Reviews

A. Lang , Alfred Nutt , W. Crooke , R. R. Marett & A. Werner

To cite this article: A. Lang , Alfred Nutt , W. Crooke , R. R. Marett & A. Werner (1908) Reviews, Folklore, 19:2, 236-256, DOI: [10.1080/0015587X.1908.9719828](https://doi.org/10.1080/0015587X.1908.9719828)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0015587X.1908.9719828>

Published online: 14 Feb 2012.

Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)

Article views: 1

View related articles [↗](#)

REVIEWS.

THE CULTS OF THE GREEK STATES. By L. R. FARNELL, D.Litt.
Vols. iii. and iv. With Illustrations. Clarendon Press.
32s. net.

WE have already reviewed in these pages the first two volumes of Dr. Farnell's great work ; and the greatness of his task may be gauged by the long interval of time that has passed since the first two came out. No one who has not himself tried some such task can know how long it takes to prepare for it : of the hundreds and thousands of articles and monuments to be examined, weighed, their chaff left and their grain taken ; how much work leaves no trace, since it discloses nothing good or nothing new. We are not surprised at the delay. One or two advantages, indeed, come from delay. Ten years ago, some theories were predominant that have now fallen into the background ; this is especially the case with ethnology and folk-lore, where some notable advance has been made. For one thing, totemism has fallen into the background, owing to the uncertainty caused by new discoveries in Australia. Dr. Farnell never was much inclined to give weight to this and other problems of savagery, and no doubt he feels that his caution was justified. Then, again, the Cretan discoveries have thrown a new light on the beginnings of Greek religion : for whether the Cretans were Greeks or not, their religion certainly bears a direct relation to that of historic Greece. Dr. Farnell has taken

account of Crete, but we think he was not well advised, in a book so thorough as this, in not basing his work on a study of savagery. In one matter he has come to see this. It seems that whatever may have been the origin of the state cults of Greece, the people paid their chief worship to local heroes and ancestral divinities. Now hero-worship was no part of Dr. Farnell's original plan; but he has found himself compelled to include it, his investigation having shown him its importance. Yet the heroes do not take the place that is theirs historically, first in the work; they are to come last, not formally as part of this work, but separated. We are very glad they are to come, and we will not quarrel with their place so long as we get them.

It is not only in the plan of the work that we miss the element of savage belief and practice: any of the parts would have been the better for it. Not only is this the case with strange survivals such as the horse-headed Demeter, or the Mouse Apollo, but it would serve to throw light on the Mysteries. Not that Dr. Farnell omits this side of the subject entirely: only he uses it half apologetically in illustration, not in explanation. No doubt to give it due attention would largely increase the bulk of the book; but we do not think that was or should be the determining principle. Perhaps we may see in the Dionysos volume fuller use made of the savage myth-dances, which in two cases at least—Peru and Polynesia—were the starting point for the drama. We must however admit that Dr. Farnell gave us no excuse to expect this comparative treatment; and regarding the book as a collection of facts, marshalled and ordered, belonging to a period limited in time, it is of the highest value. Dr. Farnell shows always a sane judgment; he is neither confused by the complexity of his subject, nor apt to accept the latest new theory, and his resources are so wide as to be practically complete. The collection of the authorities cited in appendices by themselves has its drawbacks, but it has also a great advantage, in that the student may without trouble get a general conspectus of the evidence. We must add however, that the method of marking references is very far from convenient; the small figures and letters easily escape the eye,

and in the appendices they are not arranged, as they should be, so as to be easily seen, in the margin say or in thicker type.

The subjects of these volumes are Ge, Demeter and Kore, Hades-Plouton, the Mother of the Gods, Poseidon, and Apollo.

The chapter on Ge introduces us to oracles and prophetic shrines, another point in which Greece comes into contact with prehistoric beliefs and practices. Here we have religious intoxication, the ceremony of oath-taking, human sacrifice, the vegetative dietry, and a number of other problems on which light is thrown by anthropology. Dr. Farnell's treatment will be useful to anthropologists as illustrating their own problems, but cannot be said to be complete from their point of view. We have not noticed any mention of the rite of striking the earth to appeal to Ge or the powers below, which appears in a few passages of Homer, Aeschylus, and Bacchylides. Demeter also has much in common with earlier cults, although to the Greeks she was rather a civilizer than a goddess of divine powers. A number of very obscure and complicated enquiries belong to her: for instance, the Skirophoria, the Thesmophoria, the Mysteries. Dr. Farnell does not subscribe to Miss Harrison's explanation of the title Thesmophoros, but regards the *θεσμοί* as the institutions of ordered life. In the Phigaleian story he sees Demeter as an earth-goddess of the dark underworld; he thinks the horse-type was due to some admixture, by which Demeter-Erinys took over the horse from a cult of Poseidon. Hades occupies only a small part of the volume; and the Mother of the Gods, and Rhea-Cybele, whom we might expect to have found near the beginning of the work, would have been almost equally unimportant but for the discoveries in Crete. We do not think that Dr. Farnell yet realizes the place of the female divinity in Greek religion: the more that is discovered, the greater her importance seems to be. It would have been worth while to consider the Mother of the Gods in connexion with Artemis at least, and to group the female divinities if possible together. We cannot help believing that these, along with the heroes, are the foundation of Greek

