WILEY

Review: 129

Author(s): W. Laurence H. Duckworth

Review by: W. Laurence H. Duckworth

Source: *Man*, Vol. 2 (1902), pp. 186-189

Published by: Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2839316>

Accessed: 27-06-2016 19:15 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, Wiley are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Man*

The extreme butt or end has been ornamented, but the small fragment which remains does not give sufficient to justify a restoration. I think, however, that there were two small figures with their heads towards the central part of the end. The expanded triangular areas at the base of the shaft are ornamented with concentric circles and notches. The whole represents great labour and was doubtless a sacred or highly valued possession. Its small size precludes the idea of its having been used as a weapon, and I have looked in vain for a similar object in the drawings of the Edge-Partington Album and other works.

FIG. 3.
SIDE VIEWS OF RELIC FOUND AT OREPUKI.

The only possible resemblance that I can find is to the fan handles made of whale-tooth ivory figured at Plate 25 and Plate 47, Fig. 6, of the Edge-Partington Album, as being fan handles from the Marquesas. Here we have the central shaft, the human figures at the sides, and the curved anchor-like arms with heads at the middle of the arms, *only the reversed way*. The head-dress, with the projecting spike for a feather plume, is seen on the head of a figure on a dancing stick from New Britain. (Plate 245, Fig. 2.)

I must call attention to the notched character of the subsidiary ornamentation, which corresponds exactly to the markings in the specimen figured in my *Maori Art* (Plate 56, Figs. 1, 4, 5, 6), and which I there state

to have a special character and significance of their own. The specimen figured on Plate 48 of *Maori Art* (Fig. 5) came from the same locality as the one under discussion and has a similar type of face. The small object figured in the same plate in Fig. 3 is slightly notched along the ridge and may have represented a small maskoid.

It is needless for me to remark that the Maori were not a fan-using people, nor do I know at present of any mention of fans in their songs, &c. No doubt they would fan themselves when hot and tired, but they did not develop the fan, as happened in many of the more tropical islands. If, then, this was a fan handle, it was probably an old ceremonial specimen brought in one of the old *hekes* as a sacred relic from another land.

A. HAMILTON.

REVIEWS.

Physical Anthropology.

Schwalbe.

I. *Der Neanderthalschädel*. Von G. Schwalbe, in Strassburg, I.E. Sonder-
abdruck aus 'Bonner Jahrbücher.' Heft 106.

129

II. *Die Neanderthalrasse*. Emil Schmidt. Globus. Bd. LXXX., No. 14.
10th October 1901.

III. *Neanderthalschädel und Friesenschädel*. Von G. Schwalbe, in Strassburg.
Globus. Bd. LXXXI., No. 11. 20th March 1902.

In these three essays, the subject of consideration is the fossil skeleton of the Neanderthal, viewed in the fresh light recently thrown upon its anatomical characters by the exhaustive work of Professor Schwalbe of Strasburg. In the first paper are set forth the methods adopted and the results obtained from these. The second paper consists of a brief account of Schwalbe's work by Dr. Schmidt; and in the third

essay Schwalbe controverts Virchow's recent pronouncement on the nature of the Neanderthal skeleton, and explains the grounds for his inability to accept Virchow's conclusion.

Returning to the first-mentioned paper, it will be found to consist of an elaborate investigation of the several bones of the famous skeleton which is now to be seen in the Rheinische-Antiquitäts Museum at Bonn. The most important results of this new enquiry are that the evidence for the view which ascribes the peculiar features of the skeleton to pathological causes must be deemed insufficient, and that the skull in particular (the limb bones have been investigated separately by Professor Klaatsch) presents so many features which ally it to the skulls of *Pithecanthropus erectus* and of apes, that the Neanderthal man must be considered to belong to a species different from any variety or race of men now known. Indeed, the conclusion that the Neanderthal variety is so distinct as to justify its description as a separate species is the essential point now demonstrated.

The methods employed by Schwalbe deserve a word of mention. It is to be noticed that almost without exception, the measurements selected with a view to the comparison of different specimens are applicable with perfect exactitude to the crania of apes as well as those of human beings. Several of these measurements and the indices derived from them were used by Schwalbe in his exhaustive examination of the calvaria of *Pithecanthropus erectus* (cf. *Zeitschrift für Anthropologie und Morphologie*, Bd. I.). An important point of comparison depends on the proportions which exist between the lengths of the several margins of the parietal bone of various primate mammals. In respect of the great proportionate length of the temporal margin of the parietal bone, the Neanderthal skull is found to be more closely allied to the apes (anthropoid and other) than it is to any human race now existing. At the same time the Neanderthal skull escapes a complete correspondence with those lower forms by reason of the associated length of the coronal margin of the same bone.

