This article was downloaded by: [New York University]

On: 18 April 2015, At: 08:45

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954

Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

Folklore

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rfol20>

Reviews

A. Lang , E. Sidney Hartland , A. R. Wright , H. J. Rose & A. C. Haddon

Published online: 14 Feb 2012.

To cite this article: A. Lang , E. Sidney Hartland , A. R. Wright , H. J. Rose & A. C. Haddon (1910) Reviews, *Folklore*, 21:4, 516-537, DOI: [10.1080/0015587X.1910.9720546](https://doi.org/10.1080/0015587X.1910.9720546)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0015587X.1910.9720546>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is

expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

REVIEWS.

L'ORIGINE DE L'IDÉE DE DIEU. Étude Historico-Critique et Positive. I^{re} Partie. Historico-Critique. Par le Père GUILLAUME SCHMIDT, S.V.D. Vienne, Autriche: Imp. des Mechitharistes, 1910. 4to, pp. xiii + 316.

IN compliance with many requests, he tells us, Père Schmidt republishes from his excellent serial, *Anthropos*, the first part,—historical and critical,—of his work on “The Origin of the Idea of God.” His purpose is to ask for criticism, which he will gratefully receive: meanwhile he bids us remark that he does not yet propound his own solution of the problem of the Origin of the Idea of God. That solution he promises to give us in a later work.

It is not an easy task for me to speak of the book of Père Schmidt, because he professes great obligations to my own writings on the evolution of religion, though, naturally, he differs from me on various points. Perhaps I may be allowed to explain how I arrived at my present opinions. They are, in fact, derived from study of the writings of Mr. E. B. Tylor. In the earlier editions of his *Primitive Culture*, a book of forty years ago, he made it plain that certain peoples, when first studied by Europeans, were not, indeed “monotheists,” did not “assign the distinctive attributes of deity to none save the Almighty Creator,” but *did* exhibit, “high above the doctrine of souls, of divine manes, of local nature-spirits, of the great deities of class and element . . . shadowings, quaint or majestic, of the conception of a Supreme Deity.”¹

¹ *Primitive Culture*, vol. ii., p. 302 (1st edit.).

"Shadowings, quaint or majestic, of the conception of a Supreme Deity"—these I found almost everywhere, when I was writing *Myth, Ritual, and Religion* (1887). In my preface of that year I said "the existence—even among savages—of comparatively pure, if inarticulate, religious beliefs or sentiments is insisted on throughout." I was amazed at the nature and amount of the evidence for Mr. Tylor's "shadowings of the conception of a Supreme Deity," among low races who did not possess what Mr. Tylor regards as the upward steps towards that conception, the beliefs in "divine manes, local nature gods, great gods of class and element." I found the result without the supposed prior steps towards the result. Therefore, in 1898, I published a too hastily written book, *The Making of Religion*, (more or less modified in editions of 1900 and 1910), and my conclusion was that the more the beliefs and practices of Animism or ghost worship prevail, the more did the conception of a primal, creative, and ethical and *non-animistic* superior being fall into the background, till in a few cases there remained of him but *nominis umbra*, or not even the shadow of a name. Meanwhile the evidence for the very wide diffusion of the belief in this being, (who is best called, I think, the All Father, a term employed by Mr. Howitt), has rapidly accumulated. I take up the newest book on a barbaric oceanic people, "The Island of Stone Money," by Dr. W. H. Furness, a son of the great American Shakespearean scholar (Lippincott, 1910), and I find Yalafath "the ruler of Heaven," "the supreme deity," high above War and Wind and Dance gods; and beginning to be, though benignant, "negative rather than positive," though addressed in prayers, (pp. 144, 149-50).

I said, and I repeat, that the comparative study of religions did so persistently overlook this form of belief that in Professor Huxley's and Mr. Herbert Spencer's works we find no trace of creeds which Mr. Tylor and "*le vieux Waitz*," (as Père Schmidt writes,) dwelt upon,—Waitz especially in the cases of African and Australian tribes. I tried to call science back to the superabundant evidence, and Père Schmidt, in an amusing history of the fortunes of my little book, shews that I piped to "scientists" who declined to dance,—at least on the Continent and in America.

At last, in Germany, K. Breysig, in criticising P. Ehrenreich, (who discovered me,) styled me "cet Ecossais, aussi parfaitement capricieux que spirituel." But K. Breysig did not examine my evidence! Moved, as early as 1902, and again in 1904, by Dr. L. de Schroeder, Professor of Sanskrit at the University of Vienna, Père Schmidt made the acquaintance of my book, and pursued the subject with energy, and with the aid of his very extensive erudition,—for example, his knowledge of savage languages, and of the Pygmæan peoples.

This personal explanation is almost necessary, for Père Schmidt devotes fifty-two pages of his work, (pp. 72-124), to a statement of "*Le Prêlanimisme monothéistique d'Andrew Lang*."