religion and cult. But perhaps when his work is finished, Dr. Farnell will consider this and other questions of principle. It is strange that this chapter does not include a plate of the remarkable snake-goddess, (or priestess in character-costume), found in Crete.

The manifold character of Poseidon's cult is recognized by Dr. Farnell; but he seems to be a little prejudiced, as most people are, by finding the god as master of the sea in the earliest literature. To our mind, this can hardly have been his original power. He does not even seem to us to have been originally a fresh-water god, developing into a sea-god by the accident of migration. Taking into account not only his association with the horse, and perhaps with war (for was not the trident a war-weapon?) his ancient cult in Corinth points to a more comprehensive power than this. There we see him appealed to by warriors and traders as others might appeal to Athena elsewhere, or to Apollo; there is no hint in the actual remains, the *πίνakes*, of a special sea-function. His name may be connected with *πόσις, ποτόν, ποταμός*, but it may be connected with *πόσις, δεσπότης*. The complicated question of Poseidon's place in Attica is skilfully analyzed at the end of the chapter. Dr. Farnell suggests that Poseidon is a late-comer, brought from Troizen with some Ionic immigration, and it must be admitted that he gives reasons for his view; he holds also that Poseidon is not identical with Erechtheus, and that Aigeus may be a name for Poseidon derived from the town of Aigai, which was "an asylum for immigrant cults." We do not feel satisfied, however, that the last word has been said on Poseidon; in particular, no one seems to have noticed how old-fashioned people in Aristophanes swear by him, and the conservatism of the countryman is well known. A good deal of suspicion, in our opinion, must also rest on a theory that assumes Poseidon's original function to have been that of a water-god.

The worship of Apollo furnishes important evidence as to early Greek ethnology. Dr. Farnell sees his earliest home in the North, whence down to historic times a religious pilgrimage used to take place, certain messengers bringing offerings of cereals to Delos. These seem first to have been brought to

Delphi, whence Apollo was long before he got a seat in Delos. The messengers came from the Hyperboreans, and were called according to Herodotus *περφερέες*; Dr. Farnell accepts Ahrens's brilliant explanation of *ὑπερβόρειοι* as a variant of *ὑπερβερέται*, which he considers to be a North Greek form of *ὑπερφερέται*, the 'porters' who carried the offerings. Apollo was originally a pastoral or woodland god, in which last capacity he was the Wolf-god *Λύκειος* (Dr. Farnell rightly insists that this adjective cannot come from *λύκη*, which would make *λυκαῖος*), and the title gave its name to Lycia, which probably had another native name. Here Dr. Farnell comes closest to the anthropological school, in admitting an animal god, to whom his name-animal was occasionally sacrificed, into the Greek pantheon. The connexion of Apollo is close also with vegetation and harvest; but his association with the sun is not original but comparatively late. In the end, this god becomes one of the most instructive to the student, as embodying conceptions of high intellectual and moral value.

We have only been able briefly to touch on a few points of interest in these volumes, packed so close with well-ordered evidence and criticism. We have indicated where it seems their plan might have been modified with advantage; but taking them as they stand, they are indispensable to the student, who will nowhere else find so good an account of the subject within its own limits. For those who disagree with this or that conclusion, even for those who may think them wrongly conceived as a whole, their value as a storehouse of learning is very great. They present in convenient form the best results of the study of Greek religion, so far as those studies can be confined within the Greek sphere.

FOLK-LORE AS AN HISTORICAL SCIENCE. By GEORGE LAURENCE GOMME. Methuen & Co., 1908.