With the remark that a carefully elaborated method used by Dubois was applied to a new determination of the probable cranial capacity of the Neanderthal skull, the subject of methods must be passed over. An important point, brought out into prominence by the work under consideration, is the stress to be laid on observations from a single specimen as affording ground for a general statement or description of the species to which the individual belonged. The point upon which Schwalbe insists is that when a single specimen presents feature after feature approximating it to the higher apes rather than to man, there is justification for such separation of the specimen as is involved in assigning it to a separate species. This brings up the consideration of the exact term to be employed in describing the zoological group to which the Neanderthal skull is to be relegated; and it must be admitted that Schwalbe does not quite clearly or consistently state whether it is as a new genus, or as a new species merely, that he would describe the specimen (cf. p. 57). What is clear, however, is, as has been already said, that the anomalies of the skull place it far outside the range of normal modern human crania, and assign to it a place distinctly nearer *Pithecanthropus* and the anthropoid apes than to these. Consequently, Schwalbe suggests that the name *Pithecanthropus* should be applied to the zoological group to which the Neanderthal man belonged, and he is thereby constrained to employ the term *Homo pithecanthropus* to describe the new species. This entails a change of name in the case of the Javan fossil (discovered by Dubois) from *Pithecanthropus* to *Anthropopithecus*, and as the latter name has to be wrested from the Chimpanzees, Schwalbe suggests the re-employment of the name *Troglo-dytes* for these. Such a wholesale shuffling of names appears, however, quite inexpedient at the present time, and the best term descriptive of the new species would seem to be *Homo neanderthalensis*. A scheme of the very varying opinions expressed on the subject is given by Schwalbe on pp. 56 and 57 of his work.

The second essay is, as has been said, a carefully and clearly written account of the foregoing publication.

In the third paper under consideration, Schwalbe takes up the address recently delivered by Virchow at Metz, on the occasion of the annual meeting of the German Anthropological Society in that city. Virchow reiterated his opinion that the peculiar features of the Neanderthal skull do not exclude it from association in the same species with other human beings. Schwalbe examines Virchow's arguments most critically, and is able to point out that even this great authority had not taken the opportunity of informing himself correctly on the subject of various anatomical points on which stress was laid. Thus Schwalbe refutes, with apparent success, Virchow's contention that pathological causes can be invoked to explain the extraordinary combination of anomalies in the Neanderthal skull. He then discusses again the question of the value of the differences between the Neanderthal and other human crania, in so far as they may justify separation to the extent of a genus or a species only, and, as already stated, concludes that the differences have a specific value. Finally, comes the most important part of this third paper, viz., the demonstration that several skulls claimed as "neanderthaloid," notably certain Frisian skulls thought by Virchow to be modern representatives of the Neanderthal type, do not stand the test of a minute examination, and are only superficially allied in appearance to the type specimen.

It should be finally mentioned that the question of the geological age of the strata in which the Neanderthal skeleton was discovered has been further investigated by Koenen, with the result that their antiquity is now considered as very considerable as regards the occurrence of human remains, it having been suggested that the formation is a tertiary one (*see* No. I., p. 63, *Nachtrag*).

The foregoing essays and the questions incidentally discussed give rise to the following reflections amongst others. In the first place, as concerns the character of the work, one is impressed by the precision and accuracy of the methods employed, with consequent freedom from ambiguity in the indications obtained. As one result, among many, it is very clearly shown that in craniology, as in other matters, things are occasionally not what they seem; and that the claim of such skulls as that from Borreby, that of Kai-Lykke, &c., to a resemblance with the Neanderthal skull, rests on the slender basis of an outward similarity in the common possession of a retreating forehead, a basis which will not stand the test of a searching examination. The net result of the work of Dubois on the calvaria of *Pithecanthropus erectus*, work which was the precursor in point of time, which anticipated in principle this later work of Schwalbe, and which must be associated with it, is a great gain to physical anthropology in respect of precision of method.