The terms *prêlanimisme monothéistique* scarcely express my notions. As Mr. Tylor says, "the assignation of the distinctive attributes of Deity to none save the Supreme Creator," is monotheism "in the strict sense," and "in this strict sense no savage tribe of monotheists has ever been known." Very few monotheistic peoples, "in the strict sense" very few, if even any at all, have ever been known. I do not think that I ever ascribed to any savage tribe, or to the masses of any European people, a religion which is monotheistic "in the strict sense" of the philosopher. What I did hold, and do hold, is that "shadowings quaint or majestic" of a most superior, *non-animistic*, often ethical Father and Master and Maker are a very widely diffused element in savage and barbaric beliefs, and that this element is the germ of the most advanced monotheistic creeds. It is desirable that adversaries should criticise, in detail, the testimony, early, modern, and daily accruing, to the fact of the existence, (in various degrees), of the belief. Such criticism is a very considerable task; the adversary must undertake it before he can prove that my opinion is, in Mr. A. R. Brown's words, "an elaborate misinterpretation" of the evidence. Nobody seems to be in a hurry to examine the evidence!

Père Schmidt states my scantlings of evidence, with additions from later sources, such as Mr. Strehlow's work on the Aranda and Loritja. He is most copious as regards both materials and criticism in his critique of my theory, (pp. 125-244). Here he deals with the views of Messrs. Howitt, Tylor, Hartland, Foy,

Marett, and Van Gennep, especially applauding "l'opposition resolute mais noble de M. Sidney Hartland," to whose criticisms, indeed, and perhaps to his alone, I am greatly indebted. That Mr. Tylor has not offered any censure of my book, or books, is due to two causes, no doubt. I am his very old friend and pupil; he loves not controversy; and his official duties at Oxford, combined, alas, with ill health, have retarded the publication of the great work on which he has long been engaged. Many learned men, like Mr. Tylor, detest polemics, though, for my part, I think that discussion may be most profitable, as long as we do not let "our angry tempers rise."

Père Schmidt begins with Mr. Howitt, whose theory of the origins of the belief in an All Father is not, indeed, identical with my own. But, in the matter of facts, Mr. Howitt wrote, "as to the belief in the tribal All Father which is held by the tribes mentioned by me in my *Native Tribes*, and is not held by other authors, I see no reason to alter anything I have said." Well, as to the existence of the belief in an ethical and explicitly *non-animistic* All Father, I entirely agree with Mr. Howitt. As to the origin of the belief I do not feel sure that Mr. Howitt is right, his view being that the All Father is merely the Head-man of the Sky-tribe. However, this is a matter of theory of origins: and Père Schmidt proceeds to combat Mr. Howitt's theory (pp. 127-128), which certainly does not colligate all the facts. At most Père Schmidt appears to grant that "some of the traits which characterise the Supreme Being among the aforesaid tribes" are suggested by the earthly headman: which is not unlikely.

To me Mr. Howitt seemed to regard the belief as a concomitant of social progress from "group marriage," female descent, and "matrimonial classes," to individual marriage, male descent, and society with a local basis. Père Schmidt shows that Mr. Hartland and Mr. Frazer understood Mr. Howitt in the same sense.² But I pointed out that, according to Mr. Howitt, the belief existed among tribes with female descent and with no local basis of society, while it is not found in Mr. Spencer's Arunta and the northern tribes with individual marriage, male descent, and *local* communities.

² *Folk-Lore*, xvi., 1905, p. 106. *Fortnightly Review*, Sept., 1905.

Mr. Howitt replied that I had misunderstood him; but he did not say that Mr. Frazer and Mr. Hartland had also done so,—as they had. Even now I do not think that his statement was lucid, nor am I entirely certain that he did regard the All Father creed as a concomitant of social advance, while the question was superfluously complicated by his belief in “group marriage” among the Dieri and their congeners. The certain fact is that the All Father belief is common, or universal, in South Eastern tribes whether with male or female descent, whether with or without communities of local basis, while the belief is absent, or merely vestigial, in northern and central tribes with male descent and local communities. These are the facts, and they exclude the opinion that, in Australia, the presence or absence of the All Father is a concomitant of social advance or failure to advance.³

There is no room for a criticism here of Père Schmidt's opinions about social evolution in Australia. He is inclined to think that, in Australia, descent in the male line is earlier than descent in the female line, and he enters into ethnological theories of race. My reply exists in a book which will probably appear some day. But into these ethnological theories about various races, with various institutions, now combined in Australia, I cannot here enter. I confess to being a sceptic about all ethnological speculation whether concerning Pelasgians in Greece, or Papuans and Negritians in Australia. My knowledge does not enable me to estimate the value of linguistic arguments and tests of race; it is for philologists acquainted with many outlandish tongues to criticise Père Schmidt's conclusions. He reviews battles long ago, waged in *Folk-Lore* between Mr. Hartland and myself. To me he seems an impartial umpire, for, though on the whole he sides with me, he allows plenty of “points” to Mr. Hartland. If I were re-writing my book I should find much advantage in Père Schmidt's verdicts. “Mr. Hartland's piercing eye has discovered many weak places, inaccuracies, and exaggerations in the system of Lang.” Being on my side, after all, Père Schmidt, naturally, gives me the majority of “points,” mainly objecting to “the emphasis with which Lang so often insists on the word “father.””

³ Père Schmidt, (p. 131, Note 3), has unluckily credited me with some opinions entirely contrary to what I hold.