THE conductors of *Folk-Lore*, not long ago, expressed a decided opinion against authors who reply to criticism. I have been doing so all my days, in matters of folklore, history, and so on, and venture to think that discussion clears matters up, and that criticism is really a form of collaboration. In the case of Mr. Gomme's *Folk-Lore as an Historical Science*, this critic, at least, would welcome a reply, as he feels by no means certain that he understands exactly what his author would be at. Mr. Gomme seems to think that history and historians are behaving unkindly to their little sister, folklore; yet, as a writer of history, I feel unconvinced of this sin. Mr. Gomme's object in this work is to state "the claims of Folk Lore as a definite section of historical material," and "to shew how pure history is intimately related to folklore at many stages, and yet how this relationship has been ignored by both historian and folk-lorist," (p. xii).

I really do not see that the relation can be ignored by the modern historian. Part of his business is to clear the tower of historic masonry from the picturesque but pernicious ivy of folklore, that is, of erroneous popular and family tradition. For example, there is a place in Scotland called Kinedward, and folklore steps in with her tale of King Edward I, which is only a *Volksetymologie*. The historian cannot ignore this folklore, but he chops at its root, and so he does in hundreds of cases in which family and popular tradition can be proved by documentary evidence to be nonsense. In the meantime no historian denies,—to my knowledge,—that folklore contains valid evidence as to the *prehistoric* condition of mind and the *prehistoric* institutions in the past dwellers in these islands for example; and I have known traditions of certain historical events to be very fairly accurate in parts of Scotland. If any historian denies the value of tradition in proto-history, he may fight his own battle. On the other hand, when tradition ascribes to Cromwell a camp of the Early Iron Age, then folklore has

become a very erroneous source. These facts are not ignored by any competent historian or folk-lorist. It may well be that what is now folklore was originally a suggestion of an antiquary: thus Sir Walter Scott, I think, started an erratic theory of the inscribed stone in Yarrow which may still hang about in that valley. If so, it is folklore now, and has been historically refuted.

Mr. Gomme argues that tradition sometimes "reveals facts which history has either hopelessly neglected or misinterpreted" (p. 13). In that case the historian will gratefully acknowledge his debt to tradition, though I do not see how the fact revealed by tradition can ever be proved correct, except by historical methods. Mr. Gomme devotes much space to an example, the old story of a country fellow who dreamed that he should get good news at London bridge, went thither, and there met somebody who told him that he, the Londoner, had dreamed that there was a treasure in the country fellow's garden. Mr. Gomme would much oblige me, and the science of Psychical Research, if he went on to prove that this tradition has an evidential basis. But he does not do that! He traces the story in documents from January, 1652-53, and proves that the village of the country fellow is variously localised, and that there was once a window with a picture of a pedlar and a dog in the church at Lambeth, while there is a wooden figure of ditto at Swaffham; the locality of the country fellow in one variant. The story may have attached itself to these figures, just as the figure sometimes suggests the story.

In the little and very ugly town of Douglas, the people tell you that Claverhouse cut off the ears of a local Covenanter with a pair of scissors. They prove this by showing you a stone in the wall of a house, on which are incised two letters,—say J. R.—a pair of tailor's scissors, and a tailor's goose. It was common for tradesmen, having no armorial bearings, to engrave their initials, and their hammer, shuttle, scissors, or whatever was the chief tool of their craft, on a stone over the door of their houses, or on the wall. The shears have suggested to Douglas folklore the myth of Claverhouse; the tailor's goose is left out of account.

As a historian I did not ignore folklore, but hunted for the crop-eared martyr in Wodrow's copious martyrology. His name did not appear among the hundreds of sufferers, and, duly considering the goose, I relegated the tale to the "fictional," in Mr. Gomme's phrase.

To return to the story of the dream, it occurs, with London bridge, in a Breton *märchen* still current, and in the *Heimskringla*. Here a cripple dreams that he will be cured at the church of St. Olaf in London. The man crossed London bridge on his way to St. Olaf's church, he met a man (the saint) who led him thither, and who went away while the miracle came off. Very well, there was a bridge in London when the sagaman heard that story. Plenty of other places, from Cairo to Holland, are given in tales as the place of the central incident.

But Mr. Gomme argues that the story of London bridge existed "before the separation of the Breton folk from their Celtic brethren in Britain." I cannot possibly accept this opinion as proved, because Breton folk, often at peace with English fishermen while France and England were at war, kept on dealing with English fishermen, and could pick up the English *märchen*. Naturally the Northmen knew all about London bridge, and had every opportunity of picking up the *märchen*, though, in the *Heimskringla* the story became hagiographic. No more is needed. We have nothing to do here with the Bretons before their migration from Britain, or with human sacrifices accompanying the building of a bridge, or with "the mythical trappings of Arthur," whether he was trapped on London bridge, like Jean sans Peur on the bridge of Montereau, or not. The treasure was not under London bridge, though the Thames bed is full of antiques of many ages. I do not see that the bridge story adds an item to history.

