







*J. P. [unclear]*

*Handwritten signature*

THE MODERN REVOLUTION.

Historical Inductions.

NEW FOLKLORE RESEARCHES—GREEK FOLK POESY.

*'Thug e doibh sgeul air Rìgh na Gréige, agus mar a bha Nighean an Rìgh air a gleidheadh 'san Dùn, 's nach robh aon air bith gu AILLIDH, Nighean Rìgh na Gréige, fhaotainn ri phòsadh, ach aon a bheireadh a mach i le sàr ghaisge.'*

SGEUL CHONUIL GHUILBNICH.

NEW FOLKLORE RESEARCHES.

# GREEK FOLK POESY:

ANNOTATED TRANSLATIONS,  
FROM THE WHOLE CYCLE OF ROMAIC  
FOLK-VERSE AND FOLK-PROSE.

BY

LUCY M. J. GARNETT.

EDITED WITH ESSAYS ON  
THE SCIENCE OF FOLKLORE,  
GREEK FOLKSPEECH, AND THE SURVIVAL  
OF PAGANISM,

BY

J. S. STUART-GLENNIE, M.A.

'And he told them the Tale of the King of Greece, and how his Daughter was kept in the Dun, and that no one at all was to get BEAUTY, Daughter of the King of Greece, to marry, but one who could bring her out by great valour.'—CAMPBELL: *West Highland Tales*, Vol. iii., p. 258.

VOL. I.—FOLK-VERSE.

GUILDFORD:  
PRINTED FOR THE AUTHORS BY BILLING AND SONS;  
AND SOLD BY  
DAVID NUTT, 270, STRAND, LONDON.  
1896.

[All Rights Reserved.]





To

THE GREAT SCHOLAR,  
ORATOR, AND STATESMAN,  
THE MOST POWERFUL UPHOLDER  
OF NATIONAL RIGHTS,  
AND THE GREATEST OF LIBERAL PREMIERS,  
THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE,  
GREEK FOLK-POESY

Is Dedicated

GRATEFULLY BY THE TRANSLATOR,  
AND WITH PROFOUND RESPECT BY THE EDITOR,  
THE ENDEAVOUR OF BOTH HAVING BEEN  
TO MAKE THEIR WORK  
WORTHY OF ASSOCIATION WITH THE BRITISH NAME  
THE MOST HONOURED  
BY ALL GREEKS.

ΤΩ,  
ΔΙΑΠΡΕΠΕΙ ΛΟΓΙΩ,  
ΡΗΤΟΡΙ ΚΑΙ ΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΩ,  
ΤΩ, ΚΡΑΤΕΡΩΤΑΤΩ, ΠΡΟΜΑΧΩ,  
ΤΟΥ ΤΩΝ ΕΘΝΩΝ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΥ,  
ΚΑΙ ΜΕΓΙΣΤΩ, ΤΩΝ ΦΙΛΕΛΕΤΘΕΡΩΝ ΠΡΩΤΗΠΟΤΡΩΝ,  
ΤΩ, ΤΙΠΕΡΤΙΜΩ,  
ΓΟΥΙΛΙΕΛΜΩ, ΕΒΑΡΤΩ, ΓΛΑΔΣΤΩΝΙ,  
Η ΤΩΝ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΩΝ ΔΗΜΩΔΩΝ ΠΟΙΗΜΑΤΩΝ  
ΗΔΕ ΣΥΛΛΟΓΗ  
ΑΝΑΤΙΘΕΤΑΙ,  
ΕΤΗΝΩΜΟΝΩΣ ΜΕΝ ΤΗΟ ΤΗΣ ΜΕΤΑΦΡΑΣΑΣΗΣ,  
ΕΤΣΕΒΑΣΤΩΣ ΔΕ ΤΗΟ ΤΟΥ ΕΚΔΟΝΤΟΣ,  
ΚΟΙΝΗ, ΣΥΝΕΡΓΑΣΑΜΕΝΩΝ  
ΚΑΙ ΕΠΑΞΙΩΣ ΤΟ ΕΡΓΟΝ ΣΥΝΑΨΑΝΤΩΝ  
ΤΩ, ΒΡΕΤΤΑΝΙΚΩ, ΟΝΟΜΑΤΙ  
ΤΩ, ΤΟΙΣ ΕΛΛΗΣΙΝ ΑΠΑΣΙΝ ΕΝ ΤΟΙΣ ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ  
ΤΕΤΙΜΗΜΕΝΩ, .

# CORRESPONDING CONTENTS

OF

VOLUME I.

AND

VOLUME II.

PREFACES.

INTRODUCTION.

THE SCIENCE OF FOLK-  
LORE.

PREAMBLE.

SECTION I.—The New Generalisa-  
tions of Historical  
Theory.

NOTE.—The Ethnology of the  
White Races.

SECTION II.—The New Principles  
of Method.

„ III.—The New Sugges-  
tions of Historical  
Deduction.

SUMMARY.

TRANSLATIONS—FOLK-  
VERSE.

CLASS I.—MYTHOLOGICAL  
IDYLLS.

SECTION I.—Zoönist.

„ II.—Magical.

„ III.—Supernalist.

CLASS II.—SOCIAL SONGS.

SECTION I.—Antenuptial.

„ II.—Family.

„ III.—Communal.

CLASS III.—HISTORICAL  
BALLADS.

SECTION I.—Byzantine.

„ II.—Ottoman.

„ III.—Hellenic.

ANNOTATIONS.

EXCURSUS.

GREEK FOLK-SPEECH.

TRANSLATIONS—FOLK-  
PROSE.

CLASS I.—MYTHOLOGICAL  
TALES.

SECTION I.—Zoönist.

„ II.—Magical.

„ III.—Supernalist.

CLASS II.—SOCIAL STORIES.

SECTION I.—Antenuptial.

„ II.—Family.

„ III.—Communal.

CLASS III.—HISTORICAL  
LEGENDS.

SECTION I.—Byzantine.

„ II.—Ottoman.

„ III.—Hellenic.

ANNOTATIONS.

CONCLUSION.

THE SURVIVAL OF PAGAN-  
ISM.

PREAMBLE.

SECTION I.—The Facts of the Sur-  
vival of Paganism.

„ II.—The Old Natural and  
the New Moral Reli-  
gions.

„ III.—The Results of the  
Survival of Paganism.

SUMMARY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF GREEK  
FOLK-LORE.

INDICES.





## GENERAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

### VOLUME I.

	PAGE
DEDICATION - - - - -	v
NEW FOLKLORE RESEARCHES — GENERAL	
PREFACE - - - - -	xiii
GREEK FOLK-POESY—PREFACE - - - - -	xxxi

#### INTRODUCTION.

##### THE SCIENCE OF FOLKLORE.

PREAMBLE - - - - -	1
SECTION I.—THE NEW GENERALIZATIONS OF HISTORICAL THEORY - - - - -	2
NOTE—THE ETHNOLOGY OF THE WHITE RACES - - - - -	14a
SECTION II.—THE NEW PRINCIPLES OF METHOD - - - - -	15
„ III.—THE NEW SUGGESTIONS OF HISTORICAL DEDUCTION - - - - -	31
SUMMARY - - - - -	47

#### TRANSLATIONS.—FOLK-VERSE.

##### CLASS I.

##### MYTHOLOGICAL FOLK-IDYLLS.

##### IDYLLS ILLUSTRATIVE OF KOSMICAL IDEAS.

SECTION I.—IDYLLS ILLUSTRATIVE OF ZOÖNIST IDEAS	51
„ II.—IDYLLS ILLUSTRATIVE OF MAGICAL IDEAS	61
„ III.—IDYLLS ILLUSTRATIVE OF SUPERNALIST IDEAS - - - - -	81

## CLASS II.

## SOCIAL FOLK-SONGS.

## SONGS ILLUSTRATIVE OF VILLAGE LIFE.

	PAGE
SECTION I.—SONGS ILLUSTRATIVE OF ANTENUPTIAL LIFE - - - - -	118
„ II.—SONGS ILLUSTRATIVE OF FAMILY LIFE -	151
„ III.—SONGS ILLUSTRATIVE OF COMMUNAL LIFE	202

## CLASS III.

## HISTORICAL FOLK-BALLADS.

BALLADS ILLUSTRATIVE OF HISTORICAL  
MEMORIES.

SECTION I.—BALLADS ILLUSTRATIVE OF BYZANTINE MEMORIES - - - - -	230
„ II.—BALLADS ILLUSTRATIVE OF OTTOMAN MEMORIES - - - - -	278
„ III.—BALLADS ILLUSTRATIVE OF HELLENIC MEMORIES - - - - -	339

## ANNOTATIONS.

HISTORICAL, COMPARATIVE, AND EXPLANATORY -	389
--	-----

## EXCURSUS.

## GREEK FOLK-SPEECH.

PREAMBLE - - - - -	427
SECTION I.—THE PAST DEVELOPMENT OF GREEK -	428
„ II.—CHARACTERISTICS OF GREEK DIALECTS -	441
„ III.—THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF GREEK	449
SUMMARY - - - - -	462
ANALYTICAL TABLE OF CONTENTS - - - - -	463

## NEW FOLKLORE RESEARCHES.

---

*'Der grosse Aufschwung, den während des letzten Menschenalters die Wissenschaften genommen haben, ist der Mythologie . . . nicht zu gute gekommen . . . . Es herrscht die grösste Unsicherheit nicht blos über die Grundfragen, sondern auch über die Mittel, mit denen sie beantwortet werden müssen, und selbst die Fragestellung steht keineswegs fest. Der verschiedenen mythologischen Systeme sind fast ebenso viele, als der Forscher.'*—GRUPPE, *Culte und Mythen*, Vorwort iii.

*'But as the changes in our knowledge of the past history of Mankind have mostly been effected without reference to the study of Mythology and Folklore, their effect upon these studies has never been set forth clearly, and . . . the consequences are doctrinal anarchy in both departments.'*—NUTT, *Waifs and Strays of Celtic Tradition*, vol. i., Intr. xvi.

---

## GENERAL PREFACE.







## NEW FOLKLORE RESEARCHES.

### GENERAL PREFACE.

§ I *a*. HARDLY at all is it recognised to how remote a date the first collecting of Folklore goes back; how very remarkable, and, indeed, revolutionary, have been the chief Epochs of the collecting of especially mythical and historical traditions; and how clear a periodicity may be traced in the recurrence of the greater of these Epochs. How far the oldest monuments of Culturelore, the oldest Sacred Books of Egypt and Chaldea in their primitive forms, incorporated Folklore may remain doubtful. Perhaps they had exclusively for their contents the Kosmical, and particularly the Astronomical Observations and Theories, the Historical Traditions, and the Sacred Songs and Ritualistic Observances of the Ruling White Race<sup>a</sup> of these River-valleys. Unquestionably Folk-belief and Folk-custom

<sup>a</sup> See Note on *The Ethnology of the White Races*, below pp. 14*a*, 14*b* and 15.

influenced, at a very early period, both the doctrines and the rites of the Religions of which men of the Higher Race constituted themselves the systematisers and hierophants. But, so far as we as yet know, it was not till a later Age, though still as early as from the Third Millennium B.C., that Folklore was definitely collected, and, in a more or less transformed shape, presented in Culture-lore—as in the great Chaldean Epic, of which the Flood-story is an episode (2300 B.C.), and in the earliest collections of Egyptian, Chinese, and Indian Folk-tales. It was not, however, till a still later Age—the Age that must be dated from that great Asian-European Revolution of the Sixth Century B.C., which broke up the Ancient, and initiated New Civilizations, in which all our modern conflicts are already found in germ—it was not till this Age that the interaction of Folklore and Culture-lore became more definitely historical, and more socially and politically important. And in both Sacred and Secular Literatures there are found, not only at this great Epoch, but thereafter at regularly recurring Epochs, characteristic manifestations of the recordation of Folklore by, and its influence on, the Cultured Classes.

