

CORRESPONDENCE

DRAMAS AND DRAMATIC DANCES OF
NON-EUROPEAN RACES: A REPLY.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIRS,—It seems ungrateful to make any reply to Dr. Marett's very kind review of my book (*C.R.*, August, pp. 159-162), especially as he says that 'in the interests of pure fighting I could almost wish that I did not agree with Professor Ridgeway as fully as I do.' But there are one or two points on which it is necessary to set the reader right. Dr. Marett practically confines himself to a defence of his own doctrine that '*mana* is a root-principle of explanation applying to the origin of magic and religious rites,' a doctrine which I have controverted in my book (pp. 48-49; 349-350). I hold not only that magic is not a stage prior to religion as held by Sir James Frazer, but also that there is no ground for regarding *mana* as something absolutely distinct from, or antecedent to, the belief in the existence of the soul after the death of the body. My reason for this later belief is that as 'spirits and ghosts are apt to possess *mana*,' yet as all ghosts do not possess it, but only those that are specially potent *tindalos* (ghosts of dead chiefs), its explanation seems to lie in the fact that those ghosts who are supposed to possess it were powerful and important persons in life, just as in other countries and in other creeds the power of working miracles, or of giving protection in sanctuaries, does not belong to all dead persons, but only to great warriors, saints, and the like. In other words, I consider *mana* to be one of the secondary phenomena that spring from and depend on the primary belief in the immortality of the soul. Dr. Marett supplies strong evidence in favour of this view, for whilst he urges that French caves of the Reindeer Age, which he places about 15,000 years ago, afford strong indications of hunting rites of the kind that figure so prominently in the *Golden Bough*, admits that 'Mousterian man of the Mid-Pleistocene period,' whose date he places at a 'beggarly 50,000' years ago, 'buried his dead with an eye to their comfort in a future state'—a fact strongly in favour of the priority of the belief in the immortality of the soul to magic as a root-principle. Whilst Sir James Frazer holds that magic is a stage prior to religion, and Dr. Marett regards *mana* as belonging to 'pre-animistic religion,' the examination of a long series of facts led me to conclude that religion is at least as early a stage as magic and certainly is not later. Dr. Marett now seems to have dropped his doctrine of 'pre-animistic religion,' and he says that 'he is sorry that (he) has managed to convey a false impression to Professor Ridgeway, and still more sorry that he should find it inconvenient to give that false impression up.' 'My view' (he proceeds) 'has always been that *mana*, or wonder-working power, may be

attributed to a rite that in its inception has nothing to do with animism, but is inspired by some other notion—for instance, by what Sir James Frazer would call magic, the sympathetic principle. Thus the Melanesian picks up a stone that is fearfully and wonderfully shaped in the likeness of a yam, and concludes that it has *mana* for making yams grow.'

I believe that the wonder-working power is suggested in the first instance simply by the fact that the stone is so wonderfully like a yam. If the Melanesian, as apparently happens, explains the efficacy of his charm, not on the ground that like produces like, but on the ground that the stone has 'eaten ghost,' I assume this to be a secondary gloss due to what Professor Ridgeway would himself call 'a natural extension of the ghost theory.' The sympathetic principle, on the other hand, whether reflectively grasped or not, undoubtedly operates as a motive, I regard as the primary source of the attribution of *mana* to the stone and to the fertility rites that make use of the stone, and therefore in such a context would term the underlying motive 'pre-animistic.'

I am sorry if I am labouring under a false impression respecting Dr. Marett's doctrine that there was a pre-animistic stage in the evolution of religion. He has only himself to blame, for he wrote in the Preface to *His Threshold of Religion* (p. ix): 'It would be untrue to deny that the term pre-animistic was used by me *designedly* and with a *chronological* reference' (the italics are mine). With these words it is hard to reconcile his later statement now repeated that there are 'other conditions not less primary [than animism]. If *mana* is not more primary than animism, why did he place it (*mana*) under the head of pre-animistic religion, in which phrase he admits that the qualifying adjective is used "designedly," and with chronological reference?'

The example which Dr. Marett presents, *e.g.*, the stone shaped like a yam, so far from substantiating his statement that 'it can be shown conclusively that in some cases animistic interpretations have been superimposed upon on what previously bore non-animistic sense,' adds another proof to my case. For he himself admits that the Melanesian regards the *mana* in such a stone as due to the indwelling of a ghost; and to the positive statement of the Melanesian respecting his own belief, Dr. Marett has no other reply than his own *a priori* assumption unsupported by any facts from Melanesia or anywhere else.