Mr. Gomme gives a case in which a local tradition of a buried treasure was verified by an accidental discovery. Perhaps in this case the tradition was genuine, but the country is full of treasure legends which are not verified. In the Mold ghost-story of a spectre in golden armour, excavation did not find man's armour, but the golden trappings of a horse, as the learned declare. The ghost called the *Dhuine Mor*, at Ballachulish, has been carefully observed by the late Mr. MacInnes, who correctly described the

armour of a Viking invader, and I believe that relics of a battle between Vikings and natives have been found on the spot. But Mr. MacInnes was no archaeologist, though the armour of the *Dhuine Mor* was correctly described by him from careful study of the ghost. In this case tradition was not the source of the knowledge of the percipient. There were two percipients, but the other was alarmed and showed no scientific curiosity.

Mr. Gomme calls on psychical research to hand supranormal phenomena over to folklore, but I cannot see that folklorists make anything of them. Folklore does not cross-examine the witnesses and compare adjacent evidence tending towards proof or disproof of the phenomena. Yet this appears to be the only scientific method of dealing with such things.

In other cases where *märchen* contain vestiges of institutions, the fact has not been "ignored"; thirty years ago I was busy in tracing these vestiges, and the knowledge has been *vulgarisè* in most treatises on folklore. For example I gave the Frog Prince story, and so does Mr. Gomme, but he says "Frog Prince=totem" "It mout be so, or it moutn't," quoth Uncle Remus. Again, a prince coming from a foreign country to win a bride, makes "an exogamous marriage." Now in Australia you make an exogamous marriage with a neighbour in your own tribal territory (save in one or two cases as in that of the Kurnai, where you go to a remote part of tribal territory), but it was not a case of exogamy when his Majesty married a "Sea-King's daughter from over the sea." We must not be in such a hurry to find exogamy! Nausicaa wanted to marry a foreign prince, the Ithacan, but it was legal, and desirable, that she should wed a Phaeacian of her own island.

I really do not quite see what novelty Mr. Gomme thinks he is introducing. If he makes exogamy and foreign marriage co-extensive, or thinks that a case of foreign marriage or a dozen cases, are necessarily due to the exogamous prohibition, then the information is rather novel than convincing.

When Mr. Gomme finds fault with historians for demurring to Greek and Roman accounts of the low savage estate of the natives of these islands in the "La Tène" or "Late Celtic" period, does he mean that our Graeco-Roman books are folklore? He says "the terms 'savage' and 'barbarism' indulged in by the Greek and

Roman writers, cannot be rejected by modern historians simply because they are too harsh." "Barbarism" is not harsh; and "savage" must be rejected because archaeology proves beyond possibility of refutation, that, in England, Ireland, and Scotland, the people of Caesar's time were not savages.

The material civilisation and art of the La Tène iron age of late Celtic ornament, arts, and crafts, were no more savage than the art and civilisation of Late Minoan Greece. As to the alleged "community of women," if it existed, the fact was quite out of harmony with the material culture, and quite out of harmony with the traditional evidence (which Mr. Gomme should respect), of the *Tain Bo Cualgne*, though Queen Maive "wur a bad 'un,—she," as the Northern Farmer says. Mr. Gomme (p. 116) plucks a crow with me about all this, citing my *History of Scotland*, vol. i. pp. 3-5. I have read vol. i. pp. 3-5, and to these pages I refer the curious inquirer. As it happens, I did not say (or "declare roundly"), that "to found theories upon such evidence as archaeology provides is the province of another science, not of history." I said, "to discuss the race and language of the tribes who incised on the rocks the universal hieroglyphs of early man; who used the polished neolithic weapons; to found theories on the shapes of skulls unearthed from barrows, is the province of another science, not of history." History is not craniology, and history is not philology *bombinans in vacuo*, studying a language of which we have not a single word on record.

The language of the people who inscribed Scottish rocks with Chiriqui and Arunta decorative designs is not known to us. We cannot prove that they were men of Celtic speech, and, if they were not, they have left no linguistic traces except perhaps in some mysterious monosyllabic river names such as the Spanish Ter and the English Ver and Cher. How can history criticise such names, or read the Cretan inscriptions, not in Greek, but written in Greek characters?