§ 1 *b.* To prove, or even adequately to illustrate such a generalization would require more space than I can give to the whole of this *General Preface*. But let the Folklorist recall the Folklore incorporated, not only in the Sacred Books of the Ancient Civilizations—the Indian *Vedas*, Persian *Zendavesta*, Hebrew *Bible*, etc.—

as re-edited at the opening of the Age initiated by the Revolution of the Sixth Century B.C., but also in the Sacred Books of the New Civilizations—the Christian Scriptures, and particularly the *Gospels*, at the opening of the Second Half-millennium (1-500 A.C.), and the Mohammedan *Koran*, with the Scholia of its Commentators, at the opening of the Third Half-millennial Period, reckoned from that European-Asian Revolution. And let him also, surveying Secular Literatures, recall, in the First of these Half-millenniums (500 B.C. to 1 A.C.), the Collections of the Foundation-legends of Cities, to which even an Aristotle contributed in his lost *Κτίσεις*, and the Collections of Greek Myths generally, as by Apollonios Rhodios, not only in his *Κτίσεις*, but in his epic *Argonautica*, and by Apollódoros in his *Περὶ Θεῶν*, *Βιβλιοθήκη*, and *Χρονικὰ*; the Collections, in the Second Half-millennium (1-500 B.C.), of Roman Legends, as in the '*Ρωμαϊκὴ Ἀρχαιολογία*' of Dionysius Halicarnassus, and the *Βιβλιόθηκη ἱστορική* of Diodorus Siculus, and the magnificent use made of them by Vergil in his *Æneid*, as also by Ovid in his *Fasti*; the Collections, even in the dark Third Half-millennium (500-1000), the true Mediæval Age, and even in our remote islands, of British Traditions in the *Irish Annals of the Four Masters*, the *Four Ancient Books* of Wales, and the *Historia Britonum* of Nennius; the Collections, nor the collections only, but, in the *Shah Nameh* of Firdausi, the Arthurian Romances, and the *Nibelungenlied*, the splendid epicisings and romanticisings of Racial Tra-

N.

N. conditions in the glorious Fourth Half-millennium (1000-1500); and finally, at the opening, in the Sixteenth Century, of the Fifth Half-millennium of the Age initiated by the Revolution of the Sixth Century B.C., not only the Collections of various antiquaries, but the poetically transforming incorporation both of Folklore facts innumerable,<sup>a</sup> and of heroic national traditions in the Plays of Shakespeare—the great poet of the Anglo-Keltic (more correctly, perhaps, Norse-Keltic) Race.

H. C. § 1 c. But it must here suffice to have thus merely indicated the extreme antiquity of the recording of Folklore, and to have thus merely suggested that the greater Epochs of World-literature will be found to have been determined by the greater energy and intensity at these Epochs of the more or less constant interactions of Folk-lore and Culture-lore. The reason of this may hereafter be seen in the very constitution of Civilized Societies, and traced to the essential condition of their origin—the Conflict of the Colonists of a Higher White Race with the *πολὸν πλῆθος ἀνθρώπων*, ‘the great multitude’ of Lower Coloured and Black Races, by whom, living *ἀτάκτως καὶ ὡσπερ τὰ θέρια*, ‘lawlessly and like beasts,’<sup>b</sup> we now know that the Chaldean and Egyptian Cradlelands of Civilization were already,

<sup>a</sup> See THISTLETON DYER, *Folklore of Shakespeare*. And more than one such passage as the first of the two mottoes of my Introductory Essay to *Greek Folkpoesy* testifies to Bacon’s recognition of the importance of Folklore.

<sup>b</sup> BEROSSOS, *Χαλδαϊκά*. See LENORMANT, *Commentaire des Fragments cosmogoniques de Bérose*; and DAREMBERG et SAGLIO s.v. *Chaldæi*.

before the settlement of these White Colonists, peopled. Conflicts of Classes have succeeded Conflicts of Races. And the fact that Folklore forms so considerable a constituent element of the later Sacred Books, and, at regularly recurring Epochs, surges up so prominently in Secular Literatures, will be found in general to indicate nothing less than a more or less revolutionary uprising into political power of ethnically or culturally Lower Races or Classes. But I must now pass at once to the characterisation of those Eras of the Modern Period of interaction between Folklore and Culturelore, which here more particularly concern us.

H.B.

§ 2. The first of these later Eras may be dated from the publication, in 1760, of MacPherson's *Fingal, an Ancient Epic Poem*, and the European enthusiasm excited by that Epoch-making book in which 'breathed the very soul of the Celtic genius.'<sup>a</sup> Folklore Researches were carried by it high above the plane on which the older antiquaries of the Modern Period had worked—Drayton (b. 1563), and Camden (b. 1551), and Aubrey (1686), and Bourne (1725). For, originating the whole course of those Keltic Researches which have gone on to this day, it initiated that Keltic Revival—just fourteen years after the suppression of the last Jacobite Rebellion 1745-46—of which the results, not literary and scientific only, but also social and political, are very far indeed, as yet, from being exhausted. Yet this Keltic Revival forms but one of the movements at once

| n

<sup>a</sup> ARNOLD, *On the Study of Celtic Literature*, p. 150.

literary, social, and political, with which MacPherson must be for ever associated. To the European enthusiasm excited by his *Ancient Epic*, and to the example of those researches which it stimulated in Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, may be traced the similar Folklore Researches, with their similar results of revival of national memories, and kindling of national aspirations, which presently disturbed every Despotism in Europe, and have already, though not yet, indeed, completely and finally, rectified or reconstituted national boundaries. Almost sufficient proof of this might be furnished by a mere Bibliography of National Folklore Researches since 1760, each country ranking according to the date of the first important work on its Folklore—not excluding, of course, such poetic syntheses as the Scottish *Fingal*, in 1760, and the Finnish *Kalevala*, in 1835<sup>a</sup>—and indications being given of the social and political changes effected in each country since the first work on its National Folklore. Besides, however, leading to such

<sup>a</sup> It is admitted that verses occur in the *Kalevala* which cannot be found in any existing folk-songs, and which were composed simply to suit 'the exigencies of Dr. Lönnrot's epic design.' (See BILLSON, *The Folk-songs comprised in the Finnish 'Kalevala.'*—*Folk-Lore*, December, 1895, p. 350.) MacPherson, to suit the 'exigencies of *his* epic design,' doubtless inserted a far greater number of his own compositions than Dr. Lönnrot found necessary. But candour about his work was made as difficult for him as possible by the *bear* he had to contend with.

'Here lies poor Johnson : reader have a care,  
Tread lightly, lest you rouse a sleeping bear—  
\* \* \* \* \*  
Illbred, and overbearing in dispute,  
A Scholar, and a Christian, yet a Brute.'

N.B.  
ex.

political and social changes, Folklore Researches, in this brilliant Eighteenth Century Era of their activity, not only gave to the writing of History new facts, and with these a new interest and a new style, but contributed to the creation, by Sir Walter Scott, of a new Art-form, the Historical Romance. And through these new National Histories and Historical Romances, Folklore Researches became still more definitely causes of Historical Events.

§ 3. Half a century later than the Era that must be associated with MacPherson was that which must be associated with the Grimms. That European Civilisation is an organic unity constituted by the interaction of the Romance and Teutonic elements was the idea which Von Ranke formulated in his earliest work,<sup>a</sup> and still maintained in his latest.<sup>b</sup> Substitute *Keltic* for 'Romance,' and *West European* for 'European' Civilisation, and we shall find an illustration of the truth of this theory, in the succession of the Eras of Modern Folklore Research. Characteristically Keltic as was its Eighteenth Century Era, initiated by the *Ancient Epic* of 1760, characteristically Teutonic has been the course of its Nineteenth Century Era initiated by the *Kinder und Hausmärchen* of 1812-14. The National Researches distinctive of the former Era still continued with their various social and political results;

<sup>a</sup> *History of the Romance and Teutonic Nations between 1494 and 1535.*

<sup>b</sup> *Universal History.* He died May, 1886, aged 91.

ex.

W.  
ex.

ex.

11.13.

but this later Era has been more distinctively marked by the larger than merely National aims and objects which have stimulated students of Folklore; though, indeed, in Germany, these larger aims and objects have too often been subordinated to a mere vulgar glorification of Germans as the supreme Aryan Race. The solution of such great historical questions as those of the origins of European Folklore, the origins of Epics, the origins of Mythology, nay, the origins of Religion, have, in this Nineteenth Century, become the aims of Folklore Research. These great problems began now to be attacked also by another class of Researches—those into Aryan Philology, and Early, and especially Vedic Aryan Literature—and this particularly after the verification by Franz Bopp, in 1833-35, of Sir William Jones' theory, already stated in 1786, of the common derivation of the Aryan, the Indo-European, or, as Germans, in despite of Kelt and Slav, delight in calling them, Indo-Germanic Languages—Sanskrit and Zend, Greek and Armenian, Latin and Keltic, Lithuanian, Teutonic, and Slavonic. And then arose the Philological and Aryan School of Mythologists which, under Professor Max Müller, ruled supreme in this country for an unfortunately prolonged period, seeing that what have turned out to be the truer views of native scholars, naturally less favoured by our German Dynasty, were thus for long scouted and suppressed.

§ 4. Truer, however, though these views might be—Latham's Theory, for instance, of the European Origin



of the Aryans, and Lang's of the Savage Origin of Myths—no adequate and consistent theory has yet been stated. As so learned a Folklorist as Mr. Nutt frankly admits, 'no homogeneous theory has taken the place of' those which the changes in our historical knowledge have 'dispossessed'; and 'the consequences are doctrinal anarchy in both departments of study'—in our Theories both of Mythology and of Folklore—'and party grouping of scholars according to insignificant side-issues rather than according to well-defined general principles.'<sup>a</sup> Here I have no space to justify this opinion, corroborating, as it does, my own. Nor is it necessary. The reader interested in the question will find the fullest justification of these judgments in Gruppe's elaborate criticism of the *wichtigsten Versuche die Entstehung des Cultus und des Mythos zu erklären*,<sup>b</sup> and more especially during the Era above distinguished from the Brothers Grimm in 1812-14 down to 1887. The Folk-poesy Theories of the Grimms, the Philological Theories of Adalbert Kuhn and Max Müller, the Metaphysical Theories, the Anthropological Theories, the Theories of the Demonologists, Schwartz, Mannhardt, Lang, etc., the Ancestral-ghost Theories of Herbert Spencer, Lippert, etc., the Theories of the so-called Kakodemonists and Eudemonists, etc., are all subjected to such a severe, yet candid, criticism as to convince all readers, I should

<sup>a</sup> *Waifs and Strays*, I. Intro. xvi.

