WILEY

16. Note on a MS. in the British Museum.

Author(s): N. W. Thomas

Source: *Man*, Vol. 6 (1906), pp. 26-27

Published by: Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2788533>

Accessed: 27-06-2016 07:25 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 co efficient must be high, owing to the small number of measurements within the series. But it is to be hoped that this note may induce others to study the relative variability of modern and ancient and of rural and urban peoples, and the various conditions affecting it.

CHARLES S. MYERS.

India, South.

Annandale.

The Introduction of the Blow-Gun into Southern India. By

N. Annandale, D.Sc., Indian Museum, Calcutta.

15

During a recent visit to the Ramnad estate, on the Indian shore of the Gulf of Manaar and Palk's Straits, I was surprised to hear that among the unorthodox Muhammedans known locally as "Lubbais," men not uncommonly make a livelihood by shooting pigeons with blow-guns. There has long been intercourse (which is still conducted in native boats) between these people and the ports of the Straits Settlements, and I was able, at a place called Kilakarai, to carry on a conversation in Malay with the owner of a blow-gun, which he finally sold me. According to his statement, blow-guns are bought from "*orang Bugis*" in Singapore and carried home in schooners, built and owned by Tamils, to Kilakarai and the neighbouring ports. The specimen, which I hope to describe in detail shortly in the *Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, is evidently of North Bornean workmanship, with certain alterations made in India. The tube is of palm wood, single, artificially bored, finely polished outside, and decorated, in characteristic patterns, with an inlay of tin, the mouth-piece being of the same metal. Little pellets of unbaked clay were used with it instead of darts. The local name of the blow-gun is *sənggūtān*, derived, in popular etymology, from the Tamil words *sən*, above, and *kūtā*, to stab; really, there can be little doubt, a corruption of the common Malay name of the weapon, viz., *sūmpitan*.

N. ANNANDALE.

Philippines.

Thomas.

Note on a MS. in the British Museum. By N. W. Thomas, M.A.

16

Dr. Brinton, on p. 45 of his *South American Languages*, 1892, quotes from fol. 53 of a Spanish MS. in the British Museum (Add. MSS. No. 17,631) a vocabulary which he referred to Patagonia, though he was unable to show that it had affinities with any Patagonian language. He also states that the same numerals are given in another vocabulary which, however, differs widely in some of the words, but is evidently allied to the Tsoneca tongue. This latter vocabulary is, he says, denominated Ilongote in the MS. In his *Record of Study*, published six years later, he corrected this statement by referring the "Ilongote" language to the North Pacific coast.

As a matter of fact the numerals published by Dr. Brinton do not appear in any other vocabulary in the British Museum. The second vocabulary to which he refers has no connection with the first, and neither of them is denominated "Ilongote" in the MS. On fol. 51 are notes on the Ilongotes of the Philippines and a vocabulary; on fol. 52 a vocabulary from Port Mulgrave, Alaska, which I propose to publish later; and on fol. 53 the vocabulary published by Dr. Brinton, with some errors of transcription (*gadyocoye* for *gaayocoye*, *chavin* for *chagui*, *teus* for *tkus* (?), *tasabay* for *tajabay*, *amts* for *Jamts*, and a sentence omitted) with the endorsement "a la Goleta" (according to Brinton, Soleta). The fact that the word canoe appeared in the vocabulary should have made it clear that it is unlikely to be S. American, and Goleta (near Santa Barbara, California) should have suggested the real provenience of the vocabulary, the numerals of which seem to be those of a language of Washington territory, or perhaps of Salish, though with many inaccuracies.

More remarkable still was the failure to read this plainly written "Ilongote" and to infer the East Asiatic origin of the notes from a mention of the nose-flute and the Tagalos, or from the obviously Malay character of the vocabulary.

The Ilongotes, also termed Egongotes, are a Malay race inhabiting the Pacific coast of Luzon. According to the MS., which seems to be about 100 to 120 years old, they are white in colour, bearded, and corpulent, and have European noses. They cultivate rice, tobacco, maize, &c. They cut off the head of an enemy, and dance and sing round it; they are not cannibals, but they consume certain portions of the bodies of their enemies. They are continually at war with the negritos. They are accustomed to file their teeth and drink sea water with great gusto. They do not count above five.

N. W. THOMAS.

REVIEWS.

Totemism.

Lang.

The Secret of the Totem. By Andrew Lang. London: Longmans, 1905. Pp. x + 215. 24 × 15 cm. Price 10s. 6d.

17

Mr. Lang has at length worked out his theory of totemism, and argues it in this volume with all the ingenuity and much of the wit of which he is a master. It starts from Darwin's opinion that the earliest man was, like "all male quadrupeds," extremely jealous, probably living with a number of wives in a band, and guarding them from all other men. The young males of the band would be conquered and killed or driven out. Eventually they might, perhaps, be allowed to remain, provided they took mates from outside. The various women thus taken, and their children, would be distinguished by the name of the group from whence they were obtained. These names, in the first instance nicknames given from without and afterwards adopted by the groups to which they were severally given, were usually names of animals, more rarely of other objects. The mystical quality of names is an article of every savage creed. Once adopted, the names would be held to imply some mystical connection with the objects properly called by them. Hence totemic rites and beliefs. Prominent among these is the avoidance of the totem. This would give a religious or quasi-religious sanction to the exogamy already established. Exogamy would result in the intermixture of totem-clans in every local group. But the habit of taking wives from without, having been previously established, would continue by means of hostile raids, until two strong local groups, weary of this state of things, would make a treaty of alliance and *connubium*. By such a treaty they would combine to form a single local tribe, containing two phratries, the descendants of the two original groups. If additional groups were taken into the tribe they would join one or other of the two primitive phratries. Finally, the fact that both phratries never (except among the Arunta) contain the same totem-clans is accounted for by supposing that the clans were afterwards redistributed by way of deliberate legislation, for the purpose of regulating marriages.

This rough presentation of the theory omits, of course, the preliminary and incisive criticism of rival theories, and conveys no notion of the skilful reasoning by which it is supported and the care taken to meet and overcome the various difficulties and objections. It may be said at once that for all this I have nothing but admiration. It rests, however, admittedly to a large extent on conjecture, and though supported by a wide knowledge of savage modes of thought and procedure, it must be regarded at present as simply an hypothesis—an hypothesis plausible, indeed, of great ingenuity, and, if we grant the premises, perhaps not without some probability.

But I find difficulty in granting the premises. The name of Darwin is a great name to conjure by. In his use of it Mr. Lang has omitted to observe that in the context of his quotation the great naturalist has admitted that "the indirect evidence in favour of" the former prevalence of communal marriages is strong," and that he expressly uses the term *marriage* (and consequently its correlatives, such as *wife*) in a very limited sense, implying nothing more than temporary possession, as sufficient for the work of sexual selection which he is discussing. This limitation of the term *marriage* limits the

[27]