

and the child remained longer dependent upon the parent. But with the constant association of near relatives an aversion was acquired to close intermarriage, resulting in the custom, or rather instinct, that now characterizes all classes of mankind. The chief factor of change thus ceased its operation, but the formation of races had already occurred.

Thus the author would account for those primitive and wide divergences that must once have taken place. With his development and acquisition of language, man became the most cosmopolitan of animals; tendency to further divergence was checked, and is now rather toward homogeneity. Anthropologists are fast recognizing the futility of separating tribes and classes by cranial classification. Very great variations are found between dolichocephalic and brachycephalic types among all civilized or uncivilized races. The pure Germanic race of the blond type is disappearing, as Virchow has shown, and greater racial uniformity is becoming apparent. The larger part of the German people is a mixture between the light-skinned indigenous race and the dark-skinned Indo-European races. Free crossing prevents the further formation of striking changes; but, with the development of civilization, a new and subordinate factor is taking, in a measure, its place,—that of national and social caste, which tends to the formation of minor variations. The peasant and the noble, the Jew, the German, Frenchman, or Englishman,—all are differentiated by very tangible characters, the result of partially restricted crossing, from social causes. Thus in man's history we see the unrestricted crossing of bestiality, fruitful in change; the acquired humane instincts averse to pairing between blood-relations, and eager for remote and strange mates; and, finally, the prejudices of social and political castes that lead to the formation of minor variations.

#### AN OLD-FASHIONED BOOK.

THIS volume seems to be in its principal features an abridged translation of Weber's '*Lehrbuch der weltgeschichte*,' to which, indeed, Dr. Fisher acknowledges his great indebtedness, especially as to ancient and mediæval history. As to the need of some such book as the one under review, there can be no question. Teachers still, even in many of our best colleges, use the old mechanical method of teaching history. We call it the mechanical method with no intention of discrediting it; for there is no doubt but that, in the case of the great majority of our history teachers,

*Outlines of universal history.* By G. P. FISHER. New York, Ivison, Blakeman, Taylor & Co., 1885. 12°.

the safest way is to put a good book into the hands of the student, and make him commit to memory so many pages a week. To be sure, he forgets most of his facts as soon as possible after the examination. But, on the other hand, if the book is a good one, he has learned very few things which will have to be carefully unlearned in after-life. The best example that occurs to us, of the working of this system, is with regard to the teaching of botany in one of our smaller sectarian colleges not so very many years ago. The text-book was large, and well supplied with poor pictures. The class came in regularly: they could not be absent without excuse. As soon as the man in charge had satisfied himself that all were present, he said to N. or M., 'Proceed.' N. or M. proceeded to recite from memory the opening paragraph of the day's lesson. When the man in charge thought he had recited enough, he ordered another boy to 'proceed.' Then came reviews and second reviews. At the end of the term or year the boys knew the book by heart. As they had never analyzed a flower, or applied the knowledge thus gained in any way, their botanical wisdom was very slight. To this day, most of them know absolutely nothing of botany, though still able to recite page after page of the large and very dry text-book. So it is with history. A man may know a hundred dates. He may know, for instance, that Magna Charta was signed by King John on June 15, 1215; but if he knows nothing about the document itself, what it meant, who drew it up and why, under what circumstances it was signed and why, he may be said to know nothing about the most interesting document in the history of the Anglo-Saxon race. He may know, too, that the first perfect parliament was summoned by Edward I.; but, if he knows no more, he may with truth be said to be utterly ignorant of an event which John Richard Green has denominated 'the most important event in English history.' Still, books giving such general knowledge of the world's history have their place.

Professor Fisher has undoubtedly put much time and labor into the making of this book. Portions of it are well done—exceedingly well done. It is also very well proportioned, and in its arrangement no fault can be found. We are conscious, too, of the enormous labor involved in getting out such a work. But all these considerations only add to our regret that Dr. Fisher did not use still more care in his original writing, and exercise very much more vigilance in his proof-reading; then he might have produced a book that would have remained the standard work, of its size, for a very long time. Let us call attention to

a few errors, which, though trifling in themselves, have given us a distrust of the whole book, and especially of that portion dealing with modern history.