<sup>b</sup> *Culte and Mythen*, Kap. I.

think, save those criticised, and even perhaps some of them, that there is but partial, and, it may be, but very partial, truth in any one of these theories. Nor, as I venture to think, can more be said of Gruppe's own theory save on one point;<sup>a</sup> nor of the theories, either implicit or explicit, even of such important works for their facts as those of Mr. Frazer and Mr. Hartland, published since Gruppe's work—*The Golden Bough* in 1890, and *The Legend of Perseus* in 1894-96. Must we then conclude from such results of criticism that the problem of the origin of Myth and Religion is insolvable? 'Das verschlossene Wesen des Universums hat keine Kraft in sich welche dem Muthe des Erkennens Widerstand leisten könnte.'<sup>b</sup> Our more reasonable conclusion will, I think, be simply, that the problem must be attacked from some new and higher point of view, and that its solution must be aided either by some newly discovered, or more duly considered, facts.

§ 5. Now, the historical student of larger range is struck by few things more than by the connection which, however unapparent at the time, later events make manifest in the synchronisms of History. Not only Des Brosses, but Hume, was a contemporary of MacPherson; and synchronous with *Fingal, an Ancient Epic Poem* (1760) was not only the *Dieux Fétiches* (1760), but the *Natural History of Religion* (1757). A certain connection may be recognised between the two last;

<sup>a</sup> See below, p. 43.

<sup>b</sup> HEGEL, *Encyklopädie, Anrede. Werke*, B. vi., s. xi.

but could any books be named apparently more unconnected than these last and the first? Yet, as we have just seen, the New Era of Folklore Research initiated by MacPherson was succeeded by one of which the aim has become less and less distinguishable from that of Hume's *Natural History of Religion*; while the method of at least one of the Schools of this later Era has been identical with that of the *Dieux Fétiches* of Des Brosses. Quite independently, however, have the two movements, initiated respectively by Hume and by MacPherson, hitherto proceeded. Taken in conjunction with the *Treatises* in which Hume set forth his theory of Causation (1738-48), those in which his theory of the Natural History of Religion was either suggested, as in his *Dialogues*, or outlined, as in his *Essay* (1754-57), gave rise to a New Era in that great movement of philosophic thought initiated by Bodin in his *Methodus* (1566) and *Republic* (1576)—that great movement of which the aim has been a Philosophy of History. But of this splendid philosophic effort, the chief, perhaps the only ideas which have, as yet, been, not stated merely, but more and more clearly verified, seem to be these three. The first is the idea of the central Law of History as a law of the historical development of Thought, or, more definitely, as a law of the historical development of the conception of Causes. The second of these two ideas is that of a certain Differentiation and Reintegration as the logical form of thought, and this, whether observed in the

n | large process of the historical development of Thought, or in every elementary process of individual Thought. And the third is the idea of the correlation of all Social Laws, and hence of the importance of the discovery of any one, and particularly of that of the development of Historic Thought. To Turgot, and more especially to Hume, we chiefly owe the first; to Fichte, and more especially to Hegel, the second; and though we do not chiefly owe to Comte, but rather to the naturalist Cuvier, the third of these ideas, it is with Comte's name that, in its application to History, it may be chiefly associated. Beyond these ideas, the Philosophy of History has hardly, perhaps, as yet, made any considerable advance. And hence, exceedingly difficult must be the great task of the Rev. Professor Flint in attempting to give a detailed, interesting, and impartial survey of the History of the Philosophy of History, which shall not be open to the charge that one cannot see the trees—the three or four, or, at most, half-dozen giant oaks—for the wood, much of it but mere brushwood, that surrounds them.

M' | § 6. For no more than did Hume, or Hegel, or Comte, do any of their successors as yet appear to have verifiably solved two Problems, without the solution of which no important advance can be made beyond those three ideas which I have just defined. The first of these Problems may be stated in the Question: *What is the main objective condition of the origin of progressive Social Organization, or Civilization?*

And the second of these Problems may be stated in this further Question : *What is the main subjective condition of the origin of progressive Philosophic Thought, or Ratiocination?* That the first of these Problems is not as yet solved—or is not, as yet, generally admitted to be solved—will be evident on considering the admittedly unsatisfactory character, not only of each of the past, but of the presently current theories, of the origin of Civilization—(1) the *Family-Origin* Theories of Plato and Aristotle; after the long night of the Christian Dark Ages, (2) the Sixteenth Century *Conquest-Origin* Theory of Bodin; (3) the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century *Social Contract-Origin* Theories of Hooker, Grotius, Hobbes, and Locke, etc., to Rousseau; and (4) those theories now of Dr. Tylor, Sir John Lubbock, and Mr. Spencer, which may be distinguished as the *Savage-Origin* Theories of Civilization, doubt of which becomes more and more general, as knowledge of the results of Assyriological and Egyptological research becomes more and more diffused. But to admit that this First Problem is not, as yet, satisfactorily solved is implicitly to admit that the Second is also, as yet, similarly unsolved. For unless we have some tolerably definite and verifiable knowledge of the main objective condition of the Origin of progressive Social Organization, we can evidently have neither definite nor verifiable knowledge of the main subjective condition of the Origin of the progressive Philosophic Thought, which has unquestionably been, if a determined, a determining

correlate of progressive Social Organization. Besides, however, such implicit, there is explicit and conclusive evidence of the non-solution of the Second of these Problems in the disputes still about a Primitive Fetichism, Innate Ideas, and a Primitive Revelation.

§ 7 *a*. It is by the aim, to which recognition of these two defects in the New Philosophy of History give rise, that these New Folklore Researches are distinguished. For when it is seen that these two great Problems—the Origin of progressive Social Organization, and the Origin of progressive Philosophic Thought—are not as yet satisfactorily solved, it must be evident, on reflection, that, until these General Problems are verifiably solved, there can be no adequate solution of the Special Problems of Folklore and Mythology—such Problems as those of the origin, the diffusion, and the relations of Folk- and Culture-myths, and of Folk- and Culture-expressions generally. To solve, or at least to contribute to the solution of these larger Historical Problems, is, therefore, the clearly defined aim which may, perhaps, justify my calling these studies New Folklore Researches. The discovery of the Origins of Civilization must, indeed, be primarily drawn from the results of historical, archæological, and ethnological research. But Folklore Research will afford a most important deductive verification of whatever hypothesis we may have been led to by these other researches, if it can be shown that this hypothesis serves to explain unsolved problems of Folklore, as

also of Folk-custom. Such deductive verifications of our hypothesis as to the Origins of Civilization will be found in the solution of the problems of Myth-Origin and Diffusion suggested in the essay on the *Science of Folklore*, which serves as Introduction to the First Set of these New Folklore Researches. And a similar verification will be suggested in the solution offered of the Problem dealt with in the Second Set of these Researches, that, namely, on *Amazonian Matriarchy*.

§ 7 b. But though it is on historical and ethnological research that we must chiefly rely for the solution of the problem of the Origin of progressive Social Organization, or Civilization, it is otherwise with regard to the problem of the Origin of progressive Philosophic Thought, or Ratiocination. What the solution of the former of these problems would appear to be, I have already indicated, and will, in the above referred-to *Introduction*, have occasion more fully to state. The Origin of progressive Social Organization, or Civilization, has been found in a Conflict of Higher White and Lower Coloured and Black Races; hence, not, as currently believed, in a spontaneous development from Savagery; but in such a conflict between Races with Higher and Lower aptitudes as, in its economic consequences, gave to the former the most favourable conditions for the development of its aptitudes. But if progressive Social Organization, or Civilization, has thus not originated in a spontaneous development from Savagery, neither certainly has pro-

W

10 ( |  
gressive Philosophic Thought, or Ratiocination. If the former has in a Conflict of Higher and Lower Races, the latter must have originated in a Conflict of Higher and Lower Conceptions. And just as a survey of the history of Civilization appears to verify such an induction as to its origin, so does a survey of the history of Ratiocination appear to verify such an hypothesis as to its origin likewise. For the more we penetrate into the facts of the historical conceptions of things, the more we see that our histories of Religions, of Literatures, and of Philosophies give us, for the most part, only facts of culture-conceptions; and but indications only of quite different Folk-conceptions, which, however, are constantly making themselves felt in their reactions against these culture-conceptions. But if progressive Philosophic Thought, or Ratiocination, originated in a conflict of higher and lower conceptions, how are these to be distinguished? It is on Folklore Research—on the most careful collecting, classifying, and comparing of the conceptions of the Folk, either, like Savage Peoples, wholly, or almost wholly, uninfluenced by Culture, or of Lower Classes only partially so influenced—that we must chiefly rely for the solution of this Problem. It is Greek and Keltic Folk-poesy that I have chiefly studied with a view to the definition of these higher and lower conceptions; with a view, therefore, to the discovery of such a Law of Historic Thought as is possible only if the main conditions of the origin of



its development can be verifiably defined; and hence, with a view to deductive solutions of such problems as may thus, but cannot otherwise be solved. In the Prefaces respectively to *Greek Folk-poesy*, and to *Keltic Folk-poesy*, I shall point out the special importance of the study of each with respect to this General Problem. And in the terminal Essays of these First and Third Sets respectively of our new *Folklore Researches*—in Essays on *The Survival of Paganism*, and *The Folk-sources of Romance*, I shall state the conclusions to which study of these most ancient and important of all West Aryan Folk-poesies may appear to lead with respect to this great problem of Thought-origins, of which the solution is the *sine quâ non* of discovery of an ultimate Law of History.

§ 7 c. To recall what I said in the opening paragraph of this *General Preface*, and to sum up. It was suggested that, dating from that Revolution of the Sixth Century B.C., common to both Asia and Europe, European-Asian History may be divided into clearly marked Half-millennial Periods, and that each of these has been distinguished by special interactions between Folklore and Culture-lore. But up to this fourth century of the fifth of these Half-millennial Periods the collecting of Folklore has, in general, been entirely unscientific in its method, and when collected it has been used in general merely for the purposes of Religion and of Poesy. If we except Aristotle, it was by the Grimms, in the beginning of this century, that

Folklore was first collected with scientific method, and used for scientific purposes. And as the Special Problems for the solution of which Folklore has been studied, when scientifically studied at all, appear to have been found insoluble by direct attack, it is now proposed both to collect and to use it with a view to the solution of certain Historical Problems, not only because they are as yet unsolved by the Philosophy of History, but because it would appear that it is only from the solution of these General Problems that adequate solutions can be deduced of the Special Problems of Mythology and Folklore.

J. S. S.-G.

1884-1896.