History is primarily concerned with contemporary documents. When these do not exist, she strains her eyes with the aid of old books of history, and gratefully accepts what help she can receive from philology, archaeology, anthropology, folklore, sphragistic

heraldry, and so forth. But what Caesar says is evidence (not folklore evidence), and, if he were well informed, then the social conditions of the people of these islands, in his time, were much out of harmony with their degree of material culture. I do not discuss Mr. Gomme's theory of kinlessness and totemism among the Semangs, because Mr. Skeat, as he kindly informs me, could find no certain vestige of totemism in that people, and his book proves that they recognise kinship. I do not follow Mr. Gomme into the relations of race and folklore, because about race we know, at least I know, very little; and our own, and Greek, and ancient Egyptian folklore contain many elements common to Arunta or Dieri folklore. Folklore seems, on the whole, universally human. I do not quite understand what Mr. Gomme means when he says that "the Teutonic people, and their Celtic predecessors, came to Britain with a tribal, not an agricultural constitution." Does he mean that these tribes had no agriculture in their old homes? That would be hard to prove, and if they had agriculture it must have been under rules, "an agricultural constitution." Is there any reason why a tribal people should not occupy villages? The word "tribal" is very vague, but the tribes of the north-west coast of America live in villages, and the Celts and Teutons may have done so too. The people of Attica were tribal, living in villages, before the synoecismus. I really do not see that the fact can only be explained by ethnological differences, and perhaps Mr. Gomme does not mean that. All my observations must be taken with the reserve that I may have failed to interpret his meaning with precision.

A. LANG.

THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE. Vol. i.
FROM THE BEGINNINGS TO THE CYCLES OF ROMANCE.
Cambridge : University Press, 1907.

'THE history of a nation's literature cannot be divorced from some consideration of its political, religious, and social life, including its manners as well as its phases of sentiment and fashion, its trivial thoughts no less than its serious moments.' I read this sentence in the preface of the new *History of English Literature*, and, so far as it goes, I find the principle therein enunciated good. True, as a folk-lorist, I should have liked some recognition of those obscurer, more instinctive, more primitive manifestations of the racial or, as I should prefer to say (the term racial being prejudiced by its pseudo-scientific associations), national, consciousness which are in so large a measure the objects of our study. Still here the principle is asserted, that literature must be regarded, not as a fortuitous succession of individual manifestations of talent unrelated to each other and to the life out of which they spring but as the revelation of the intellectual, aesthetic and spiritual ethos of a community, which ethos has been in the past and is in the present dependent upon conditions which we can analyse and determine. As a folk-lorist my concern with the present volume is chiefly to consider in how far it has carried out this principle, and I necessarily disregard nearly all that most reviewers, dealing with it from the standpoint of literary history as commonly understood, make the subject of their comments. I should, however, like to express my appreciation of the utility of the work; it contains a great deal of information accurate in itself and lucidly presented; its merits in this respect are such as to entitle it to a place on the shelves of all students of our early national past; a reprint will doubtless be called for before long and in anticipation thereof a few remarks upon its plan, and upon the way in which that plan has been carried out, may be thought not out of place.

The plan is that of the *Cambridge Modern History*: special sections of the subject are dealt with by different writers, the various contributions being dovetailed into and more or less harmonised

with each other by the editor, who provides birds'-eye surveys of the main periods and tendencies. I cannot but think the plan a mistaken one. It necessarily leads to overlapping and duplication, serious drawbacks when the literature of well-nigh a thousand years has to be surveyed in 400 pages. A flagrant instance is supplied by chapters ix. and x: Latin Chroniclers from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries, by Prof. Jones; Latin Literature of England from John of Salisbury to Richard of Bury, by Dr. Sanday. It would have been far better to allow Prof. Jones to treat the whole of this literature, upon which, despite the variations of subject matter, the form and historic antecedents of the language impress a character that distinguishes it from work in the vernacular, whether French or English. The worst fault is undoubtedly the assignation of the Metrical Romances (1200-1500) to two writers, Prof. Ker and Mr. J. W. H. Atkins. It is of less consequence that the two not infrequently differ as that on the whole they go over the same ground without either subjecting it to that exhaustive and penetrating survey we have a right to expect. Thus despite the really excellent 'linking and harmonising' chapters of the editor, Mr. Waller, the reader obtains no clear broad impressions; he must himself in large measure supply his own synthesis, and he is handicapped by the fact that the materials therefor reach him in vertical instead of horizontal sections and thereby hinder a clear insight into the evolution of the literature as a whole.

