up his claim of making a contribution in his notes to the bibliography of the subject, and which showed how preposterous such claim was; and the *New-York post* and *Nation*, which took him to task for his opinions on the early Mexican civilization, and for his churlish discourtesy to the late Lewis H. Morgan, — a man of pre-eminent reputation, whom Mr. Bancroft modestly accused of seeking to obtain a little cheap notoriety by attacking his (Mr. Bancroft's) views. Mr. Bancroft has made answer to these reviews in a tract, of which he requests an opinion, which we give him. He does not print or quote in any comprehensible way the articles which annoy him; and so the reader is left, unless otherwise informed, to infer the nature of these questioners' criticism from his own discourteous and specious language, which takes on a humorous sort of mongrel admiration in the juncture of such words as 'astute hair-splitter' and 'erudite dogmatist.' Without citing proofs, he accuses them of ignorance and mud-throwing, and thus makes but the vaguest responses to clear exemplifications of his own ignorance, to citations of the inadequacy of his index-mongery, and to instances of perversions, which the reviewers adduced. The reviews in question were severe, and, from the nature of the case, cutting; but they were not disfigured by foul language, and were explicit. His answer is vituperative and general. This pamphlet is eked out with extracts of laudatory comment growing out of the average conception of 'a big thing' from all sorts of sources, including a fresh commendation from certain California judges, who have no status, certainly, as students in this field, however reputable their legal qualifications and general intelligence. Some of Mr. Bancroft's gyrations are not more strange than the opinions which seem to have been wrung by him from various eminent people concerning this 'Macaulay of the west.' More than one distinguished gentleman has discovered to his annoyance, that polite sentences, in notes of acknowledgment for presentation

copies, have been used to swell this chorus of admiration.

He has another craze. He chooses to assert that there is a conspiracy among what he calls 'the Morgan men' to depreciate and crush him, and that these two articles are part of the plan. We suspect archeology is too engrossing a study for such trivial by-play; and we know, also, that the editors, whom he berates for lending themselves to such a plot, found students in the field too inclined to ignore his work, to bring themselves easily to the bestowal of any time upon criticising it. It is piteous to think how what might have been a useful labor is resulting in discredit and personal intrusiveness.

A STUDY OF THE HUMAN TEMPORAL BONE.—I.

It may be asked why the writer of the present article should publish a subject which has already been so thoroughly and repeatedly investigated, is so familiar, and is treated with the utmost detail in many manuals of anatomy. In his experience as a teacher of anatomy, he has, of necessity, been obliged to observe many important points over and over again; and, as one of the results, he has been led to see some of them differently from the views commonly entertained. As no other bone is so complex as the temporal, and none more important in its relations, it occurred to him that his view of it might prove of interest to students. No discoveries are claimed, and it is probable that what is here written may be found in previous anatomical literature. In some points the details are less complete than those given in the admirable, accurate, and exhaustive 'Handbuch der anatomie' of Professor Henle; but others are perhaps more definitely indicated. For brevity, some of the more obvious details, given in every manual, are excluded.

For convenience of study and reference, it is usual to consider the temporal bone as consisting of the squamous, mastoid, and petrous portions, though these do not accord with the natural divisions observed in its development. To avoid circumlocution, the terms 'squamosa,' 'mastoidea,' and 'petrosa,' are substituted for the ordinary phrases 'squamous portion,' etc.

The *squamosa* is the irregularly circular or oval plate, upright in position, at the fore-part of the bone. Its outer surface, nearly flat or

feebly convex, forms part of the temporal fossa. The inner surface is concave and pitted, as usual in the other bones of the cranium, and is marked by grooves for the great meningeal vessels. It is commonly defined by a fissure of variable extent, remaining as part of the petro-squamosal suture.

Projecting from the lower part of the squamosa, externally, is the *zygomatic process*, which articulates with the malar bone to form the zygoma. The base of the process is broad and strong, and has its upper surface slanting forward. The upper sharp border of the process is continuous backward with a curved line, the *temporal ridge*, which defines the squamosa from the mastoidea.

The squamosa underneath forms the articular surface for the mandible, consisting of the glenoid fossa with the articular eminence in front; both extending outwardly below the root of the zygomatic process. The *glenoid fossa* is a deep, transversely oval concavity, defined behind by the glenoid fissure. The *articular eminence* is a transverse ridge of variable thickness, convex fore and aft, and more or less concave to straight transversely. Variable prominences at the outer part of the articular surface are the *anterior* and *posterior glenoid processes*.

The *mastoidea* is the outer back part of the bone, externally defined from the squamosa by the temporal ridge. It is prolonged below into the conspicuous nipple-shaped eminence, the *mastoid process*. Internally, to the base of the process, is a large fore-and-aft groove, the *digastric fossa*; and internally to this again is a narrow groove for the occipital artery.

The broad archway between the mastoid and post-glenoid processes is formed by the *auditory plate*¹ (fig. 2, *d*), which extends inwardly as the roof of the external auditory meatus. It is partially defined from the temporal ridge by a variable, irregular crescentoid indentation.² The inner extremity defines the meatus from the tympanic cavity by an acute curved edge, from which a wide crescentoid plate, the *tympanic scute*,³ slants upward, and forms the outer boundary of the upper portion of the tympanic cavity. The *scute* (fig. 1, *b*; fig. 2, *c*) can best be seen by sawing the temporal bone fore and aft through the tympanic cavity, and viewing the outer division of the bone from within. The scute is separated externally from the rest of the auditory plate by spongy substance, but occasionally is continuous through thick, compact substance. Its anterior border joins the

¹ Lamina auditoria.

² Post-auditory fossa.

³ Scutum tympanicum.