## NEW FOLKLORE RESEARCHES.

### I.

### GREEK FOLK-POESY.

#### P R E F A C E.

§ 1. OF the Σύλλογη Δημωδῶν Ἀσμάτων τῆς Ἠπείρου, by the late Dr. Aravandinos of Ioánnina, presented to me in the autumn of 1880 by a Greek friend at Corfu under the circumstances mentioned in the sequel,<sup>a</sup> I found myself able to read but little. So difficult to one hitherto a student only of the Greek Classics, are the Dialects of these Songs, with their riddles of Grecized foreign words, their poverty of grammatical forms, and their puzzles of contractions and elisions of every kind. But on discovering, at a later period, that Miss Garnett could read more or less easily what I could make so

<sup>a</sup> In the opening paragraph of *The Survival of Paganism*, vol. ii. p. 467.

little of, I urged her to turn this exceptional knowledge to some account. We projected, therefore, so long ago as 1882, a little book of translations from Aravandinos under some such title as that of *Songs of Epeiros*; and, in 1883, I sent some specimens of these translations to my old Master, the late Professor Blackie, the first scholar in this country who insisted on the closeness of Modern to Ancient Greek, and the first who advocated the study of Greek, not as a dead, but as a still living Language. The humblest projects, however, become not unfrequently greatly enlarged. Our project of a booklet of Folk-songs limited in its scope to a selection of those of Epeiros became enlarged to that of a book giving as complete a view as possible of all the various phases of Greek Folk-life, and drawn not only from Epeiros and such a single source as Aravandinos, but also from Thessaly and Macedonia, and thus from all the provinces of 'Ἡ Δούλη Ἑλλάς, 'Enslaved Hellas,' and a corresponding variety of sources. Thus enlarged in scope, and with an Introduction on *The Survival of Paganism*, the first edition of these *Greek Folk-songs* was printed in 1884<sup>a</sup>, and, after certain difficulties, published in 1885 (Elliot Stock). A second edition was published in 1888 (Ward and Downey) with an additional essay by myself on *The Science of Folklore*, which considerations of expense had prevented my publishing with

<sup>a</sup> Hence it is from this year that I date these New Folklore Researches.

the first edition. And now, this second edition of *Greek Folk-songs* having been long since sold out, we present two volumes of *Greek Folk-poesy*, of which the first contains nearly twice as much Verse-poesy—Idylls, Songs, and Ballads—as did *Greek Folk-songs*, and the second is an entirely new volume of Prose-poesy—Tales, Stories, and Legends—arranged in the same classes as the Verse-poesy; while the area of collection of the originals embraces not only the Provinces of ‘Enslaved Hellas,’ but the whole of the Ottoman Empire, and also the Greek Kingdom, and our sources, therefore, are now of the almost exhaustive variety indicated in the appended Bibliography.

§ 2. It may be desirable briefly to indicate the results of research which led to this great enlargement of the scope and contents of our Collection of Greek Folk-poesy. The explorations and studies, in 1880 and 1881, at the outset of which I was presented with the *Ἀσµατὰ τῆς Ἠπείρου*, led, first of all, to the conviction that it was the Northern Greece of those Sanctuaries of Dodona, of Olympos, and of Samothrace—which, in the then anarchic condition of the country, I reached with so much difficulty, yet at each of which I managed to spend so considerable a period—that was, after all, the true Ancient Hellas, as was, indeed, affirmed both by Homer<sup>a</sup> and Aristotle.<sup>b</sup> After my explorations, more particularly at Dodona, and studies at Ioánnina, the Kuhn-Müller explanation of Hellenic

<sup>a</sup> *Il.*, ii. 634-5.

<sup>b</sup> *Meteor.*, i. 14.

No. 13

Mythology from the *Vedas* seemed impossible, and Hellenic Mythology seemed much more probably derivable from the pre-Aryan Civilizations of which I found so many traces, and with which the Western Aryans probably first came into contact in these Northern Provinces of Thrace, Macedonia, Thessaly, and Epeiros. But, if so, then the Ancient Civilization of Southern Greece was founded probably by the same 'Pelasgian' race to which the pre-Hellenic Civilization of Northern Greece was due, though, in Tiryns and Mykenai, it reached a greater height of splendour than has been anywhere as yet discovered in Northern Greece. So far, indeed, as it seemed to me, was the Ancient Civilization of Southern Greece from being Hellenic, that it was by the Hellenic Dorians that it was destroyed, and that a condition of Society, so different from that depicted by Homer, was introduced—the condition depicted by Hesiod.<sup>a</sup>

§ 3. But whence came this pre-Hellenic Civilization, and by what race, and under what conditions, was it founded? During a stay of some weeks at 'Lárisa of the Pelasgians,' towards the end of 1880, the fact that a long line, or rather a broad belt, of Larissas, or Lar'sas, connects those of Greece and Italy with Lársa, one of the most ancient cities of Chaldea, appeared to me to have a significance which had not yet been duly appreciated. Hence, as soon as I

<sup>a</sup> See my *Origin of the Classic Civilizations*, *Trans. Cong. of Orientalists*, 1892, vol. ii., pp. 486, 487.

returned to England, I resumed previous studies of the conditions of the origin of what, so far as we know, were the Primary Civilizations of Chaldea and Egypt. And of these studies the general results were these three. First, the main determining condition of the origin of these Primary Civilizations was a Conflict of Higher White, but non-Semitic and non-Aryan, Races with Lower Coloured and Black Races. Secondly, the study of the origin and history of Civilization must be swung round to an absolutely new standpoint, with the most revolutionary results in all directions—the standpoint of the Primary Civilizations of Chaldea and Egypt. And, thirdly, the Semitic and West Aryan Civilizations certainly, and the Chinese and East Aryan Civilizations probably,<sup>a</sup> and all other Civilizations possibly, were either directly or indirectly derived from these Primary Civilizations under a similar general condition of Conflict to that in which these Primary Civilizations themselves originated; but a Conflict, in the case of the Semites and Aryans, rather between culturally than racially Lower and Higher Races—culturally Lower Races who assimilated and transformed the Civilizations of culturally Higher Races.

§ 4. It would be irrelevant here to say more of this

<sup>a</sup> It is to the late Professor Terrien de Lacouperie that we chiefly owe demonstration of the connection of the Chinese with the Chaldean Civilization; and his death, from want of due means of subsistence, is one of the many similar scandals that excite as yet, alas! in our plutocratic society, but powerless indignation.

H.B.

H.B.

H.B.

General Theory of the Origin of Civilizations, Primary and Derivative. I proceed, therefore, to point out, though very briefly, some of the more important deductions with respect to Folklore which were naturally suggested by this General Theory. The first of these was that, if this Theory were found verifiable, one of the two chief defects would be corrected which, as I have pointed out in the *General Preface*, at present exist in current Philosophies of History. And a further deduction was that, if the Problems of Folklore, which are more or less admittedly insolvable on the assumptions of the current Theory of the Origins of Civilization, were found solvable on the assumptions of this new Theory of these Origins, we should be furnished with very important deductive verifications of this Theory. In order to this, however, nothing less was required than a reconstitution of the Science of Folklore. For this Science, so far as it can be at present said to exist, is based on a Theory of the Origins of Civilization which, if it does not explicitly deny, entirely ignores those later results of Assyriological and Egyptological Research from which is derived the Theory which I have ventured to propose. And hence it was necessary that, in the *Introduction* to this First Set of these New Folklore Researches, I should attempt to indicate the Principles, the Method, and the Results of a Science of Folklore based on this New Theory of the Origins of Civilization. What will now be suggested as the Principles of the Science of



---

Folklore will simply be the generalisations of this New Historical Theory. From these generalisations the Method of the Science will be deduced. And then, those solutions of Folklore Problems will be indicated which offer themselves for verification as deductions from the generalisations here assumed, but elsewhere, as I venture to think, proved.

§ 5. Another defect in current Philosophies of History, besides that of unverifiable theories of the Origin of progressive Social Organization, or Civilization, was pointed out in the *General Preface*—the want, namely, of a verified and generally accepted theory as to the Origin of progressive Philosophic Thought, or Ratiocination. But it was also pointed out that if, as we were led to conclude, the former had originated in a Conflict of higher and lower Races, the latter must have originated in a Conflict of higher and lower Conceptions; and that it was on Folklore Research that we must chiefly rely if we would attain a verifiable definition of these higher and lower Conceptions. It was the aim at a more assured solution of this Problem, no less important for the Science of History generally, than for the special Science of Folklore, that has led to the enlargement, above noted, of the scope and contents of this Collection of Greek Folk-poesy. For, as I went through these Greek Folk-songs with Miss Garnett in the deliberate way required by our attempt to give scrupulously literal and metrical translations, I was more and more struck by the extra-

N.B.

ordinarily little influence that appears to have been exercised upon them by Christian conceptions, and by the extraordinarily marked difference between the Folk-conceptions of the Greek peasants, and the Culture-conceptions of the Greek priests. Long domination by such Culture-conceptions as those of Christianity might, indeed, have naturally been expected to destroy almost everything distinctive in the Folk-conceptions submitted for two millenniums to so powerful an influence. But as, so far from having been destroyed, these Greek Folk-conceptions were found to present still all the most characteristic features of Paganism, it seemed that, in order to the solution of the Problem above stated, I could take up the study of no Folklore more likely to have fruitful results than that of Greek Folk-poesy. And to this I was further moved by the remarkable parallels discovered between Greek and Keltic Folk-poesy, and by the hope of being able to supplement my present collection and study of monuments of the former by a similar collection and study of monuments of the latter—the only other West Aryan Folk-poesy which rivals that of the Greeks in age and historic importance.

§ 6. As fully pointed out in the *Introduction*, Literature must thus be regarded as including both Oral and Written Literature, both Folk-lore and Culture-lore. And in order to that comparative study of Folk- and Culture-conceptions required for the solution of the above-stated Problem, such a Natural

---

Classification of the different departments of Folk-lore and Culture-lore is required as will make possible a scientific comparison of the conceptions expressed in the one with those expressed in the other. My first work, therefore, as Editor of this Collection of pieces representative of every department of Greek Folk-poesy, was to classify them in accordance with the principles stated in the *Introduction*. No less important, however, did I esteem the duty of ensuring, by careful and repeated revisions of the Translations, a scrupulously close rendering both of the spirit and letter of the Originals; and as to the character of the Englishing, our aim has been to make it as simple as possible, and dialectic only in occasional touches. Miss Garnett's Footnotes and Annotations I have also revised, adding to them here and there; but I have not thought it necessary to indicate these Editorial additions, save where they refer to personal experiences of travel. With reference to the Translations, Miss Garnett desires me to express her thanks to all the correspondents from whom she has received loans of books, answers to queries, or other assistance. The veteran French scholar, to whom the study of Greek Literature, in both its Folk- and Culture-lore, is so greatly indebted, M. Émile Legrand, she especially desires to thank for the valuable aid he has rendered, not only in supplying information from the vast stores of his erudition, but in generously placing at her disposal the hitherto unpublished Originals, in MS. or proof, of a large number of

pieces; to the well-known Greek author, M. Demetrios Bikelas, Miss Garnett desires also to acknowledge her obligations for the important Collections of Greek Folklore he has kindly lent her for so long a period, and also for the helpful interest he has taken in her work for the last dozen years; and to Mr. Alfred Nutt both she and I must gratefully record our thanks for the gift, or loan, of a little library of books on Keltic Folklore.