Really, as the Australians do so too, I hardly see how I can help following the evidence. To be sure, as Mr. Howitt observed, they use the term "father" in the classificatory sense, but they also use it in the personal sense. Moreover they use "father" as a title of reverence, and, as Christians speak of God as "the Father," black fellows apply the same term to the being whom they regard as primal and most potent; while their application of the word "Father" to a Colonial Governor is on a level with our speaking of "Father Schmidt." Really I do not see how I have erred in this matter.

Père Schmidt gives a point to Mr. Hartland for saying that we find no All Father who at the beginning lived in the sky. But before the beginning Atnatu of the Kaitish lived beyond the sky, and still inhabits that region. I must not, however, go on defending myself,—to tell the truth, Pere Schmidt often does me that service, even in cases where I should have been at a loss. The personal character of these All Fathers is certainly in striking contrast to that of Zeus in Greek mythology, but Bunjil is accused of seizing two women whom Karwin had made or created, and of giving Karwin satisfaction by spearing him in the thigh. I do not feel tempted to excuse Bunjil, but Père Schmidt thinks it worth while to do so. From my point of view the contrast between the Zeus of everyday *fabliau* and the Zeus to whom Eumæus prays is quite natural and inevitable, and nobody denies that Zeus is a supreme being.

The same view I would extend to Bunjil, but Père Schmidt defends his character in a very complex argument which I do not clearly follow and cannot condense. It partly turns on the relations of Bunjil with the Eaglehawk of mythology, and with the stars (pp. 202 *et seq.*), and "sex-totems" come into the discussion. It is too ramified for me, but at all events, in a variant of the Karwin myth given by Miss Howitt, Karwin is the sinner, and Bunjil merely punishes his wickedness. Let us give Bunjil the benefit of the doubt! The discussion leads Père Schmidt into theories about astral and lunar myths, no longer intelligible to the blacks, and to a system of the blending of two distinct cultures and races in S.E. Australia: a crisp-haired and a straight-haired race. "Solar heroes" come into the system, and,

enfin, a medley of astral, lunar, and solar myths, and sex-totem myths, have obscured and more or less depraved the legends of the All Father, which is very probable. Thus the view of M. Van Gennep that the All Fathers are merely First Ancestors or Culture Heroes is set aside. It was rejected by Mr. Howitt, and may, I think, be disproved without all the apparatus of Père Schmidt. Four divergencies from my view, and concessions to criticism, are made,—with my entire consent, though I am rather shy of our old friend the Solar Hero. *J'en ai vu bien d'autres!*

"Le résultat général de la critique est donc extrêmement favorable à Lang." But Père Schmidt for the present confines himself to Australia, while pointing out that my contention covers the whole field of savage and barbaric religion, as far as I have information. To the great mass of evidence Père Schmidt intends to return.

His last chapter deals with the "preanimistic theories of Magic," which we associate in England with the name of Mr. Marett. The book of a predecessor, Mr. King, "The Supernatural," (London, 1892), is unknown to me, and is described as "the best work, hitherto, of the new school." Père Schmidt has a genius for discovering hidden merit: he has met with no mention of Mr. King in the literature of our topic. One must instantly procure Mr. King's book, in two volumes: its title, "The Supernatural," would have attracted me, but it never swam into my ken. Mr. King does not accept Animism as the starting point of religion, "Magic is anterior to Animism." He investigates the notions of *mana*, *wakan*, *orenda*, and so forth. About the All Fathers of Australia, Mr. King seems to be strangely ill-informed (p. 257). Concerning Mr. Marett's essays, Père Schmidt makes criticisms of much the same sort as have occurred to myself: he admires the article "From Spell to Prayer," first published in *Folk-Lore*, June, 1904.

Space permits but a very inadequate notice of the work of Père Schmidt, and vanity has dictated a treatment perhaps too personal, though it was quite impossible, as his readers will see, to keep myself "out of the memorial."

A *prima facie* objection to the opinion which I share with Père Schmidt, is that we have both a heavy bias,—he as a Catholic

priest, and I as *un capricieux*,—against the anthropologically orthodox doctrine of the rise of religion in Animism. But I have no *a priori* objection to that doctrine, for, like Malvolio, "I think nobly of the soul," and, if we have no souls, I have no interest in religion. The truth is that, the more I studied early religion, the less did the hypothesis of Animism as the origin of belief in the All Father seem to colligate the facts. None the less, Animism has, of course, had an enormous influence on the development of religion, an influence often very hostile to Theism; in other cases complementary to Theism.

As Père Schmidt has not yet given us his own theory of the origin of the idea of God, I do not know what his theory is, or in what way his bias affects, if at all, his logic. But let me insist that every man of us *has* a bias, and a strong bias, a circumstance which our opponents,—whose strong point is not a sense of humour,—do not seem to be able to understand. Whether or not the scientific bias caused the chapter of the All Father of backward tribes to be ignored, it is not for me to say, but ignored it was, too frequently, by students in the last century. In that chapter there is nothing to alarm them, if they see the obvious conclusion which,—with their opinions,—they can draw from the early belief.

A. LANG.

MÉLANGES D'HISTOIRE DES RELIGIONS. Par H. HUBERT ET M. MAUSS. Paris: F. Alcan et Guillaumin, 1909. 8vo, pp. xlii + 236.

L'ANNÉE SOCIOLOGIQUE. Publiée sous la direction de ÉMILE DURKHEIM. Tome xi. (1906-1909). Paris: F. Alcan et Guillaumin, 1910. 8vo, pp. iii + 822.