The capital error of the book remains to be noticed; it is one which defies the excellent principle I quoted at the outset of this review, and one of which the disastrous nature is especially apparent to the folklorist reader. An attempt has been made to treat in one volume two markedly distinct periods in the growth of our national literature, and thereby facts, which were to exercise a most potent influence upon the whole subsequent development of English letters, are slurred over or distorted. In a period of 350 years, 700-1050 in round figures, English literature exhibits a development which it is comparatively easy to trace, characteristics which are comparatively simple and homogeneous, a formal body and an animating spirit which are obviously the product and expression of a comparatively harmonious and genuinely national

conception of life and its problems. The same, bearing in mind the infinitely greater complexities of modern life and the infinite amount of variation thereby engendered, may be said of English literature from the days of Chaucer to our own time. But the intervening period is one to which no parallel can be adduced in the story of any other great literature. For over a century the nation is dumb, if we take account solely of utterance in the national tongue; for another century it is slowly and painfully asserting first its right to exist and then to dominate, and when at length the long struggle is over, and Englishmen once more express their highest thoughts and boldest imaginings in English, a tremendous change is apparent: vocabulary, syntax, metre, literary convention whether in prose or verse, nature and choice of subject matter, all have altered, and altered so profoundly that at first sight there seems to be no connection between the two bodies of literature. And yet the writer of the fourteenth or the twentieth century is an Englishman just as was he of the eighth or tenth; and yet throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries when English was dumb or content to take a humble place, Englishmen were thinking and fancying, but it was in Latin or in French that they shaped their thoughts and fancies.

Periods so markedly dissimilar as 700-1050, and 1050-1300, required entirely different modes of treatment to do justice to the problems they present. Moreover an unique opportunity was lost of exemplifying the principles set out by the editors in their preface. Pre-Conquest English literature is compact, limited in extent, clearly defined for the most part as regards chronology and locality; the people which produced it is small and fairly homogeneous, possessors of a culture of which the constituent elements are known with singular precision and the growth of which under well-known influences can be clearly traced. In no other section of the world's literature are the elements of the standing problem of all literature—its true relation to the envioning life—so simple and so manageable. All these considerations called emphatically for a separate treatment of this period, and for recognition of the fact that here, if anywhere, the ideal study of literature as expression of a special form of life could be inaugurated.

It remains to say a few words about those sections which more specially concern the folk-lorist. Unfortunately it must be frankly stated that, with one exception, they are the weakest of the book. Mr. Chadwick's chapter on the Pre-Christian element of early English is meagre and inadequate in the extreme, a mere dry-as-dust enumeration of facts which neither sets out the fascinating problems involved nor makes any essay to solve them. Moreover it is exasperating to find a portion of the bare twenty pages allowed to this complicated subject wasted upon such extreme examples of German misapplied ingenuity as Kögel's hypothesis that 'epic poetry originated among the Goths, and that its appearance in the North-West of Europe is to be traced to the harpist who was sent to Clovis by Theodoric.' The couple of pages given to *Widsith* seems to me an exemplary instance of failure to apprehend the real issues involved, and of baffling statements of the writer's own views. Of the two chapters devoted to the Metrical Romances I have already spoken. As in all Prof. Ker's writing we find much that is suggestive and illuminating, especially in his too brief remarks on the parallelism of certain traits in English and North Teutonic treatment of romance during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. But from his command of all the literature to be considered, and from his fine and sound critical gift, we had a right to expect far more. Is it too much to hope that we may one day receive from him that account of romance in the vernacular as it developed in the period 1050-1250 which he is better qualified than any living scholar to furnish? Such an account must, I think he would agree with me, emphasise the underlying unity of all the varied manifestations of the romantic spirit and their mutual relation to definite common historical and psychological causes.

Professor Lewis-Jones' account of the Arthurian literature may be heartily commended as a sane and scholarly statement of the facts, which should be corrective of the idle talk upon the subject that is finding its way in ever-increasing measure into print. But perhaps he is a little too sane. A touch of the *arwen*, under the influence of which the Principal of Jesus' studies are mostly prosecuted, might not be out of place. In entering this

enchanted forest of Arthur-land one must not mind taking one's scientific life in one's hands.

I am unable, as will be seen, to regard the *Cambridge History* as more than a stepping-stone to that adequate account of what the men and women of our race have achieved in the realm of fancy and thought. None the less does it mark a distinct stage in the progress towards the realisation of such an ideal.

ALFRED NUTT.

COMPENDIUM OF THE PUNJAB CUSTOMARY LAW. By H. A. ROSE. Lahore, 1907.