§ 7. In *Greek Folk-songs*, the first lines of the Originals of the various pieces were given in order that scholars might have an opportunity of judging for themselves both as to the character of the Dialects, and the accuracy of the Translations. Considerations of expense, however—the number of pieces in the present Folk-verse volume having been so greatly increased—have made it impossible to print so much Greek—such works as this being, in any case, the reverse of remunerative. But specimens of the Dialects not having been thus given, a Note on their Characteristics seemed all the more desirable for those who might wish to know something of the Language in which these Songs are composed. And for those who might be struck, as I have been, with the Paganism of the sentiments and ideas expressed, something more seemed also desirable. For, considering the relations between Language and the Thought which it expresses, the question might naturally arise whether the degree of change in the Language corresponds with the degree of change in the Thought. This led to con-

---

verting my original 'Note on the Characteristics of Greek Folk-speech' into but the central Section of an *Excursus*, of which the first Section attempts a summary indication of the stages of the past development of Greek, and the third Section ventures on remarks on the burning question of the direction to be given to the future development of Greek—whether towards a re-Atticizing, or a popularizing, of the Literary Language. How closely connected are discussions of the past, and the future, development of Greek with the subject of Greek Folk-speech will, I trust, be found sufficiently evident to justify such an extension of my original Note. Here, therefore, I shall only say that all these questions are treated from the point of view, not only of my General Conflict Theory, but of that Theory (which I stated nearly a quarter of a century ago in *The New Philosophy of History*, 1873) of the Sixth Century B.C. as the true Epoch of the Origin of the Modern Civilizations, and of the Half-millennial Periods distinguishable since then in European, and indeed also in Asian, History. And hence I would hope that this *Excursus* on Greek Folk-speech may, in some degree, add to the proof, or at least illustration, of both these Theories. I cannot, however, conclude my reference to this *Excursus* without an expression of my grateful acknowledgments to the distinguished Greek whose pen-name is 'Αργυρής 'Εφταλιότης, not only for the loan of the *Études de Philologie néo-grecque* of his friend M. Jean

Psichari, but also for an introduction to that eminent philologist and literary leader, to whose correspondence, as well as works, I have been greatly indebted.

§ 8. Finally as to *The Survival of Paganism*, the general conclusion to this First Set of Folklore Researches. Under this title I have summarized the results of studies of every class of Greek Folk-poesy both in verse and in prose—Idylls and Tales, Songs and Stories, Ballads and Legends—in their bearing on the solution of the Second of those two great Historical problems above stated—the Problem of defining the characteristics of Folk-, in their relation to Culture-conceptions, and hence, of the conditions of the origin of Philosophic Thought, or Ratiocination. A Theory of the origin and history of Civilization as the result of a Conflict between Races or Classes, ethnically, culturally, or economically distinguishable as Higher and Lower, naturally leads to a Theory of the origin and development of Ratiocination as the result of a Conflict of Folk- and Culture-conceptions—a Conflict seen in the historic interactions of Religions, Literatures, and Philosophies. I venture to think that great light will thus be found to be thrown, not only on the origins of Religions and Philosophies; but also on the actualities of Belief as distinguished from conventional assumptions with respect to it; and, indeed, on the whole process of the development of Religious and Philosophic Ideas. Progress has been variously conceived, but perhaps in no way more falsely than as a direct advance. Our

M.B.

consideration of the Conflict of Folk- and Culture-Conceptions in *The Survival of Paganism* will show that Progress is a very much more complicated process than that. Yet we may find reason to believe that the Racial and Economic Conflicts which constitute the History of Civilization may have a far-off, yet perhaps, at length, not unattained, goal in a *voluntary* Co-operation of human Capacities working together, each within its due limits, for the Common Good. And so, we may also find reason to believe that the Conflicts of Folk- and Culture-conceptions which constitute the History of Thought may have a far-off, yet perhaps at length, not unattained, goal in a *true* World-consciousness.

§ 9. Previous criticisms, however, warn me that the mere mention of such ideas in connection with a book of Folk-poesy may appear to some minds highly incongruous and out of place. Be it so. The authors of these criticisms, even though unburdened with scientific aims, have given no such proof, so far as I am aware, of capacity for enjoying Folk-poesy merely as Folk-poesy, as has been given by the years of labour expended on these Translations—though aims were certainly kept in view other than that of mere sympathetic enjoyment of what I found in the Originals—the spontaneous revelation of the very heart of a people in all its ideas, sentiments, and memories. Indeed, it was just my profound sympathy with the Greek Folk-life thus expressed that made so especially

welcome the kind terms in which Mr. Gladstone acceded to Miss Garnett's request to be permitted to dedicate to him these volumes. How far he may assent to, or dissent from the views I have ventured to put forth, I do not know; though, as he himself was one of the first scholars to show the importance of Ethnology in its bearings on Mythology, I cannot but hope that he may view with some favour my theory of the Conflict of Races. But apart altogether from the theories outlined in my Essays, it seemed to me that a work, of which by far the greater part deals, not with theories, but with the facts of Greek Folk-thought, Folk-sentiment, and Folk-memory, could be to no one dedicated more fitly—and seeing especially that, in Macedonia and Crete, there is still a Δούλη"Ελλας—than to a scholar of Mr. Gladstone's special attainments, and a statesman of his special renown. I felt certain also that no acceptance of the Dedication would be more gratefully appreciated ὑπό τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀπάντων than Mr. Gladstone's—and it is, indeed, to a Hellene, Dr. Valetta, that I am indebted for the Greek version of our Dedication. Nor is there but another point of fitness added by the fact of Mr. Gladstone's Keltic descent. For, considering the relations of Greeks and Kelts in the Classical Period, it is curious to remark that the most distinguished of English-speaking Philhellenes—the most distinguished of those who, in our Modern Period, have sought to deliver from



---

bondage 'Beauty, the daughter of the King of Greece,'  
*Aillidh, Nighean Rìgh na Gréige*—have, almost all, had  
in their veins a more than usual proportion of the  
Keltic blood which is common to the whole Britannic  
Race.

J. S. S.-G.

HASLEMERE, *May* 19, 1896.





## INTRODUCTION.

---

*'Antiquitates, seu historiarum reliquæ, sunt tanquam tabulæ naufragii; cum deficiente et fere submersa rerum memoria, nihilominus homines industrii et sagaces . . . ex . . . proverbiiis, traditionibus, archivis et instrumentis tam publicis quam privatis . . . nonnulla a temporibus diluvio eripiunt et conservant.'*—BACON, *De Augmentis*, lib. ii., cap. 6.

*'Neque pro nihilo æstimandum, quod per longinquas navigationes et peregrinationes (quæ sæculis nostris increbuerunt) plurima in natura patuerint et reperta sint, quæ novam philosophicæ lucem immittere possint. Quin et turpe hominibus foret, si globi materialis tractus, terrarum videlicet, marium, astrorum, nostris temporibus immensum aperti et illustrati sint; globi autem intellectualis fines inter veterum inventa et augustias cohibeantur.'*—*Novum Organum*, lxxxiv.

---

## THE SCIENCE OF FOLKLORE.

INTRODUCTION

The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been named in the preceding pages of this book. The names are given in the order in which they appear in the text. The names are given in the order in which they appear in the text. The names are given in the order in which they appear in the text.

THE CHANGE OF POLKING



## THE SCIENCE OF FOLKLORE.

---

WE have seen, in the *General Preface* to these New Folklore Researches, that a complete anarchy at present exists in current theories of Folklore and Mythology; and also—what is always the first step in the reduction of anarchy to order—the cause of that anarchy. For, directing our attention from the present discordant theories of Folklore to that great movement towards a New Philosophy of History, which has run parallel with the development of Folklore Studies, we found ourselves obliged to recognise in it two great defects, of which the first was the want of a verifiable theory of the Origins of Civilization. And as verifiable theories of Folklore and Mythology must necessarily be founded on some verifiable general Theory of History, the cause became at once apparent of the anarchy admitted by Folklorists themselves—or by, at least, the most distinguished of them. Then, in the special *Preface* to this First Set of New Folklore Researches, it was indicated that the chief result of my eighteen months of exploration in Northern Greece, and of the subsequent studies which led to the correction, development, and verification of the historical hypotheses suggested in the course of these explorations, was a New Theory of

the Origin of Civilizations, Primary and Derivative. Whether this New Theory of the Origins of Civilization will be ultimately verified may still appear questionable, unable as I have yet been to submit to criticism more than mere samples of the facts of which it is a generalization. Sufficiently verified, however, I trust it may appear to justify me in stating it as the basis of a reconstitution of the Science of Folklore. For to do this will be, in fact, to submit the Theory to the most definite and crucial tests.

## SECTION I.

### THE NEW GENERALIZATIONS OF HISTORICAL THEORY.

§ 1. Foregoing further allusion than I have already made, in the *General Preface*, to the Classical, the Sixteenth, the Seventeenth, and the Eighteenth Century Theories of the Origins of Civilization, I shall, before proceeding to state the New Theory which I would propose as the basis of the Science of Folklore, confine myself to but a brief characterization of those current views which may be generally distinguished as Theories of the Savage Origins of Civilization. The theories, all essentially similar, of Dr. Tylor, Sir John Lubbock, and Mr. Spencer, have in common these three characteristics. In speculating on the Origins of Civilization—or of ‘Political Forms and Forces’<sup>a</sup>—they all start from the conception of an unorganized horde of savages, and hence, from the assumption not only that savages may independently raise themselves, but that ‘various races have independently raised themselves

<sup>a</sup> SPENCER, *Principles of Sociology, Political Institutions*, v.

from utter barbarism.'<sup>a</sup> The second characteristic of these theories which is, indeed, implied in their above-defined starting-point is, that 'it is both possible and desirable to eliminate considerations of hereditary varieties or races of men, and to treat mankind as homogeneous in nature.'<sup>b</sup> And, in further accordance with such assumptions, these current theories, and Mr. Spencer's, no less than the others, are all characterized by either vague or unverifiable assumptions as to internal Capacities, and insistance chiefly on the external Conditions by which 'the Higher Culture has gradually been developed or evolved out of the Savage State.'<sup>c</sup>

Such are the assumptions which at present form the bases of Folklore Studies. It is, however, between eighty and ninety years since Niebuhr affirmed that 'no single savage race could be named which has risen independently to civilization.'<sup>d</sup> And it was complacently imagined by Archbishop Whately that this affirmation left us no option but that either of disproving, as seemed impossible, the truth of Niebuhr's assertion, or of believing that Civilization had a supernatural origin.<sup>e</sup>

Now, it must be admitted that the century, nearly, of research since the publication of Niebuhr's *Römische Geschichte* has in no way disproved his assertion, but has, on the contrary, enabled us to repeat it with no less assurance, and with incomparably greater evidence

<sup>a</sup> LUBBOCK, *Origin of Civilization*, p. 479.

<sup>b</sup> TYLOR, *Primitive Culture*, vol. i., p. 6.

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. i., p. 28.

<sup>d</sup> 'Kein einziges Beyspiel von einem wirklich wilden Volk aufzuweisen ist, welches frey zur Cultur übergegangen wäre.'—*Römische Geschichte*, Theil i., s. 88 (1811).

<sup>e</sup> Compare his *Origin of Civilization*, and his *Political Economy*, p. 68.

of its truth, than was in his day possible. For not only is it the fact that there is no example of a savage people raising themselves independently to civilization, but the theories founded on the assumption of such independent development are now more or less candidly admitted to be incapable of giving any satisfactory solution of the chief problems presented to the student of Folklore. Are we then forced, after all, to the Archbishop's presumed only alternative—that of a supernatural origin of Civilization? By no means. And I shall now proceed to summarize those new results of historical, and particularly of ethnological, research which appear to suggest a new theory of the Origins of Civilization, and hence a new basis for the Science of Folklore.