THE BIRTH OF HUMILITY. By R. R. MARETT. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910. 8vo, pp. ii + 31.

THE first two books are in continuation of the valuable series of publications initiated by Prof. Durkheim, of which an account has been laid before the Folk-Lore Society on previous occasions,

and which have contributed so much to the discussion of anthropological problems during the last dozen years. Of the second it will be sufficient to say that it continues the acute and original series of reviews of works, whether in the shape of books or of single articles, on sociological and anthropological subjects, and that its intrinsic importance is in no way diminished by its divorce from the initial *Mémoires* that used to appear in the same covers.

The volume of *Mélanges* by Messrs. Hubert and Mauss is a reprint of three articles already published, two of them,—namely, those on Sacrifice and on the Origin of Magical Powers,—in previous volumes of the series, and the third,—on the Representation of Time in Magic and Religion,—separately. They are here preceded by a Preface in which the authors expound the connection between the three and the ideas which underlie their researches, and incidentally answer objections to method and results. The republication of these articles in a cheap and handy form will render them more useful to students of folklore, and it is to be hoped will cause them to be more widely known and studied. Students who are already acquainted with them will turn with interest to the Preface. The defence of the authors' position it contains is to some extent a retrospect of the steps by which they have reached that position. But it is more than this, for in replying to objections they are led to the enunciation of general principles and results. The summary analysis of the idea of Sacredness, for example, deserves careful comparison with that recently put forward by Mr. Marett in his masterly lecture on *The Birth of Humility*. Mr. Marett's analysis is the more detailed and exact; but, while it covers much of the same ground and so far agrees with that of Messrs. Hubert and Mauss, it approaches the subject from a different starting-point. Mr. Marett is a psychologist: Messrs. Hubert and Mauss are sociologists. They insist on Sacredness as a social phenomenon: he views it primarily as the expression of the complex emotions of the individual soul. Neither of these aspects can be safely neglected. A clear comprehension of the interaction of the social relations with individual impulses is necessary to enable us to read the half-effaced hieroglyphs of the genesis of religion. For the French authors

the social influence is everything. Judgements, for them, are not dictated by the individual reason, but by social forces. We owe much to Prof. Durkheim and his disciples for calling attention to the social side of religion. The tendency of the English school of anthropologists was too greatly to neglect it. But, after all, the emotions arise in the individual. They are emphasized and organized by contact with those of other individuals collected in a group, whether that group be a howling mob of rioters or the bedizened knights and councillors and dames of a Primrose League. What anthropologists have to do in retracing the history of civilization is to balance accurately the one set of forces with the other, and to allot to either no more than its fair share in originating and impelling the movements of human progress.

E. SIDNEY HARTLAND.

THE SIGNS AND SYMBOLS OF PRIMORDIAL MAN. Being an Explanation of the Evolution of Religious Doctrines from the Eschatology of the Ancient Egyptians. By ALBERT CHURCHWARD. Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1910. 9 $\frac{5}{8}$ " x 6", pp. xxiii + 849. Col. etc. ill.

THE title of the book is somewhat misleading, as the object is not so much to explain the evolution of religious doctrines as to set forth a pet theory of the author in regard to Freemasonry. The author finds the root of all true religious knowledge in the Egyptian religion, especially as set forth in the Book of the Dead, and, as has been done before, traces Egyptian influence to almost every clime and people. The book is written *ad maiorem gloriam* Freemasonry, and with Freemasonry, as such, we find no fault.

To judge by the author's frequent remarks, such as,—“a statement too absurd for any kind of argument,” “an assertion sufficiently ridiculous to prove his complete want of knowledge of the subject” (p. xii.), “so lamentably ignorant of the whole subject” (p. xiii.), “in ignorance of anything pertaining to the subject” (p. xiii.), when speaking of those who disagreed with him

in regard to views set forth in another work of his, the author is by no means destitute of confidence in his superior knowledge; indeed, not to leave the reader to the mercy of his (*i.e.* the reader's) private judgement, he states in plain language, "We contend that the result of our labours herein set forth is correct" (p. 5). It may be quite true that the reviewers of the former work of the author had no knowledge of the Egyptian alphabet (pp. xiv *et seq.*), and we have no doubt that the author has "tried to search after the facts with a steady honesty" (p. xi), and, when he says,— "Facts and history are one thing; theories and "according to" are another" (p. i), we agree with him heartily, finding both in his book. The book contains many facts carefully collected from numerous mentioned and not mentioned sources, and a great many more theories, many of which have long been exploded as fanciful. To the facts no one can object, but, when they are handled, as they have been by the author, to prove a preconceived notion, science gives way to imagination and fact to fancy.

The book bristles with assertions which one really cannot take seriously, and is full of inaccuracies. The writer seems to lack even an elementary acquaintance with one of the languages which he uses (or attempts to use), to prove one of his theories. This is surprising, especially as he lays so much stress upon accurate knowledge, from which he avers the correctness of his deductions (p. 5). We will point out only a few things in support of what has been said above.