The first sentence is from p. 295, and is as follows: "John (surnamed Sansterre or Lackland, a name given to younger sons who died before they were old enough to hold fiefs) was chosen king." Of course, this statement is absurd. It is singular that Professor Fisher should not have seen it; for the definition is correctly given by Miss Thompson, whose admirable 'History of England' the author seems to have read with some care: "John, surnamed Sansterre or Lackland (a name given to younger sons whose fathers died before they were of age to hold fiefs)." Then, again, take the following from p. 315. The author has been speaking of Llewellyn, and goes on to say, that, "when a rebellion broke out several years later, Wales was conquered, and the leader of the rebellion executed (1273)." Now, of course, the author knows that Llewellyn was killed in a chance skirmish, and that it was his brother David who was executed in 1283, not 1273; but he should have said so. Then, too, on the very next page (316), the date 1292, which is assigned to the defeat of Warrenne by Wallace at Stirling Bridge, should be 1297; while on the following page (317) Isabel is said to have returned from France, bent on the overthrow of her husband, Edward II., in 1325, instead of 1326. Now, here, on three successive pages, are three dates — and three very important dates — wrongly given. No doubt they are misprints, or mere slips of the pen; but the greatest care should have been taken to prevent just such errors. It must not be supposed that such failings are confined to this part of the book, or to English history, as, in whichever direction we have turned, the same want of care has been observed. In American history, in European history, and even in ancient history, similar errors have been found.

The sections devoted to the history of the people — to the literature, theology, art, etc., of the different periods — are good as far as they go. The maps of classical times are mainly printed from the same plates as those in the 'Standard classical atlas,' issued by the same publishers (*Science*, vii. p. 51): those relating to more modern events, while not so large, are clear and fairly accurate. The most serious omission in this part of the book is the lack of a map showing the partitions of Poland. Taken altogether, the maps add something to the value of the work. So, too, do the various genealogical tables; while the little bibliographies, though very general, will serve to start the inquiring student in the right direction. It is to be regretted that an insufficient index impairs what

ever usefulness as a work of reference the volume might otherwise have had.

#### COMPARATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF JEWISH ABILITY.

THE pronounced racial characteristics of the Jewish people, with their remarkable persistency of type, have always rendered them a favorite subject for ethnological study. The peculiar environments in which they have been placed, and the almost constant persecution to which they have been subjected, have certainly given their impression to the mental characteristics of the race, and in many respects we see these as sharply portrayed as the peculiar physiognomic cast.

Mr. Joseph Jacobs has recently published (*Journal of the anthropological institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, February, 1886) an analysis of the characteristics of more than thirty thousand eminent men with especial reference to the Jewish race. The conclusions he arrives at are of the greatest interest, and in some cases unexpected from the crude inductions of common experience.

Jews have no distinction whatever as agriculturists, engravers, sailors, and sovereigns. They are less distinguished than Europeans generally, as authors, divines, engineers, soldiers, statesmen, and travellers, but approximately their equal as antiquaries, architects, artists, lawyers, natural scientists, political economists, scientists, and sculptors. They seem to have superiority as actors, chess-players, doctors, merchants (chiefly financiers), metaphysicians, musicians, poets, and philologists. One would, however, have expected a much larger contingent of lawyers and political economists than is actually found, and art is better represented among them than one would suppose. The sciences also, both biological and exact, show a greater equality than most people would expect. As regards the former, of course Jews have no Darwin. It took England a hundred and eighty years after Newton before she could produce a Darwin: and as the Britishers are five times as many as the Jews, even including those of Russia, it would take, on the same showing, nine hundred years before they could produce another Spinoza; or even, supposing the double superiority to be true, four hundred and fifty years would be needed. But, even in the lower ranks of biology, Jews have done and are doing good work. Bernstein, Cohn, Remak, Rosenthal, and Valentin as physiologists, Cohnheim, Hirsch, Liebreich, Lombroso, and Traube as pathologists, will be recognized; while F. Cohn is perhaps the third greatest botanist in Germany. It