§ 2. This new theory of the Origins of Civilization is a generalization of the following three sets of facts mainly.<sup>a</sup> The first set of facts are those which overthrow altogether the current commonplaces, by our actions belied, about the Equality of Human Races.<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> This Theory I first fully stated in 1887, in papers read at the April meeting of the Royal Historical Society, and the September meeting of the British Association, and afterwards published in full or in abstract in their respective *Transactions*. I had, however, partially stated the Theory in previous publications—only a development, as it is, of my *New Philosophy of History* published in 1873. And, with reference to this Theory, I have, since 1887, both written Papers published in the *Transactions* of the International Congresses of Orientalists, the *Transactions* of the International Folklore Congress, the *Archæological Review*, *Folklore*, and other Periodicals, and delivered Lectures (*The Conflict of Races: a New Theory of the Origins of Civilization*) at the Philosophical Institution, Edinburgh, reported in the *Scotsman* from November, 1893, to January, 1894.

<sup>b</sup> This Equality doctrine I disputed with the late Mr. Buckle more than thirty years ago (*Pilgrim-Memories*, pp. 338-40). Already, however, DE GOBINEAU had published his *Inégalité des Races Humaines*, 1853-55, and POTT his *Ungleichheit der Menschlichen Rassen*, 1856. But, opposed as their conclusions were to current ideas, their works had but little vogue, and I was not, till long after their publication, even aware of their existence.



Though there is nothing we hear of more frequently in the School of Messrs. Spencer and Tylor than 'Primitive Man,' yet the fact is that, in the very earliest ages to which anthropological evidence goes back we find at least two different, and intellectually unequal Species, or Races of Primitive Man. Of these the lower is better distinguished as the Spy or Neanderthal than, as by Hamy and De Quatrefages, as the Cannstadt type, while the Higher is commonly referred to as the Cromagnon type.<sup>a</sup> Both appear to have lived in the Pleistocene Period;<sup>b</sup> yet these probably co-existing species differed from each other in cranial type as well as in stature, even more than Whites now differ from Blacks; and there is even less evidence to show that one of these types was derived from the other than there is to show that the Neolithic was a descendant of the Palæolithic Man.<sup>c</sup> Besides, we find that, when once a Race is definitely formed, it becomes through heredity analogous to a Species, and is marked henceforth not only by the most extraordinarily persistent physical features, but by no less extraordinarily persistent moral characteristics and intellectual capacities. And just as, during infancy, there is very little difference between the brain-weight of Man and the higher Apes, and after maturity very great difference; so it is, though not to an equal degree, when we compare the brain-weights respectively of the infant and the adult White and Negro.<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> See their *Crania Ethnica*.

<sup>b</sup> See GEIKIE, *Prehistoric Europe*, p. 559.

<sup>c</sup> *Prehistoric Europe*, p. 379; and compare AGASSIZ, *De l'Espèce et des Classifications*, as cited by Le Bon, *L'Homme et les Sociétés*, t. i., pp. 179-80.

<sup>d</sup> See WIEDERHEIM, *Der Bau der Menschen*. It has been translated by Mr. Bernard.

H. ex.

This, of course, arises from the earlier closing of the cranial sutures in the one than in the other Race or Species. Hence, instead of the Cromagnon being a descendant of the Neanderthal Man, or the White being a descendant of the Negro, each may have been descended, I will not say from a different 'Species,' but from a different 'Precursor.' Which, then, of these two kinds of Man is to be regarded as the 'Primitive Man' of these Theorists? If both are so to be regarded, how, with brain-pans and therefore brains so extraordinarily different, could they both have had identical notions about things? And, indeed, how generally can the extravagant postulate of Mental Identity, which goes with that of Equality, be seriously maintained in face of that fact of a *hundred* unrelated 'Stock Languages,' which alone would appear sufficient to limit Mental Identity to but the most general characteristics?<sup>a</sup>

§ 3a. So far as to *Equality*, the unjustified assumption of current Theories; and as to *Inequality*, the verified postulate of the new Theory. And I proceed now to indicate the central set of facts on which this New Theory of Social Origins is founded. It may be conveniently subdivided into three groups. The first group of facts are those which, verifying Niebuhr's assertion above referred to, demonstrate that the 'external factors' on which Mr. Spencer, Sir John Lubbock and Dr. Tylor rely as the efficient conditions of the Origin of Civilization have never alone sufficed for any

<sup>a</sup> See F. MÜLLER, *Grundriss der Sprachwissenschaft*, b. i., s. 77. Among more recent papers on the Origin of Language, see KEITH, *On Pithecanthropus erectus*, etc., *Science Progress*, July, 1895. And compare with the details he gives as to the development of the facial muscles WALLACE'S theory in his article on *The Expressiveness of Speech*, *Fortnightly Review*, October, 1895.

such origin. Endless wars there have been between innumerable savage tribes, under the most multifarious geographical and climatic conditions, without any such result as the foundation of an organized and progressive Society, or Civilization.<sup>a</sup> To this day, and after unnumbered thousands of years of existence, savages are found among whom historical changes have had so little of a progressive character that a Sovereign Power, or Government, fundamental institution as it is of Civilized Society, does not even yet exist.<sup>b</sup> Progress, however, is as essential a characteristic of Societies called Civilized as Multiplication is of Bodies distinguished as Organized. Yet, as Sir Henry Maine remarked nearly forty years ago, 'nothing is more remarkable than the extreme fewness of progressive Societies,' and 'the difference between the stationary and progressive Societies is one of the great secrets which inquiry has yet to penetrate.'<sup>c</sup> What, then, is this secret? What are the special conditions that give rise to this exceptional phenomenon? What is the cause of the origin of an organized and progressive, rather than of such an unorganized and stationary Society as only receives accretions and suffers disintegrations, as does a Stone as distinguished even from a Protozoon? No-where is this fundamental question of Sociology faced by Mr. Spencer. And it must be confessed that a student anxious to find a statement of this problem, and a discovery of its solution, is apt to get somewhat impatient of what he is offered instead—endless illustrations of Von Baer's, which was already, nearly a

<sup>a</sup> For a definition of this term, see below, p. 29.

<sup>b</sup> See, for instance, CURR, *The Australian Race*, vol. i., pp. 51-60; or CODRINGTON, *The Melanesians*, pp. 45-56.

<sup>c</sup> *Ancient Law*, pp. 22, 23 (Second Edition, 1863).

H.B.

H.

century ago, Hegel's, formula of 'differentiation and integration.'<sup>a</sup>

§ 3b. The solution of this fundamental problem of the Origin of progressive Societies, or, in a word, of Civilization, is to be found, I believe, in the following facts: The essential condition of the first Human Co-partnership, that of the Family, was a complementary difference of Capacities; similar was the essential condition of the second degree of Human Co-partnership, that of the Domestication of Animals; and similar also was the essential condition of the third degree of Human Co-partnership, that of the State. For the States, of the origins of which we know anything, appear now to have all arisen from the interaction of two complementarily different Races—an organic interaction which I would compare to that of Cell-elements in their relations to External Conditions. In the Primary Civilizations of Chaldea and Egypt, these complementarily different Races were Higher White and Lower Coloured and Black Races; in the derivative Secondary and Tertiary Civilizations, they were rather culturally than ethnically distinguishable, through the possession by the one, and non-possession by the other of the Arts of Civilization. The evidence of the first of these assertions given by the results of the Assyriological and Egyptological researches of especially the last fifteen years is now, I think I may say, overwhelming; as appears also to be the evidence that the Higher White Races of these Primary Civilizations were non-Semitic and non-Aryan, and, as such, conveniently distinguishable as 'Archaian.'<sup>b</sup> The present

<sup>a</sup> Hegel is said to have taken his *Phenomenologie des Geistes* to the printers the very day of the battle of Jena, 1806.

<sup>b</sup> See *The Ethnology of the White Races* below, p. 14a.

evidence of the second of these assertions varies in amount in different cases: the derivation of the Semitic Civilizations being certain; that of the Chinese and Aryan Civilizations, I think I may say now, almost certain; while there is hardly, perhaps, evidence, as yet, to justify any decided opinion with respect to the derivation of the Higher Element in the conflict in which the Ancient American Civilizations originated. But no more than was the Co-partnership of Domestication was the Higher Co-partnership of Civilization established by War only and Enslavement. Only by sympathies as courageous as profound, and by treatment making life more pleasant to them as well as to their Masters, could fierce and fleet wild Dogs, huge and powerful wild Cattle have been brought into willing and attached Co-partnership with Man.<sup>a</sup> And that it was similarly that Co-partnerships were, in the Primary States, established between Higher and Lower Races, to the advantage of each, is vouched for by all the traditions of the Origin of Civilization. For these are traditions of Colonisation, rather than of Conquest, traditions of the settlement, even as by ourselves to this day, of but a few White men among multitudes of savages.<sup>b</sup>

§ 3c. The third group of what I have distinguished as the central facts on which this New Theory of Social Origins is founded are those which certainly followed as the necessary results of the Settlement of Higher White Races among Lower Coloured and Black Races—given such correlative moral and intellectual differ-

<sup>a</sup> See HAHN, *Die Hausthiere und ihre Beziehungen zur Wirthschaft des Menschen*; and compare MICHELET, *Bible de l'Humanité*, ch. i., *L'Inde. Le Ramayana*.

<sup>b</sup> See my *Traditions of the Archaian White Races—Trans.*, Royal Hist. Soc., New Series, vol. iv., p. 303.

ences between them as to make the rule of the White Colonists and the obedience of the Coloured or Black Natives possible. This psychological condition was, of course, of the first importance. Just as there are Animals which cannot adapt themselves to Domestication, there are men who cannot adapt themselves to Civilization. But that there were the required correlations between the Aborigines of the Nile and Euphrates Valleys and the White Colonists of both, is unquestionable. Not otherwise could Civilizations, of the composite ethnological character of which we have now the fullest evidence, have ever been established in these Sacred Cradlelands. And many contemporary facts testifying to the impression made on Coloured and Black Races by White Settlers, even the rudest and most ignorant, enable us to understand the suggested process of the establishment of Civilization. All the traditions, however—and, though mythical in their forms, they are corroborated by a variety of facts—indicate that the White Colonists of Egypt and Chaldea had already acquired certain arts of Civilization, and probably in Southern Arabia. This would, of course, make easier their subjection of the Natives, and certainly even more by the arts of peace than by those of war. But mark the necessary economic results. Inducing the Aborigines thus to work under direction, the White Colonists would naturally obtain for themselves wealth and leisure. And this leisure, the very conditions of their rule would force them to devote to intellectual work, and especially, as the most practical of all, to those astronomical observations, and that first and greatest of scientific objects, the discovery achievement of which led to prediction of, and hence, power over, the inundations of their great Rivers; made

11. B.

possible a Systematic Agriculture; and led to the institution of regularly recurring Religious Festivals—the discovery of the Year.