The author's remarks on the Jewish religion (pp. 236 *et seq.*) betray no knowledge of the state of the historical situation as recognized by the scholars of to-day. It may be that the author, who seems to quote well-known authorities simply to point out their ignorance, did not consider it worth while even to mention the critical position of Bible scholars as being perhaps, to use his own language, "too ludicrous to discuss." He revives a long-exploded theory identifying Jahweh with an Egyptian deity (p. 294). The author's knowledge of Hebrew cannot even be called elementary. The Hebrew word in l. 20, p. 294, which he imagines to represent the Hebrew word for mercy-seat, has absolutely no meaning. The four Hebrew letters **לפך** should be **כפרת** and the mistake arose simply from the author's ignorance of Hebrew. The same

is true of other Hebrew words with which the author ornaments the pages of his book; *e.g.*, on p. 297 we find a word which the author believes to represent the Hebrew for "ark" or "coffer." As little knowledge of Hebrew is displayed on pp. 364 *et seq.* To judge by the way in which Baali (p. 365) is used, the author seems to have no idea that it is Baal *plus* the pronominal suffix of the first person singular; and what does "Baalam" (p. 365) mean? Whence that form? The plural is Baalim.

HISTOIRE DE L'IMAGERIE POPULAIRE FLAMANDE ET DE SES RAPPORTS AVEC LES IMAGERIES ÉTRANGÈRES. Par E. H. VAN HEURCK et G. J. BOEKENOOGEN. Bruxelles: G. van Oest & Cie, 1910. 4to, pp. ix + 727. Col. etc. ill.

THE Continental definition of *folklore* as covering folk arts and crafts and, in fact, anything produced by or related to the folk, seems to have stimulated the formation of collections and museums of folk objects. While the museum of peasant art at Haslemere is probably,—until Mr. Lovett's comprehensive collection is adopted by some fortunate locality,—the only separate public gathering of the kind on this side of the Channel, in 1907 the catalogue of the Antwerp *Musée de folklore* of the *Conservatoire de la Tradition Populaire Flamande* already included 2816 items, ranging from house tiles, salt-boxes, stable lanterns, costumes, and toys, to lovers' hearts cut in trees, *folklore electoral*, chapbooks, and broadsides. Collections of less importance exist at Skansen in Sweden, Bucharest, and elsewhere. The present handsome and fascinating volume is appropriately dedicated to M. Elskamp, the donor of the Antwerp Museum, and describes, with the help of hundreds of illustrations, the picture broadsides, each containing one or a number of coloured or plain woodcuts or prints with accompanying legends, which from the adoption of wood engraving for this purpose in the fifteenth century up to recent years were produced in millions for the peasantry and the children of Flanders and other European countries. Early prints of this kind were generally religious, and evidence of this remains in the

names still applied to them of *heilig* in Protestant Friesland and of *aleluyas* in Spain. Some of the most interesting examples are still of the religious type, such as the pennons (*drapelets*) printed with the legends etc. of trade patron saints, or places of pilgrimage, carried in funeral and wedding processions, and hung up in the peasants' homes beside the statuette of the Virgin. The capricious colouring of the prints is thought by our authors to have been adopted to suit a popular taste formed by the weird rose-coloured dogs, red trees, and blue horses of the twelfth and thirteenth century painted glass in the cathedrals of Antwerp, Laon, etc. The authors supply a mass of laboriously collected material for the study of the long life and transmutations of wood blocks,—some of which they trace back to seventeenth-century Dutch and French originals and others to eighteenth-century chapbooks, while the bulk were specially cut for the broadsides. One of the most curious examples of change of ascription is the use about 1820 of a very recognizable portrait of Napoleon as the portrait of the hereditary prince of the Netherlands, 'the conqueror of Waterloo.' In another print, obviously of St Brigit of Ireland, the legend is that of Brigit the Swedish princess. As might be expected, many of the subjects occur in the prints of almost every nation, and, as in chapbook and ballad literature, there is the strangest mixture of old folk-tales,—Cinderella, Habetrot, Red Riding Hood, Tyll Owlglass, the Land of Cockayne, the Wandering Jew,—with tales perhaps on their way to become folk-tales,—e.g. Gulliver's Travels, in which two episodes differ from Swift, Gulliver's death-scene appearing to be copied from that of Tom Thumb!—proverbs, street cries, fashions, games old and new, monsters surviving from mediæval bestiaries, old customs such as leaping over candles on January 6, universal jests such as *La Dispute de la Culotte*, battle pictures of Jena etc., the burning of Moscow, and prints (of about 1850) of General Tom Thumb. One interesting adaptation to modern conditions is the belief that if the prayer on a certain common print be read daily for eight days before the drawing of the conscription, and the print bound to the arm with which the ticket is drawn, a 'good number' will result (p. 74).

The greater part of the book is concerned with the prints

produced at Turnhout, (about 20 miles from Antwerp, and now a world-centre of the manufacture of playing cards), and we are told that, of the three principal houses originally producing these broadsides, one has closed its doors, another has given up their production and destroyed its blocks, and the third has adopted modern machine processes and is allowing its remaining blocks to pass to the Antwerp Museum,—a different attitude to that of a Nancy proprietor, who refuses to part with, or even to show, the blocks mouldering since 1844 in his attics, and is using the remaining stock of prints as packing material! Much information is given, however, about other countries, with bibliographies, and it is possible to confirm Mr. Nutt's luminous suggestion (*ante*, p. 384) that the racially distinctive elements of the lore of the folk are to be found amongst its artistic rather than its practical elements; soldiers abound in German broadsides, while they are rare in Holland until after the Napoleonic wars and the Belgian insurrection of 1830, and many other examples occur of national preferences and additions to the common stock of subjects.