Secondly and lastly, one cannot avoid a special reference to the work of the eminent anthropologist so lately deceased, Professor Virchow. Keenly interested in physical anthropology, Professor Virchow had investigated the Neanderthal skeleton more than thirty years ago. The difference of opinion as to the nature of the Neanderthal man seems to emphasize the whole difference which of late years placed Virchow with a limited following, in contrast with, if not in opposition to, the majority of anthropologists in Germany. To me, Virchow's position appears to have been essentially that of an agnostic with regard to the origin of species in general and of man in particular. The reason for his extreme caution in this matter could only be furnished by one intimately acquainted with Virchow's character and trend of mind. But it has had as its result, that Virchow's contributions to physical anthropology have been made rather through the pupils he has inspired than by his own work. Descriptions he has left us in immense quantity, but for so vast an amount of labour there is peculiarly little outcome in the way of the conception, formulation, or corroboration of a general theory of the relation of man to other animals or the inter-relationships of various human races. The

work of Schwalbe differs essentially from that of Virchow in that through it all runs a spirit of confidence in the guiding principle of evolution of form. One cannot but feel that the satisfaction experienced in reading such work is due to the stability conferred by the presence of such confidence, while at the same time, the several results present such concordance that one's reliance on the trustworthiness of the principle is proportionately enhanced.

W. LAURENCE H. DUCKWORTH.

New Guinea.

Schmidt.

The Languages of North-East New Guinea.

1. *Ein Beitrag zur Kenntniss der Valman-Sprache*; auf Grund der vor P. 130
Vormann, S.V.D. gemachten Aufzeichnungen, bearbeitet von P. W. Schmidt, S.V.D.
Zeitschrift für Ethnologie. Berlin, 1900. pp. 87-104.

2. *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Valman-Sprache*. A. *Texte* von P. N. Spölgén,
S.V.D. B. *Beiträge zur Grammatik* von P. W. Schmidt, S.V.D. (*Wiener Zeitschrift*
für die Kunde des Morgenlandes. Bd. XV. 1901. pp. 335-366.)

These two papers refer to the language spoken by the natives of Berlinhafen on the north coast of Kaiser-Wilhelmsland. The Valman, called Leming by their neighbours, are the occupants of the coast of the mainland. On the neighbouring islands of Tumleo (Tamara), Saliu (Saleo), and Ali a different language is spoken. The first paper consists of a notice by P. W. Schmidt of the Valman language, based on the notes of P. Vormann, a missionary of the Societas Verbi Dei at Berlinhafen. The second is a series of descriptions of scenes and occupations collected by P. Spölgén, the successor of P. Vormann. From these P. Schmidt has extended and corrected his former notice. Together they form a most valuable contribution to our knowledge of the linguistics of this part of New Guinea, a subject which Professor Schmidt is making peculiarly his own.

The Valman language belongs to that division of the New Guinea languages for which the present writer in the *Journal of the Anthropological Institute* for 1895 suggested the term Papuan: that is to say, it entirely differs in structure from the languages of the Melanesian Islands and has a distinct vocabulary. With the Kai (or Katedong) language at Finschhafen, and the Bogadjim of Astrolabe Bay, it shows that the languages of German New Guinea exhibit the same phenomena as those of the British region, the islands and some districts on the coast using Melanesian forms of speech, whilst in the greater part of the region, and especially inland, non-Melanesian languages are found.

On the island of Tumleo, opposite the Valman district, a Melanesian language is spoken, and from this the Valman has borrowed a few words, but otherwise the Melanesian has had no influence. The words borrowed from Tumleo are such as we might expect a non-seafaring people to borrow from islanders. Examples are: *vago*, boat (Tumleo, *vaka*); *vul*, pig (Tumleo, *pul*); *vesi*, oar (Tumleo, *vesi*); *sam*, outrigger (Tumleo, *suam*). These are the common Melanesian words: *vaka*, *polo*, *vose* and *sama*.

With regard to grammar it is not clear whether the noun, as in some of the Papuan languages of British New Guinea, is declined by suffixes. Prepositions are not used and postpositions indicate the relationship of things, as *nagol-peni*, house-in, *nupol raninke*, tree-round. The genitive case is only indicated by position. If denoting possession it precedes the governing word, but if qualifying, follows; *nupol mäten* (tree fruit), tree's fruit, *vul notu* (water coconut), coconut water. The nominative precedes, the accusative follows, the verb; but neither have any distinctive form.

The possessive of pronouns is shown by affixing the ordinary forms to a stem *vo* (modified to *vu*, *vi*). For the separate personal pronouns see examples of verbs:

Sing. 1st Pers. *vikhúm*; 2. *vítí*; 3. (masc.) *vónóm*; (fem.) *vüru*.

Plur. 1. *vókhin*; 2. *vítim*; 3. *vírí*.

[189]