LAW, as is well known, assumes two forms in India: first, the priestly legislation, embodied in the Institutes of Manu and other authorities to be found in Max Müller's series of Sacred Books; secondly, a body of local or tribal usages, which are sometimes complementary to, and sometimes at variance with, the Brahmanical codes. It is peculiar to the Punjab that the tribal organisation is very stable, and this fact has saved Hinduism from destruction by the forces of militant Islam. For many years the Local Government has devoted much attention to the tabulation of this local or tribal usage, and at each periodical revision of the land revenue opportunity has been taken to collect from the people themselves a record of their customs in connection with marriage, the devolution of property, and other matters connected with their social life. These materials, which are of great bulk and complexity, Mr. H. A. Rose has now codified with admirable care and precision. The result is a collection of primitive tribal usage which is probably unique. The chapter on marriage throws fresh light on questions such as endogamy, betrothal, and polyandry. That on inheritance exhibits the various methods by which the wisdom of the grey-beards has adapted a system of property to the varying needs of the polygamous family. Two curious facts result from this codification:

first, that customary law is determined mainly by religion; secondarily, by locality; and that so far as it is a matter of caste or tribe at all, it is more generally a question of social status rather than one peculiar to the particular caste or tribe concerned. Mr. Rose's pamphlet must be taken into account by all students of the subjects with which it attempts to deal.

W. CROOKE.

KAFIR SOCIALISM AND THE DAWN OF INDIVIDUALISM: AN
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE NATIVE PROBLEM.
By DUDLEY KIDD. London: A. & C. Black, 1908.

THIS book, addressed as it is to the politician and imperialist rather than to the anthropologist as such, may seem at first sight hardly to call for review in these pages. On such a topic, however, as the treatment due to the black man from the white, one can trust the sympathetic author of *The Essential Kafir* and *Savage Childhood* to "think black," with enlightening results even for the pure theorist. Besides, pure theory cannot turn its back on practical reform, when the latter puts a respect for pure theory in the forefront of its demand. "Before we can understand the bearings of the Native Problem," says Mr. Kidd, "we must study native customs and thought." He consequently moves (and, I am sure, the Folk-lore Society will be only too glad to second), that a Bureau of Ethnology be established at the Cape forthwith. Let some millionaire endow it, and endow it handsomely, he suggests. Is this too much to hope? A South African magnate has recently endowed Colonial History at Oxford on the most magnificent scale. May we not, then, expect that a similar patriotism, at once local and truly imperial, will suffice to equip the dominant race in South Africa with the means of removing once for all those misunderstandings with the Kafirs which the best will in the world cannot prevent, if unaccompanied by insight

into the dark places of the Kafir mind. Mr. Kidd's plea is the better timed inasmuch as there is some chance of seeing a central Bureau of Ethnology founded in this country in the not distant future. Such an institution could not, of course, take the place of a local Bureau. On the contrary, it must help to call into existence many such ethnological laboratories throughout the Empire, thereafter co-ordinating their labours, and enabling both theoretic results and maxims of applied Ethnology to be interchanged between one native-ruling portion of the British world and the other. Doubtless the Cape has done not a little for anthropology already, and certain "blue-books" have proved of the highest value in a science in which there is so much that must be read and yet so little that is worth reading twice. Mr. Kidd, however, is bent on showing that the fringe of the subject of Kafir psychology and sociology has hardly been touched so far; and he says enough to assure the man in the street of what the man in the study has been all along aware, namely, that the most fundamental notions of government and justice entertained by the Kafir are at present unwittingly violated by our most well-meant endeavours to improve his condition.

Insisting as he does that the essential need is for more light, Mr. Kidd does not spoil his case by indulging in premature solutions of the native problem. He views with a certain regret, it is true, the gradual break-up of the "socialistic"—it might, perhaps, be termed more safely the "patriarchal"—regime under which the black man loyally submitted to the social will as embodied in the chief. But he sees that we cannot, in the interest alike of civilisation and of our own security, allow the chief to make war, or to superintend the 'smelling-out' of witches. On the other hand, to inculcate anything approaching a like respect for the substituted authority is impossible so long as we do not try to meet the Kafir's ancestral modes of thought half-way. For the rest, to awaken a sense of individualism in the natives is shown to be the inevitable result of educating them on our lines; and Mr. Kidd is not opposed to this, so long as in the process we do not ruin the finer traits of Kafir character, which he proves to be still there, but, on the contrary, fasten on them and develop them to their utmost. How to do this successfully is for him the native

problem in a nutshell. An interesting chapter is appended on what might be called Kafir eugenics, and it may at all events be said that Mr. Kidd's findings are in accordance with the latest teaching of science on the highly obscure subject of heredity.