This book is not only an interesting record of the time when the workman was still a designer and thinker and not a mere machine minder, but a rich storehouse of material for study of the problems of the diffusion and variation of folklore, and is to be very heartily commended to all students.

A. R. WRIGHT.

MODERN GREEK FOLKLORE AND ANCIENT GREEK RELIGION:
A Study in Survivals. By J. C. LAWSON. Cambridge
University Press, 1910. 8vo, pp. xii+620.

IN this very readable book the author gives the results of his own researches when, ten years ago, he visited Greece as Craven student, together with a considerable amount taken, with due acknowledgement, from other workers in the same field. A companion volume to Abbott's *Macedonian Folklore*, dealing with the beliefs and practices of more southerly Hellenic populations, has long been needed, and to some extent this book, despite grave defects, fills the gap. We say "despite grave defects," for

the book is in one respect almost worthless owing to its inaccuracy. The writer sets out upon perfectly sound principles, namely, with the idea of illustrating from the present beliefs of the conservative peasantry the popular beliefs of ancient times. He succeeds in telling us something about modern Greek superstitions; but his comparisons with ancient ideas break down hopelessly, because,—to be frank,—the religion of ancient Greece is a subject about which he knows less than nothing. What is to be made, for example, of such statements as these? “Nothing was imposed [in ancient Greece] by authority. In belief *and in worship* each man was a law unto himself” (p. 3). Every man “a law unto himself” in worship, in any ancient state or any part of the countryside, of which we know anything! Probably nothing outside of savage communities was ever so completely controlled by sacred and inviolable rules, observed to the letter by the whole community, as the religion of ancient Greece, unless it was that of ancient Rome. After this we are quite prepared to find him reversing the functions of the Heavenly Aphrodite and Aphrodite Pandemos (p. 4), on the strength of a passage in Artemidorus,—he does not seem to know that the blunder, or rather the deliberate misrepresentation, dates from Plato,—and trying to find, in the confused ancient way of speaking of the dead, now as corpses and again as phantoms, a trace of something like the Slavonic belief in vampires, or stating (p. 572) that the date of the Mysteries coincides roughly with that of Easter,—a glaring error from which any handbook would have saved him. His handling of ancient texts also is childish. Not only does he accept, with hardly a trace of criticism, any and every piece of vamping of late authors on such dark subjects as the ritual of Eleusis,—(Lobeck, whom he quotes, might have taught him a little caution, to say nothing of later works),—but he continually misinterprets perfectly straightforward statements of, *e.g.* Herodotus. *Her.* iv. xciv. (the human sacrifices of the Getae) is thus expounded,—“No one can fail to notice that Herodotus’ own interest in the custom centres not in the idea which prompted it but in the manner of carrying it out. His account of it reads as if he knew his Greek readers to be familiar enough with the conception of human sacrifice as a means of sending a messenger to

some god" etc. (p. 350). That is, the presence in historical Greece of a hideously barbarous rite, mentioned with abhorrence by Greeks, for a purpose foreign to their beliefs,—for all their deities were accessible to ordinary prayer, and to kill a man was not to send him to the gods but simply to the Underworld, where he would be cut off from communication with the greater portion of them,—is to be forced out of a passage which states simply that such a rite took place among certain savages! Another misinterpretation of the same author, which we have not space to quote, occurs on p. 501, and similar blunders are scattered up and down the whole book.

When we turn, however, from Mr. Lawson's theories of ancient religion to his facts about modern and mediæval folklore, we find less to criticise and much to interest us. Thus, the examples of survivals of polytheistic beliefs are noteworthy. We mention a few; continual reference in popular stories etc. to τὰ ἔξωτερικά, the "outside," *i.e.* pagan, spirits, conceived as really existing and not necessarily and entirely malignant; the quaint Athenian blessing, *ὡς ἀξιώσῃ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ εὐχαριστήσῃς θεοὺς καὶ ἀνθρώπους*; belief in local daimones (στοιχειά); tales of a mysterious personage once actually called ἡ δέσποινα, who seems to be simply one of the Chthonian goddesses, perhaps Demeter; belief in the Fates (Μοίραι), in fairies called Νεράιδες, and in the Lamia. We are glad also to get further information about the "Callicantzari," as Mr. Lawson calls them,—Mr. Abbott, using a slightly different form of that Protean name, says "Karkantzari,"—formidable and exceedingly filthy bogeys who prowl, it would appear, especially about Christmas time. Without accepting Mr. Lawson's attempt to derive their name and functions from the Centaurs,—we should emphatically label them "non-Greek," leaving it to experts to decide whether they are Slavonic, Turkish, or what not,—we recommend these gentry to all folklorists. Equally interesting is the account of modern funeral customs, in which traces of cremation may be found; and also the survival of the common ancient metaphor of death as a marriage,—if survival it be; at least it is an interesting parallel. We wish, however, that Mr. Lawson had been a little more critical in the selection of his materials, if he did not want to publish all he had collected. When (p. 339) he

tells a tale of human sacrifice in recent times (early nineteenth century) from Santorini, we cannot but conclude that the venerable narrator was "having" him.

