WILEY

Geography of National Culture

Author(s): Géza Czirbusz

Source: *The Geographical Journal*, Vol. 43, No. 1 (Jan., 1914), pp. 96-97

Published by: geographicalj

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1778831>

Accessed: 09-04-2016 22:05 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.

Wiley, The Royal Geographical Society (with the Institute of British Geographers) are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to The Geographical Journal

years I have been studying the comparative grammar of the Bantu tongues, and I have practised myself *in situ* several Bantu dialects of West Africa: the Mpongwe, the Fan, and the Vili of Loango. I grant, however, that my etymology of "Mundequete" is not exact.

R. AVELOT.

I do not wish to labour too much my points of difference with Captain Avelot in regard to his interesting pamphlet on 'Racial Migrations in Africa,' but in respect to the letter printed above, I still maintain that, though he may have studied the works of Mons. Maurice Delafosse, he did not give the deductions of that author sufficient consideration in his pamphlet; and that, although he may have read the earlier articles of Torday and Joyce, I could find no reference to the most important work of those two authors, the monograph on the Bushongo civilization, published by the Congo Museum at Tervueren.

Dr. McCall Theal, it must be remembered, printed in the original Portuguese the text of most of the late fifteenth and sixteenth century Portuguese writers on South-Central and East African geography. A reference to these works establishes—in my opinion, beyond all reasonable contestation—that the invading hordes known most frequently by the name of Bazimba originated in the region of the upper Kwango, and were identical with the modern Imbangala and Bajok. It was these same south-west Congo cannibals that ravaged the kingdom of Kongo and Loango, much of interior Angola, nearly all Zambezia, the interior of Mozambique, the Kilwa coast, and the Mombasa district. Most emphatically they were not Gala. Neither in actual history nor tradition are the Gala, or any other Hamitic race, associated with cannibalism. Nor were East African Galas or Somals—judged from Arab records—in the same state of utter savagery as were the Bazimba described by the Portuguese and Arabs. Nor is there anything in history, archaeology, or language-study to suggest that this invading horde which swept up through East Africa from the south, had any affinity with the modern Yao or Makua.

I can see that Captain R. Avelot is to be respected as an authority on the north-west Bantu languages, but I do not think he has had equal opportunities to grasp the features of eastern and south-central Bantu, in which direction his few errors in etymology are to be detected. But in general my criticisms did not underrate the interest or importance of his pamphlet. May I, without impertinence, draw attention to his letter—printed above as it is written—as an interesting sign of the times? It is one which might pass current anywhere as the letter of an Englishman. It is pleasant to be able to record, from my own knowledge of France and French officers of to-day, that there now many officials, civil as well as military, in the French service who can write English with much the same ease and perfection as Captain Avelot.

H. H. JOHNSTON.

Geography of National Culture.

Budapest, November 30, 1913.

Compelled by the review of my 'Geography of National Culture' in the last (July, 1913) number of your valuable paper, I beg you to favour me by giving space to the following remarks. It is not my purpose to dispute with my reviewer; to do it effectively I would have to write quite a new book; I only wish to call the attention of the impartial English public to the following facts;—

(1) My book consists of eleven chapters, and from those five only were analyzed by the reviewer, and the most important paragraphs were put aside. (2) As to the scholars mentioned in the second paragraph of the review, all I wished to state was that they belong to the evolutionist school. (3) The terms "geogony" and "geosophy" I only applied to Dr. Loczy's puristic geography; as to Prof. Penck, I said that he does not approve one-sided physical consideration of geography. (4) Everybody will agree that reviewing does not consist in refuting a man's opinion by quoting stray sentences, which, when cited alone without their context, are often incompatible with the author's meaning; and it is evident that such imperfect quotations are often detrimental to the author's reputation. To this class belongs the quotation about Newton, the sense of which simply is that, though he discovered the fact of gravitation, about its cause he knew as little as we do. (5) The leading idea of my book, *i.e.* that man's intellect is a higher power in the development of humanity than the mere morphology of the terrestrial globe, and consequently a very important factor in history, caused the strongest reaction of the dominating morphologists' party, and since the publication of my book I have been the object of continuous rebukes. Still, I alone do not hold this idea; I share it with Partsch, Passarge, and Reclus, to whom descriptive geography is far more important than the physiographical treatment of this science. I agree with Colonel Close, who wrote: "We have the right to use the results obtained by others (economic, historic, politic), provided that we add something *valuable* of our own," and "He (the geographer) can do much to popularize the objects, but he cannot hope to do original work" (*Geographical Journal*, October, 1911, pp. 407, 409.)

Prof. Dr. GÉZA CZIRBUSZ.

Altitude Insomnia.

During my prolonged absence in Asian wilds, certain statements have been made at meetings of the Royal Geographical Society and elsewhere ascribing to me opinions which I have not entertained or advocated. I would call attention to one such statement, which has obtained wide currency and has been repeated by Dr. de Filippi both in papers he has read and in his book, 'Karakoram and Western Himalaya.' On p. 316 of the last he writes, "Dr. Workman . . . believes it impossible to sleep at heights of over 20,000 feet." I desire to say here I have never asserted any such belief. I have expressed an opinion, based on the altitude-experiences of ten Europeans on two expeditions, that in attempts to scale the highest peaks, insomnia might be found a serious obstacle to success—quite a different proposition from the sweeping belief attributed to me. I did not claim that all or any definite proportion of mountaineers would suffer from insomnia above 20,000 feet.

With a further experience of four more expeditions, I consider my suggestion as phrased needs no qualification. The fact that the Duke of the Abruzzi with three companions passed nine nights* at over 20,000 feet does not invalidate its force, nor obliterate the experience it was based on, nor prove that all mountaineers would be exempt from insomnia or mountain sickness at such heights, any more than the

* Dr. de Filippi asserts on p. 364, 'Karakoram and Western Himalaya,' that seven Europeans spent nine days at a height of over 20,700 feet, but on p. 317 he states that three porters descended on July 13 to Base Camp, 16,637 feet, and did not return until July 16, thus reducing the number who remained nine days to four.