I may also point out that since my book appeared, Mr. Hocart, a clever Oxford anthropologist, who has studied carefully the problem of *mana* during his residence in the Pacific, has rejected Dr. Marett's hypothesis in a powerful paper in the *American An-*

thropologist. But even if Dr. Marett could substantiate his assumption respecting the yam-shaped stone, this would not prove that animism did not precede in time the vague notions attached to certain objects 'which later received full animistic interpretation.' Dr. Marett from his standpoint was bound to hold that 'evolution in religion proceeds from the indistinct to distinct, from the undifferentiated to the differentiated, from the incoherent to the coherent.' Now as he also holds that 'religion in its psychological aspect is fundamentally a mode of social behaviour' tested his preceding statement by an appeal to the facts of primitive society, and I had no difficulty in showing that so far from primitive man being vague, indistinct, and undifferentiating in his notions respecting everything of importance to himself, the Australian aborigines, for example, have almost complex system of nomenclature and a precision of sight, hearing, and smell unknown to civilised man.

Finally, Dr. Marett disputes my statement that I have proved my case by an induction

based on facts drawn from the whole world, and whilst he admits that my 'induction is fairly searching as regards Asia,' he declares that 'it is miserably inadequate with regard to the rest of the primitive world. Four pages for Australia will hardly satisfy the anthropologist, nor would forty pages.' If I had copied out all the available evidence from the manifold tribes of Australia, New Guinea, etc., I would have filled several volumes with useless repetitions, and the reader could not have seen the wood for the trees. The question is, Can another series of examples controverting my theory be discovered amongst the numerous tribes not dealt with? I took typical examples from every separate race, and as Dr. Marett with his wide ethnological knowledge, after having nine months in which to search, has not been able to cite a single instance contrary to my long series of facts, it may be safely assumed that I have not omitted a single instance which made against my doctrine.

WILLIAM RIDGEWAY.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Bourne (Ella). A Study of Tibur, Historical, Literary, and Epigraphical, from the Earliest Times to the Close of the Roman Empire (Dissertation for Doctorate). 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 76. Collegiate Press: Menasha, Wisconsin. 1916.

Cicero (On Old Age). Translated into English Verse by Sir Robert Allison. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5". Pp. xvi + 54. London: A. F. Humphreys. 1916. Paper boards, 1s. 6d. net.

Collignon (M. Maxime). L'Emplacement du Cécropion à l'Acropole d'Athènes. 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 9". Pp. 17, with three photographic plates. Paris: C. Klincksieck. 1916. Fr. 2.80.

Deigma (A First Greek Book). By C. Flamstead Walters and R. S. Conway, with the co-operation of Constance I. Daniel. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. xxiv + 408, with a map and four illustrations. London: John Murray. 1916. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

Euripides (Rhesus). Edited by W. H. Porter. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5". Pp. lii + 97. Cambridge; University Press. 1916. Cloth.

Harris (J. Rendel). The Origin of the Cult of Artemis. 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 40. London: Longmans and Co. 1916. Half cloth, 1s. net.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology (Vol. XXVII.) 9" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. vi + 176. Oxford: University Press (for Harvard University Press). 1916. Paper boards, 6s. 6d. net.

Jones (R. M.) The Platonism of Plutarch (Doctor's Dissertation). 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 153. Chicago: University Press. 1916.

Karpinski (L. C.) Robert of Chester's Latin Translation of the Algebra of Al-Khowarizmi, with introduction, notes, and an English version by L.C.K., University of Michigan. 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Macmillan.

Loeb Library. Virgil, Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid I.-VI. By H. R. Fairclough. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xiv + 571. London: W. Heinemann. 1916. Cloth, 5s. net.

Manning (C. A.) A Study of Archaism in Euripides. 9" x 6". Pp. xii + 98. Oxford Press (for Columbia University Press). 1916. Cloth, 5s. 6d. net.

Tacitus (Germania). By D. R. Stuart. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xxiii + 139, with a map. London: Macmillan and Co. 1916. Cloth, 3s. net.

Theologisch Tijdschrift. Aflevering IV. en V. Edited by B. D. Erdmans. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6". Pp. 267 + 432. Leiden: S. C. van Doesburgh. 1916.

Ussani (Vincenzo). Le Satire d'Orazio. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. viii + 210. Napoli: F. Perrella. 1916. L. 2.

Van Wageningen. De Ciceronis Libro Consolationis. 11" x 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 54. Groningen: P. Noordhoff. 1916. Paper boards, F. 2.10; M. 3.50.

Virgil (Aeneid) in English Verse. Vol. I. (Books I.-III.). By A. S. Way. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. iv + 144. London: Macmillan and Co. 1916. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.

Walters (H. B.) A Classical Dictionary. 9" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. x + 1103, with 580 illustrations. Cambridge: University Press. 1916. Cloth, 21s. net.