However, with all its defects,—and they are wide-reaching,—the book, as we have said, fills a gap and has its value. Some day we hope the author will give his undoubted abilities a fair chance by extending his reading and cultivating the art of disbelief. Then he may give us something of less impeachable worth.

H. J. ROSE.

THE MELANESIANS OF BRITISH NEW GUINEA. By C. G. SELIGMANN. With a Chapter by F. R. BARTON, and an Appendix by E. L. GIBLIN. Cambridge: University Press, 1910. 8vo, pp. xxiii+766. Ill.

IN this massive volume Dr. Seligmann has given us the most complete account yet published of the sociology, sorcery, and religion of any tribe on the mainland of New Guinea, and he has done this for such diverse tribes as the Koita of the central district, the Roro and Mekeo tribes of the lower reaches of the St. Joseph river, and the Southern and Northern Massim of the south-eastern archipelagos. Considering the relatively short time Dr. Seligmann spent at some of the places he visited, it is surprising what a mass of systematic material he has collected, but the help which he enlisted from Government officials and from missionaries enabled him to correct and extend his observations. All the peoples studied are at the same stage of material culture, but there are considerable differences in social customs which are of great interest, and when more data are available from other areas we shall be in a better position to judge how far these are due to an evolution from within or to influences from without. The following notes will give some slight idea of the scope of the work.

The most characteristic cultural feature of the Massim is the existence of a peculiar form of totemism with matrilineal descent. The members of each clan have a series of totems, of which a

bird is the most important. The series usually consists of a bird, fish, snake, and plant, but a four-footed vertebrate may be added. In some parts there is a dual or a multiple exogamous grouping of the clans, which regulates many social matters. There does not appear to be any special affinity between a man and his totems, nor can he influence these in any way. All over the district a man shows more regard for his father's totems than for his mother's, which are also his own. A person can kill his own totems, and, with the exception of the bird, even eat them. In the central district totemism has disappeared, but among the Roro-speaking people of the coast about Hall Sound and to Cape Possession, and the Mekeo further inland, it is represented by clan badges. There is another strange resemblance to the natives of the north-west coast of America in the unexplained *hekarai* ceremony,—a series of feasts which by its rivalry and exchange of valuable property bears a superficial resemblance to a *potlatch*; but a more close analogy can be found in the public exchange of food or property which occurs in Murray Island, Torres Straits.

The burial customs of the Northern Massim are particularly interesting on account of the contrast they present to those of their Southern neighbours, among whom people of clans other than that to which the dead person belonged scrupulously abstain from having anything to do with the dead body or its burial. Among the Northern Massim the whole funeral is carried through by the dead man's *lubai* or *nubai*, certain connections by marriage, who are consequently never of the same clan as the dead man.

In the Trobriands, as soon as a man dies his store of yams is divided amongst his near relatives who are members of his own totem, and several of his coco-nut trees are cut down by some of his relatives, there being no restriction regarding the use of these trees, their leaves, or their fruit. The dead body remains in the house until burial, and wailing is kept up unceasingly. When the body has been placed in the grave by the *lubai*, food is provided by all near relatives belonging to the deceased's own totem, and is eaten by all the other clans of the village, in which feast the widow and father of the dead man take part, having previously blackened themselves as a

sign of mourning. When a village chief dies, those belonging to his totem from all the neighbouring villages bring food to the burial feast; members of any other totem bring no food, although they come to the feast. The widow's hair is cut, her mourning costume being provided by her *lubai*,—in this instance the sisters of her dead husband, who also shorten her petticoat and cut her armlets and leglets at the conclusion of her term of mourning. When a woman dies, her *lubai*,—in this case her husband's brothers,—dig the grave and bury her, after which the usual feast takes place. A widower blackens himself and wears mourning for his wife, his mourning gear being provided by his female *lubai*,—dead wife's sisters. On the night following the burial the body is exhumed by the dead man's father, or, if he is absent, the dead man's sister's husband may perform the duty. The bones of the legs and arms are then removed, and these are made into spatulæ by the father, brother-in-law, and children, who alone are allowed to use them ceremonially. The terminal joints of the phalanges are worn by the children, and in some cases the jaw is worn as a bracelet by the widow. In the case of the death of a paramount chief, his father or his sister's husband removes the bones from the arms and legs, and perhaps even some of the ribs; these bones are distributed to people of all the totems except that of the dead man, each village chief in his district receiving one bone. Enough bones would be reserved for making lime spatulæ for the ceremonial use of the father, children, and sister's husband. The skull would be made by the children of the deceased into a lime pot, which they, and perhaps also their father's widows, might use. In every case it is the relations-in-law or the *lubai* who remove the bones and make the spatulæ, and who also perform the office of burying the dead.

In the Marshall Bennets the widow almost invariably keeps the skull of her husband in the house, and wears his jaw as a bracelet, while his vertebræ and phalanges are worn by her brothers and her children. A widower also keeps the skull of his late wife in his house, and wears her lower jaw as a bracelet, while her vertebræ are worn by her mother-in-law and sisters-in-law. In some parts a dead man's jaw will be worn by his son. In

Kwaiawata the bones are kept in the house for some time, and then removed and exposed in shallow rock shelters in the sea cliffs.