R. R. MARETT.

SOME FOLK-LORE STORIES AND SONGS IN CHINYANJA. With English Translation and Notes. By R. SUTHERLAND RATTRAY, Member of the African Lakes Corporation, Ltd., British Central Africa. With Preface by the REV. ALEXANDER HETHERWICK, D.D. London: S.P.C.K.

THE existence of totemism among the Anyanja has long been known; but there was in some quarters an impression that the institutions connected with it had so far become obsolete as to be capable of throwing very little light on the subject. This may to a certain extent be the case with the Anyanja of the Shire Highlands and the river valley—though less from contact with Europeans than because the tribes have been displaced and broken up by the irruption of the Yaos and the domination of the Makololo. Even here, however, careful observers found hints of a matriarchal clan system and of totem names. Mr. Rattray has carried the matter somewhat further. He has lived for some years among the Achewa or Achipeta of Central Angoniland. These people belong to the race which for convenience' sake we call Anyanja, and speak virtually the same language as those at Kotakota, Likoma and Blantyre. Some words which are not in Dr. Scott's dictionary I recognise as used at Ntumbi, some days' journey further south—where, in fact, the language was very much the same as that in Mr. Rattray's book, though the people spoke of the "Chipetas" as different from themselves. In fact, Mr. Rattray throws light on various points which puzzled me at the time—*e.g.* Anapiri=

"Child of the Hills" as a clan-name. I had taken it for a personal name, and been somewhat surprised at its frequency.

Mr. Rattray says (p. 175) that Achewa tradition asserts the whole tribe to have borne this clan-name of *Piri* ("Hill")—and attributes the origin of that name (and probably the others, but the passage is not quite clear) to the chieftainess Nyangu, whose line seems still to have been represented in the country in Livingstone's time. But Mr. Rattray speaks as if descent in the female line were exceptional, whereas it is common to the Achewa and the Yaos and many other Bantu tribes. In a previous passage he says that the clan-name descends from the father, and in some cases from the mother. He does not make clear whether the clans in which the former is the case are those mentioned as of Zulu origin. (The Anyanja of the Lake speak of the system of paternal kinship as brought in by the Zulus.) Another explanation—which only careful and long-continued inquiry on the spot can establish—*might* be that there is a double system of descent, akin to the Herero *otuzo* and *omaanda*, and the "companies" and clans of the Gold Coast. (Concerning these, see a paper by Mr. Arthur Houlkes in the African Society's *Journal* for April.) Some of the clan-names (p. 176) are words now obsolete. "By inquiring what animal is tabooed by the person who bears such an obsolete name, the modern equivalent can generally be obtained. A thorough examination into the etymology of some of these clan-names might throw some light on the past history of many of the races of Central Africa." In some cases, at least, we have not far to seek, as three out of the five "archaic" words given by Mr. Rattray are simply Zulu. *Duwe* (for *mbidzi*) is *idube*, "zebra"; *posu* = *impofu*, "eland" and *nyati* = *inyati*, "buffalo." *Nyuchi* for the Nyanja *njuchi*, "bee," is evidently a compromise,—the Zulu form being *inyosi*. *Soko*, however, for "baboon," must have a different origin. Livingstone mentions that the chimpanzee was called *soko* by the people of Manyema; and in the Ila (or Mashukulumbwe) language, an ape is *sokwe*. Probably this clan comes from the west. There is a clan *Moyo* ("life, heart") which has for its taboo the heart of a goat—and I believe that there is also a *Moyo* clan in Uganda.

It might have seemed more natural to begin this notice with a discussion of the folk-tales in this book, but they are important enough to require a much fuller analysis than can be given here. "Kachirambe" is the same as the Yao "Kalikalanje" (see Macdonald, *Africana*, II., 336) and the Ronga "Moutipi" given by M. Junod. "The Rabbit and the Elephant" is a variant of the tale concerning all the animals and the pool of water, and "The Tortoise and the Antelope" is equally familiar. Of two other stories "The Cock and the Swallow," and "The Tortoise and the Baboon," I have MS. variants. The riddles and proverbs, and the descriptions of dances with their characteristic songs, are all highly interesting.

A. WERNER.

Books for Review should be addressed to
THE EDITOR OF *Folk-Lore*,
c/o DAVID NUTT,
57-59 LONG ACRE, LONDON, W.C.