§ 4. The third general set of facts on which this Conflict Theory of the Origins of Civilization is founded are those which more immediately apply to the solution of the problem of Myth- and Folklore- similarities. Chaldea and Egypt became not only Twin-centres of the earliest Civilizations known to us; but became Twin-centres of Trade-routes and Commerce; and Twin-centres of the Migration and Colonisation of White Races,<sup>a</sup> carrying in all directions, to the uttermost ends of the Earth, not only the Arts of Civilized life, but the Myths of the Religions through which these Civilizations were mainly established. And the third set of facts, therefore, to which I have here to call attention are those exceedingly varied and exceedingly important results of recent geographical, ethnological, and archaeological research bearing on the Cradlelands of Races, their Migrations, Conquests, and Colonisations; informing as to Land and Sea Trade-routes, Ocean Currents, and Relics of Ancient Shipwrecks; and making us acquainted with the distribution of Megalithic Monuments, of Peculiar Weapons, and of special Artistic Designs, etc. Only on a Map, however, could these facts be set duly forth; and I ventured therefore to urge on the International Folklore Congress of 1891 the preparation of such a Map. For considering these hardly questionable facts of warlike, colonizing, and mercantile expeditions, and of fugitive and other individually adventurous wanderings from the Cradlelands of Civilization, all theories affirming or implying either

<sup>a</sup> See *The Ethnology of the White Races*, below, p. 14a.

11.13.

11.13.

the independent origin of diverse Civilizations, or the independent origin of similar, but peculiar Institutions, such as Matriarchy, or of similar but peculiar Myths and Folk-tales, are hardly worth stating until it has been shown that *hypothetically independent* origins cannot be more verifiably explained as *historically derivative* origins. Undoubtedly we must beware of being led further than facts may warrant by the fascinating vision which thus rises before us of a Unity of Human History grander in the infinity of its correlations and interactions than any yet conceived. But from the results of research above indicated we may be confident that we are, so far, at least, on solid ground. For we have seen that, on the Earth, as in the Heavens, there have certainly been movements, not only from east to west, as formerly believed, but in all directions, east and west, and north and south. Most, if not all of these movements, have not only been directly or indirectly connected with the great centres both of the Primary and of the Secondary Civilizations, but have been going on, not for centuries only, but for millenniums, and probably for, at least, ten millenniums. And as discovery and recognition of the movements of what had been regarded as Fixed Stars renovated the Science of Astronomy, so, I believe, will discovery and recognition of the wonderful hither-and-thither movements of Human Races, and especially of the fertilising White Races, renovate, if not rather indeed create, the Science of Folklore.

§ 5. But a Theory of the Origins of Civilization is but a special application either of an explicit, or—as more generally happens—of an implicit, Theory of Social Evolution. Hence, the verification of the generalizations constituting a theory of Social Origins is to be



found by no means only in such inductive proofs as those furnished by the various sets of ethnological, historical, and other facts above indicated. Due verification requires also such deductive proofs as may be afforded by solutions of unsolved problems, drawn from these generalizations. And it requires finally and fundamentally that these inductive generalizations themselves be found in accordance with deductions from a Theory of Social Evolution, which is a correlate of the Theories of Organic and of Physical Evolution. To attempt, however, such a brief indication of this Ultimate Theory as would accord with my present limits would be futile; and to state at greater length even the outlines of such a Theory would here be irrelevant. That will be my task in another work.<sup>a</sup> It must, therefore, here suffice to say that, as I think, a true Theory of the Origins of Civilization must be capable of being related to the principles of a General Theory of Evolution; and, further, that such a Theory is impossible without a more generally applicable conception of the Internal Elements than that implied in attributing to them qualities of 'Variation' and 'Heredity,' which may be found to be derivative, rather than ultimate.

Hence my opposition to current theories of the Origins of Civilization is grounded not merely on great masses of facts—and with respect especially to the Egyptian and Chaldean Civilizations—which have been, for the most part, ignored by Dr. Tylor, Sir John Lubbock, and Mr. Spencer; but is based on Fundamental Principles more verifiable, as I believe, than those on which Mr. Spencer founds his General Theory of Evolution. Instead of his Principle of the

<sup>a</sup> *Fundamental Principles*—the *General Introduction* to the work, the goal of all the labours of my life—*The Laws of Man's History*.

M.S.

11.13. | 'Persistence of Force'—but a misconception of that of  
 11.13. | the Conservation of Energy<sup>a</sup>—I have proposed the  
 Principle of Coexistence (*Every Existent determines and  
 is determined by Coexistents*). And instead of concep-  
 tions of Matter, Motion, and Force, argued about as  
 separately existing *entities*—though, of course, there is  
 no Matter that is not in motion, nor Motion that is  
 not moving matter, nor Force that is not both Matter  
 and Motion—I have proposed correlative, and, as I  
 trust, verifiable conceptions of the Atom, the Organism,  
 and the State.

No light thing, therefore, is it to propose a Theory  
 of the Origins of Civilization—a Theory of Social  
 Evolution. Profound are the problems—reaching  
 down even to those of the ultimate conceptions of  
 Matter and Mind—the solution, or some approximate  
 solution, of which underlies any such theory of a duly  
 scientific character; and not vast only, but most  
 varied, are the collections of facts necessary for the  
 verification of any adequate theory of the most complex  
 of all the forms of Evolution. But if this has been  
 made in any degree clear, a fine humourousness will  
 certainly strike one in the conceit of a recent writer  
 that a theory of 'Social Evolution' can not only, in  
 despite of Aristotle's famous dictum, be scientifically  
 elaborated without investigation of its *origins*; and so,  
 be knocked-off in the evening leisure of no more than a  
 decade; but can be securely founded on nothing more  
 stable than those notoriously shifting theories of Weis-  
 mann's, which, with all their great qualities, testify  
 more strongly, perhaps, than any other, not indeed to  
 the unverifiableness of the Theory of Evolution, but to  
 the inadequacy of current conceptions of its foundations.

<sup>a</sup> See the criticisms of *e.g.* FLETCHER MOULTON, *British Quarterly*, 1873, and TAIT, *Nature*, 1879-80.

NOTE.

THE ETHNOLOGY OF THE WHITE RACES.

(See above, pp. 9 and 11.)

NOTHING, perhaps, has been more remarkable in the history of Ethnology, during the last dozen years or so, than the more general recognition, not only of the very great variety and world-wide spread of White Races, but of their relation to the history of Civilization. No doubt Pritchard pointed out seventy years ago that there were other White Races than Aryans and Semites, as, for instance, the Georgians, Circassians, etc., to whom he gave the name of Allophyllian Races. No doubt also De Quatrefages thirty years ago extended Pritchard's list of these Allophyllian Races. But no more by De Quatrefages than by Pritchard were the initiators of Civilization in Chaldea and in Egypt included, as recent research has shown that they must be, among what they called the Allophyllian Races. And hence, when I first stated this Conflict Theory, Aryans and Semites were still generally regarded, even by men of science, as the only *civilizing* White Races; while by others than ethnologists, they were regarded as the only *existing* White Races.

In the first full statement of this Theory in April, 1887, I thus defined what I meant by White Races—'By White Races I mean Races with either long or short heads (dolichocephalic or brachycephalic), high noses, unprojecting jaws (orthognathic, rather than prognathic), long hair and beards, and light-coloured skins' (*Traditions of the Archaian White Races, Trans.*, Royal Historical Society, New Series, vol. iv., p. 303). But considering that the 'light colour' of the great number of Races which come under such a general definition may vary from ruddy- or rosy- or colourless-white, through shades innumerable of olive, to ruddy-brown; considering also that their most distinctive characteristic is, not their complexion, but the oval transverse section of their hair, and its abundant growth on the faces of the men as beard; and considering further that, unlike all other Races, their settlements are not confined to any one quarter of the globe, while their place of origin is still uncertain, all the names hitherto given to this remarkable Variety of Mankind seemed to me highly unsatisfactory, nor least so, perhaps, the commonest, that, namely, of *Caucasian*, or *Caucasic*. For in no way is the Variety thus designated specially connected with the Caucasus, though, of course, they are to be found in the Caucasus as in every other region of the earth. I venture, therefore, to propose the term HYPENETIAN, from *Ἰπηνήτης*, 'a bearded man.' For this Variety is distinguished, even in its hybrid Races, from all other Varieties by its being always bearded, and having also such physical and moral characteristics that they have voluntarily made themselves homes in every quarter of the globe.

But I have ventured to propose yet other new ethnological

W.B.  
W.B.

terms. Though the White, or Bearded, Races have shown that they have in them the potential capacity of acting, under fit conditions, as the organizers and rulers of other Races, it is only certain of these White Races who have prominently distinguished themselves by this capacity. It seemed to me, therefore, in working out this theory of the Conflict of Races, very desirable to have a general name for those White Races who, antecedently to either Semite or Aryan, founded more or less developed Civilizations. Without here detailing the serious objections that may be taken to such terms as Hamitic, Kushite, etc., I proposed, in the paper above referred to, the term *Archaian* as a general designation for all the earlier White Races, the initiators of Civilization in Chaldea, and Egypt, in Europe, India, China, and possibly America. We have thus the Primary Civilizations associated with the Archaian White Races; the Derivative and Secondary Civilizations associated with the Semitic White Races; and the also Derivative and Tertiary Civilizations associated with the Aryan White Races. But for the White Races not so prominently associated with the organizing and ruling of other Races, it seems likewise desirable to have general designations. Hence, I would limit *Caucasian* to its natural connotation as a general name for the non-Semitic and non-Aryan White Races of the Caucasus. The White Races of Northern Africa form another distinct subdivision formerly known as *Libyans*, or *Berbers*, and now as *Kabyles*; and with these Berbers the *Iberians* of Western Europe appear to have been connected. To the not unjustly discredited, because hitherto inadequately defined, term *Turanian* I would give such a definite connotation as would exclude all but the non-Semitic and non-Aryan White Races of, or immigrants from, Central Asia, like the *Uzbeks*, *Turks*, *Magyars*, etc. Already Mr. Logan's term *Indonesian* has been extended by Dr. Hamy to the White Races of Oceania. But what we may popularly call White, technically Hyphenetian, Varieties of Mankind can be at once exhaustively and scientifically classified only when we are able to arrange them as *different kinds of Hybrids*.

As to that Aryan Race which has dominated the New Age initiated in the Sixth Century B.C., not only by Aryan World-Conquest, but by Aryan World-Philosophy, I venture to think that it is more of an ethnical unity than it is now, perhaps, commonly considered. No doubt the old conception of Aryans as descended from a single, primitive, and semi-divine tribe, must be given up. For unquestionably the speakers of Aryan languages are descended from a very great number of different tribes who originally spoke non-Aryan languages, the linguistic reaction of which on Aryan speech was, in fact, the main cause of the differentiation of Aryan dialects. But it is to be noted that the main constituents of the peoples now speaking Aryan languages were, so far as known, tribes of the White, or Hyphenetian Variety. And hence, just as Greek has given a certain ethnical unity to members of a number

of White, but originally non-Greek-speaking, tribes ; and just as English is giving a certain ethnical unity to members of a number of White, but originally non-English-speaking, peoples ; so the Aryan languages—spoken as, save in jargons, they appear to be only by White, or predominantly White Races—may be considered as having given to these Races a certain larger ethnical unity, in which original physical differences are lost in the new moral unity given by the intellectual characteristics, traditions, and literatures, of a kindred set of Languages.