The book contains a very large number of very excellent and well-chosen photographs, and fifty illustrations in the text. A very interesting feature is the large number of reproductions of native drawings, serving in most cases to elucidate ceremonies, but incidentally illustrating other matters, and demonstrating the artistic skill of the natives. Dr. Seligmann's book is a notable contribution to ethnology, and deserves a place in every student's library.

A. C. HADDON.

THE ISLAND OF STONE MONEY. Uap of the Carolines. By WILLIAM HENRY FURNESS, 3rd. J. B. Lippincott Co., 1910. 8vo, pp. 278. Ill.

DR. FURNESS's pleasant book on the people of the isle of Uap in the Caroline Group is not specially meant for anthropologists. Rather it is aimed at the general reader. Consequently special students are left asking for more, and hoping that Dr. Furness will communicate more precise and more extensive information to some anthropological serial. We want to know about the rules regulating marriage in Uap, about totems (if they exist in any degree), about names for human relationships, classificatory or descriptive; and perhaps Dr. Furness may some day enlighten us. He has a curious chapter on the *failu* or the club-house of the males, into which very little boys may wander freely. It is also the resting place of weary fishers home from the sea, who are tabued so strictly that they may not even see the faces of women or come near them. The lads of each *failu* carry away a pretty girl from some other community, perhaps of old by sheer violence; now some secret bargaining is probably done. Though she is common to all the adult members of the club, she is treated with perfect courtesy and kindness; too long attachments to any individual are gently discouraged, but, as far as she is concerned, there is no jealousy. The life of a

mispil is not unhappy, but poor Migiul, the prettiest *mispil* in the isle, looks profoundly melancholy. In another photograph of her sent to me by Dr. Furness *père*, the eminent Shakespearean scholar, she is much prettier than in the published copy (p. 124). If a *mispil* bears a child she becomes the individual wife of a member of the club. You may meet matrons of the most unimpeachable virtue marked with the *mispil* tattoo. Still, it is not a pretty custom. The stone money,—huge circles of perforated stone,—is hardly a medium of exchange, but a circle lost at sea is still at the owner's account at the bank. Shell money is also in circulation. A three-span *fei*, of good whiteness and shape, purchases fifty baskets of food, but the owner of the baskets need not carry off the *fei*; it lies at his account.

In religion we find, atop of the topmost bough, Yalafath, "the ruler of Heaven," "the creator of the world," Lord of the dead; he is kind, but rather unsympathetic. Nevertheless he is addressed in prayers. After a stay with Yalafath, souls seem to return, invisible, to Uap. Yalafath "is the supreme deity and has the general supervision of mankind." There is a polytheism of departmental deities; Dr. Furness found no sacrifice, and no priests, but there are paid wise men and exorcists. Colours are easily distinguished by the natives, but blue and green pass as lighter shades of black, and all three are *rungidu*. Tattooing is on the wane; slaves may not tattoo themselves. Burying is by interment; various postures are given to the corpse. The living are "delightful people," and the Germans, to their infinite credit, prohibit alcoholic drinks. There is given a pretty full vocabulary. Yalafath is rendered "God of Creation," Dr. Furness not having before him the fear of critics. But what he gives as the "Creation Legend" says nothing about what we mean by "creator," and is not of much authority.

A. LANG.

MELANESIANS AND POLYNESIANS. Their Life-histories described and compared. By GEORGE BROWN. Macmillan, 1910. 8vo, pp. xv+451. Ill.

DR. GEORGE BROWN has given us in this beautiful volume the

ethnological information he has collected during nearly fifty years in the West Pacific, but practically the book is a comparison between the natives of a limited area of New Britain and those of Samoa. Dr. Brown was one of the first white men to go to New Britain, and, though some similar information has been published by Parkinson (especially in *Dreissig Jahre in der Südsee*) and by others, his first-hand account is of great value, as it deals with the time of the first contact of the natives with Europeans. For various and obvious reasons many sections dealing with New Britain lack that thoroughness which modern science requires, but it is not fair to expect expert work to be accomplished by a pioneer missionary. In addition to his own information, Dr. Brown gives some valuable quotations from various missionaries and native teachers in the Bismarck Archipelago, from the Rev. W. E. Bromilow for parallels in south-east New Guinea, and from other correspondents elsewhere. An extremely good idea of savage life can be gained by the reader, and the student of folklore will find much to interest him, especially from a comparative point of view, for he has to hand two contrasted stages of evolution, not indeed of the same people, but at all events of people not too remote from each other geographically and culturally. Where there is so much to choose from, it is difficult to make selections, and all that the present writer can do is to recommend the book heartily as interesting, informing, and accurate; but there is so much more one would like to hear about! Dr. Codrington's *Melanesians* still retains the premier place amongst books dealing with the Western Pacific south of Dr. Brown's particular field, and for more precise information on mainly sociological and religious matters we await the publication of the investigations undertaken by Dr. Rivers. Would that an English student could supplement Dr. Brown's work in New Britain, working by modern methods!

Our gratitude is also due to Dr. Brown for the beauty of his illustrations, and to his publishers for their number. They add to the attractiveness of the book, and contain much valuable ethnographical information.

A. C. HADDON.