



The Ethnology of Funafuti [Ellice Group] by Charles Hedley

Review by: C. H. R.

The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, Vol. 28, No. 1/2 (1899), pp. 177-178

Published by: [Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2842949>

Accessed: 15/06/2014 16:10

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

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 is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

the passage just quoted from Sir Wm. Flower's address, the following words uttered on the subject by one of the speakers, "Secondly, the * * * * should try to remember that those people are not the sons of our race, religion, or clime, and that it is only by regard for their feelings, by respect for their prejudices, almost by deference to their scruples, that we can obtain the acquiescence as well as the submission of the governed."¹ To the first clause no exception will probably be taken, but surely regard for feelings, respect for prejudices, and deference to scruples form but a fractional part of the means by which the end desired is to be attained, and the statesman who relies upon such considerations only is very likely to fail unless his legislation is based upon the other factors contended for by Sir Wm. Flower, namely, a thorough knowledge of the manners, customs, mode of thought, and mental condition of the people who have to be governed.

Though the writer of this notice has had the good fortune to have heard many of these essays delivered by the author, he has read the work through with the greatest pleasure and interest, and feels confident that anyone who does the same, whether he be an anthropologist or not, will appreciate it thoroughly, and gain a fuller and better knowledge of the sciences which it has been the life-object of Sir William Flower to promote.

J. G. G.

THE ETHNOLOGY OF FUNAFUTI [Ellice Group]. By Charles Hedley (from *Memoirs of the Australian Museum*, Vol. III, Part IV).

This valuable contribution to our knowledge of the Pacific Islanders is one of the results of the expedition sent out under the auspices of the English Royal Society to investigate the formation of the coral reefs in the Pacific. This expedition unfortunately came to an unsuccessful end. A second was undertaken, subsidized by the Government of New South Wales, aided by a private individual. This second venture was under the leadership of Professor David of Sydney University, a man whose training and acquirements eminently fitted him for such a post.

Mr. Hedley's observations were made during the first named of these expeditions, and it is for this reason perhaps scarcely accurate to say that failure was the result, and it is but right to express to Mr. Hedley the gratitude of ethnologists for this important contribution which he, a conchologist, has made to the science of Ethnology. In a short paper of seventy pages he has compressed a vast quantity of information of the highest value with regard to this island, of which little is to be found in English journals. After a short introduction, containing the author's conclusions and a general statement, the paper is divided, somewhat in the manner of *Anthropological Notes and Queries*, into sections according to the various crafts dealt with. The paper consists mainly of detailed descriptions, with in most cases good illustrations, by the author, of the various articles worn or used by the islanders. Both descriptions and drawings will render it possible for any comparative ethnologist to deal with the productions of Funafuti as well as if he had the specimens before him. It is perhaps to be expected that a student somewhat unfamiliar with the subject should, on the one hand, seek for distant resemblances; while, on the other, he has overlooked some that are near at hand. Mr. Hedley sees in the natives of Funafuti, or rather of Polynesia generally, a certain likeness in several ways to the Japanese. In some of these, such as "their graceful courtesy in

¹ *Morning Post* of October 29th, 1898.

peace and fierceness in war, the status and freedom of their women, the position and authority of their chiefs, the existence of a Court language, their dexterity and daring in navigation and deep-sea fishing, and their skill in tattooing and in manufacturing bark cloth or paper," it is quite possible that they resemble the Japanese, but it is equally true that in most of them they resemble fully as much races far distant with whom no one would connect them. It would have been much more reasonable on many of these and other grounds to have connected them with the Malay Peninsula, in spite of Professor Keane's dictum that no organic Malay type exists. Even granting this to be the case, there is no question that certain arts practised in the Malay Peninsula and islands find their counterparts in the implements figured by Mr. Hedley. It will suffice to cite the cocoanut scraper [fig. 26], the rotatory adze [fig. 19], or the box and lid connected with the string on page 296 as unquestionable examples which have their analogues in Malaisia. By connecting the subject of his study with the Malays Mr. Hedley would have brought it to a more or less definite result, leaving to others the ethnic affinities of the Malays. His plea for the investigation of the smaller matters in Ethnology will be echoed by all who have worked at the subject. The Anthropological Institute has been in this respect a pioneer; for if all papers such as Mr. Hedley's were written on the lines laid down in *Anthropological Notes and Queries*, a great advance would be made. The strictures of Mr. Hedley on the very useful Ethnological Album of our fellow Mr. Edge-Partington find a somewhat amusing commentary in the fact that the references to this work in his paper number between forty and fifty.

C. H. R.

THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION 1846-1896. Edited by George Brown Goode.
(City of Washington, 1897.)

This large volume of 866 pages is the history of the first half century of the existence of the Smithsonian Institution. The short preface to it is by the President of the United States, who remarks that an Englishman, James Smithson, as though influenced by the words of Washington, who in his farewell address strongly urged the promotion of institutions for the diffusion of knowledge, bequeathed the whole of his property to the United States of America, "to found at Washington an establishment for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men." The Act of Congress establishing the Smithsonian Institution was signed by President Polk on August 10th, 1846.

The first chapter consists of a biographical sketch of the founder, who died at Genoa in 1829. The income from his estate was then enjoyed by his nephew, who died in 1835, in which year the United States became aware of the Smithsonian bequest, which was first publicly announced by President Jackson in a message to Congress on December 17th, 1835. It is strange to note that while Senators Calhoun and Preston of South Carolina were opposed to its acceptance as opponents of centralisation, and because it would be beneath the dignity of the nation to receive benefits from a foreigner, Senator Jefferson Davis of Mississippi and Senator Leigh of Virginia "took strong ground on the other side, and their counsel finally prevailed after the report had lain upon the table for several months."

On May 9th, 1838, a decree of the English Court of Chancery was obtained giving the Smithsonian bequest to the United States. But eight years passed before any definite plan was fixed upon, "although at each session of Congress the President urged prompt action." At last the Smithsonian Institution began to exist as a large and important building at Washington having attached to it an observatory, a museum