Finally, the general ethnological relations of the White, or Hyphenetic Variety may, as I think, be thus summarily indicated—postponing, however, the question as to the place in Classification of Dwarf Races. It is generally admitted that there is less difference between any one of the Mongolian, American, and so-called Caucasian, or, as I should say, Hyphenetic Races, and the others, than there is between any one of these Races, and any one of the African, Negrito, and Papuan Races. Such a fact—whether due, or not, to specifically different Precursors—ought, I submit, to be indicated in Classification. Hence the first Division I would propose of Human Races is into EQUATORIAL and BOREAL, of which the Subdivisions will become scientific only when we know more as to the hybridism of Races. And in the BOREAL Division I would suggest that the American Races would—to avoid the necessity of having to couple with ‘American’ some such adjective as ‘pre-Columbian’ in order to make our meaning clear, and whether the Atlantis-story arose from any knowledge of America or not—be desirably distinguished as *Atlantisian*.

## SECTION II.

### THE NEW PRINCIPLES OF METHOD (DEFINITION, CLASSIFICATION, AND INVESTIGATION).

§ 1a. From such New Generalizations of Historical Theory as those stated in the foregoing Section as New Bases of the Science of Folklore, there will evidently follow both New Principles of Method in dealing with Folklore Facts, and New Suggestions of Theory for solving Folklore Problems. It is to an exposition of the former of these consequences—New Principles of Method—that this Section will be devoted. The initial step of a scientific Method is the clearing of one’s ideas by coherent Definitions. And we must

first, therefore, consider what the foregoing Historical Theory may suggest as to the true significance, and hence definition, of the terms *Folk*, *Folklore*, and *Science of Folklore*. The fact mainly insisted on by this theory is that of a Conflict of Higher and Lower Races or Classes, with, as its consequences, two clearly distinguishable, but constantly interacting Lives, and Expressions of these Lives. Hence, by the *Folk* I mean people unaffected by Culture, or the ideas of Ruling Races or Classes with Written Records—people relatively unaffected by such Culture, like the majority of the Working Classes of a Civilized State; or people absolutely unaffected by such Culture, like Savages who have neither inherited anything from ancestors subjected to a Culture Race in the Past, nor acquired anything from the Missionaries and Traders of such a Race in the Present. In this definition of *Folk*, I have incidentally defined also what I mean by *Culture*. For Culture always connotes the conscious use of means for the increase of powers of production, whether physical or mental. Hence it should, I submit, when used with reference to a state of Society, imply the existence of some such means for the conscious increase of powers, as Written Records. And hence one can hardly but conclude that the term is somewhat misapplied in such a phrase as 'Primitive Culture,' used, as by Dr. Tylor, as a synonym for Primitive Savagery.<sup>a</sup>

§ 1b. And now as to the definition of *Folklore* suggested by this Theory of the Conflict of Races. How can we at once more simply and more satisfactorily define *Folk-*

<sup>a</sup> The inaccuracy, and hence confusion, in Dr. Tylor's use of the term *Culture* may be illustrated by his finding it necessary to use such phrases as the 'relation of savage to cultured life,' though savage, barbaric, and cultured life are each, with him, a stage of 'culture.'

lore than as *Folk's lore*—the traditionally transmitted, rather than graphically recorded, lore of the Folk about their own Folklife, and the lore, therefore, knowledge of which gives knowledge of Folklife. In the *Handbook*, however, of the Folklore Society, the term 'Survivals' is borrowed from Dr. Tylor's *Primitive Culture*,<sup>a</sup> and *Folklore* is defined as 'a body of Survivals of archaic beliefs, customs, and traditions in modern ages.'<sup>b</sup> But if by *Folk* we mean Lower Races or Classes unaffected by Culture, and if, since the first origin of Civilization there have always been such Classes, why limit what we study as *Folklore* to 'modern ages'? And as to 'Survivals,' surely the term can be properly applied only to such Folk-beliefs and -practices as, like certain eccentric habits and fancies of the Cultured Classes, exist, like island-peaks in a sea, amid a quite different and more coherent set of beliefs and practices? But if so, how, with this definition of it, can the term *Folklore* be used to include Folk-beliefs and -practices which, existing still as a coherent system, constitute the very life of whole nations, with Culture-beliefs and -practices as mere intrusive elements, like erratic boulders on a great plain? The definition, however, which I have above given includes under Folklore both such beliefs and practices as, like the former, may properly be called 'Survivals'; and such as, like the latter, cannot properly be called 'Survivals'; nor does it limit our study either of what are, or of what are not, properly 'Survivals' to 'modern ages.'

§ 1c. Before attempting next to define the *Science of Folklore*, let me remark that the Sciences are simply systematized and co-ordinated knowledges. Sys-

<sup>a</sup> Vol. i., pp. 15, 63 and following, and vol. ii., p. 453.

<sup>b</sup> *Handbook*, p. 15.

tematized and co-ordinated. For Knowledges to be truly Sciences must be not only systematized, but systematized on such principles as to be capable of co-ordination with the whole circle of systematized Knowledges, or Sciences. And for this good reason. The fulfilment of this condition of co-ordination will be a verification of the principles of systematization. And now we shall see that, if *Folklore* is defined as the lore of the Folk about their own Folklife, the *Science of Folklore* can be no otherwise defined than as *Systematized knowledge of the Lore of the Folk, capable of co-ordination with other systematized Knowledges.* And hence, when a Science of Folklore has been definitively constituted, a man of Culture will not only have acquired his knowledge of Folklore otherwise than, as a man of the Folk, by tradition, but such knowledge as he has will exist in a different state—as a system of related, not a chaos of unrelated, Knowledges; nor as that only, but as a system of related Knowledges capable of co-ordination with other Systematized Knowledges. With what Science, then, is the Science of Folklore to be co-ordinated? Evidently, if we accept this Conflict Theory, with the Science of Culture-lore; and these two Sciences become then the two constituent correlates of the General Science of Literature. In accordance, however, with its definition of Folklore, the *Handbook* of the Folklore Society defines the *Science* as *the comparison and identification of the Survivals of archaic beliefs, customs, and traditions in modern ages.*<sup>a</sup> But after the above criticism of the *Handbook's* definition of *Folklore*, the inadequacy and ineptness of its definition of the *Science of Folklore* may be here sufficiently illustrated by a reference to the various other

<sup>a</sup> *Handbook*, p. 15.



definitions of the Science preferred even by members of the Society<sup>a</sup> under whose sanction this *Handbook of Folklore* was issued.<sup>b</sup>

§ 2. Postponing to the concluding paragraph of this Section the further definitions which appear necessary—definitions of *Civilization*, *Myth*, and *Religion*—we proceed to consider the principles of investigating and classifying the Facts of Folklore which logically follow from such Historical Generalizations as those above stated. Now, the Criticism of Sources has been the most distinctive feature of Modern Scholarship. But such scholarly criticism has hitherto been, for the most part, confined to editions of the written records of Culture-lore, and has hardly yet been systematically extended to the traditional records of Folklore. Doubtless, in the hundred years between MacPherson's *Fingal, an Ancient Epic Poem*, 1760, and Campbell's *Popular Tales of the West Highlands*, 1860, an immense advance was achieved towards scientific truthfulness in the presentation of Folk-poesy. But, so far as I am aware, no definite principle has yet been stated by which translations of Folklore may be criticised, and their interpretation regulated. The Principle I would propose may be distinguished as that of the *Psychological*

<sup>a</sup> Mr. Nutt, Mr. Hartland, and Mr. Wade all define the Science of Folklore as a department of Anthropology—'dealing with primitive man,' says Mr. Nutt; 'with the psychological phenomena of uncivilized man,' says Mr. Hartland; 'with the psychological phenomena of primitive man,' says Mr. Wade. More approximating to my own is the definition suggested by Miss Burne: 'The science which treats of all that the Folk believe or practise on the authority of inherited tradition, and not on the authority of written records.' See *Folklore Journal*, November, 1884; March, June, and October, 1885.

<sup>b</sup> It was not published till 1890. But it was resolved that Mr. Gomme be requested to print his MS. of the proposed *Handbook of Folklore* by a minute of Council, January 12, 1887.

*Criticism of Folklore Sources.* For in this connection it is evidently required by our Conflict Theory that we guard against translating Folk-expressions by Culture-words which belong to an entirely different stage of Mental development. This Principle, therefore, implies, first of all, the most sceptical reception of the reports of Missionaries and other Travellers saturated with Christian Culture-conceptions; hence delighting in 'discoveries,' even among the 'poor heathen,' of notions proving, as they believe, the universality, save among 'wilfully perverse Agnostics,' of Christian, or at least Theistic beliefs; and hence using such Culture-terms as 'God,' 'Spirits,' 'Ghosts,' etc., in translating Folk-terms, which have really incomparably more concrete and otherwise different meanings.<sup>a</sup> But this principle of Psychological Criticism implies, not such scepticism only, but scientific effort to gain some realizing sense of what the lower mental conditions are. And there are three means by which, using all three, one may succeed in this effort. The first is, of course, such thoroughly sympathetic familiarization of one's self with lower mental conditions, as is, however, it must be confessed, possible for but very few philosophers. The second means to success in the required effort is observation of Folk-customs in order thereby to understand more intimately Folk-words. And finally, a realizing sense of lower mental conditions, and hence power of true translation of the expressions of Folk-conceptions, may, if due caution is observed, be gained by acquainting one's self with, and further developing, the recent researches of psychologists with

<sup>a</sup> See my *Queries on 'Animism,' Folklore*, September, 1892, pp. 297, following; and Mrs. BALFOUR'S note on *Bogles and Ghosts*, *Ibid.*, March, 1893, pp. 107-108.

reference to the mental characteristics of Children.<sup>a</sup> The results, however, of such varied Psychological Criticism of Folk-sources will, if I mistake not, be disastrous both for the 'Ghost Theory' and the 'Savage Philosophy' of Mr. Spencer and Dr. Tylor. Not because *this* notion agrees with *that* fact does the Child or Savage believe it, but because *this* notion and *that* notion, however contradictory, are each, in some way, easy to believe. And I venture to think that the next generation of Folklorists will regard the only too logically coherent 'Savage Philosophy' of Messrs. Spencer and Tylor as one of, at once, the most curious and the most baseless of Culture-philosophies.

§ 3a. The second and central Methodological Principle of a Science of Folklore, based on an Historical Theory of Racial Conflict, must affirm the *Necessity of such a Natural Classification of the Facts of Folklore as will permit of a direct comparison with those of Culture-love.* The following is the Classification set forth in the *Handbook of the Folklore Society*:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. <i>Superstitious Belief and Practice.</i>             | (h) Beliefs relating to a Future life ; |
| (a) Superstitions connected with great Natural Objects ; | (i) Superstitions generally. ?          |
| (b) Tree and Plant Superstitions ;                       |   |
| (c) Animal Superstitions ;                               | 2. <i>Traditional Customs.</i>          |
| (d) Goblindom ;  | (a) Festival Customs ;                  |
| (e) Witchcraft ;   | (b) Ceremonial Customs ;                |
| (f) Leechcraft ;   | (c) Games ;                             |
| (g) Magic and Divination ;                               | (d) Local Customs.                      |

<sup>a</sup> See, for instance, BALDWIN, *Mental Development in the Child and the Race*, and SULLY, *Studies of Child-Life*. But note GRUPPE'S criticism of the principle of SCHULTZE (*Fetichismus*, s. 61), 'Die Ontogenie wirft auch in Sachen der Bewusstseinsentfaltung, ihre erhellenden Schlaglichter auf die Phylogenie'; and his criticism generally of the treatment of 'die Wilden als Kinder.' *Culte und Mythen*, s. 199, note 5.