

woman according to sounds heard along a river bank. Of these methods, the first seems to be the most common. One of the Piegan chiefs has given names to a considerable number both of his own descendants and those of other men, because of his splendid martial career. While a girl generally keeps the name given during her entire lifetime, a young man may acquire new names when he has distinguished himself by some manly deed.

In some cases, a name given in mockery was formerly adopted by the person nicknamed,—but only after he had vindicated his honor by a creditable exploit against the enemy. This was the only way to wipe out the ignominy of the nickname, irrespective of whether the latter was a reproach for cowardice or for some other delinquency.

Leaving the names of individuals, Prof. Uhlenbeck makes a brief reference to those of the painted lodges still found among the Piegan. As most of these names are taken from animals and as the lodges are often inherited from father to son, some might suspect totemic institutions here. The author explains, however, that the painted lodges may freely change their ownership, passing out of a family or even a clan, and that there is no belief in descent from the animal. According to the native traditions an animal or other supernatural being once gave to some Piegan each of the painted lodges, ownership of which involved certain ritualistic performances. There is thus connected with the sacred lodges a form of animal worship, but not totemism as conceived by the author.

An appendix gives concrete data with regard to the personal names and band affiliations of three of Uhlenbeck's informants, as well as of some of their kin.

As the foregoing notice indicates, Prof. Uhlenbeck's paper adds some welcome details to our knowledge of Blackfoot ethnology. The author shows great familiarity with Blackfoot literature, but is apparently not very well acquainted with that of other Northern Plains tribes. Accordingly, he does not always see the Piegan facts in the proper ethnographic perspective, as appears most clearly from his remarks on nicknames and exogamy. This deficiency will, it may be hoped, be remedied as he continues to publish the results of his investigations.

ROBERT H. LOWIE.

Original Blackfoot Texts. By C. C. UHLENBECK. Ver. d. Kon. Akad. van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Afd. Lett., n. r. d. XII, No. 1 (1911).

This pamphlet begins with an account of the author's informants, etc. Next follows (pp. vi-x) a description of the phonetic system em-

ployed. Then come sixty-six pages of texts with English translations, arranged in two columns, paragraph corresponding to paragraph. A few pages of songs with introductions and English translations follow. An appendix gives the genealogy, history, and cosmogony of Bear-chief. Pages 94–96 contain the *addenda et corrigenda*. A good English index (pp. 97–106) completes the whole.

This essay has largely increased our knowledge of Piegan mythology, and is a good supplement to Wissler and Duvall's work; and Professor Uhlenbeck deserves credit for his performance. The English is exceptionally good for a foreigner. Of course there are a few slips of idiom and punctuation; but they are quite insignificant. It may be in place to note that Joseph Tatsey (Professor Uhlenbeck's interpreter and chief informant) is known as a thoroughly competent interpreter, the equal to or superior of Duvall.

It remains to go into technical details. On p. vii we read: "There are many vacillations in the sounding of the language—and I have thought it better to express these vacillations in my way of spelling, than to efface them by an arbitrary uniform orthography." I strongly suspect this 'vacillation' is one of hearing rather than of the language. Another point is that it seems to me that Professor Uhlenbeck has done the reverse of leaving these 'vacillations' graphically expressed. Take the case of intervocalic consonants. He says (p. vi): "In Blackfoot a consonant in the body of a word often belongs both to the preceding and following syllable and then we might write it double as well as single. Only rarely I express this gemination in writing, because in most cases it is not constant. Where it is very emphatic, as in some cases with *mm*, *nn*, *ss*, I write doubles." Regarding the alleged inconstancy I have expressed myself above; but if it be a true linguistic phenomenon, then by all means it should be recorded; if due to defective hearing, the inconstancy should remain in order to enable the reader to check the author's phonetics. And how is any one unacquainted with the language—and Professor Uhlenbeck's pamphlet presumably is designed for such—to know whether any given intervocalic consonant is double or single? A concrete example will illustrate the point. Take *stə'mitəpə* he went to 14.27. Should this be pronounced *stə'mmittəpə*, *stə'mmittəpə*, *stə'mmitəpə*, *stə'mitəpə*, or *stə'mmitəpə*? As a matter of fact none of the above is correct; the word is *stə'mmitəpəw^h*: see below.

The same point is to be made with regard to the non-indication of the glottal stop: "Glottal stop. I write it only in a few cases, though it is very often heard in the language" (p. x). Pray how then is any one

unacquainted with the language for whom, as I said above, the pamphlet is presumably written, to know how to pronounce any given word? On p. vii we learn that the sound always occurs initially before vowels (which I doubt), and for this reason in this position he has not indicated it graphically. This is not objectionable, for one has definite instruction on its use in such position. But what about its use or non-use in other positions? The following may be quoted: "A common sound in Black-foot is the glottal stop, which may be expressed by the Greek sign for the spiritus lenis. I only write it in a few words, where it is always to be observed" (p. vii). Whether the inconstancy is due to inaccurate hearing or is truly linguistic in origin, all such cases of inconstancy should be recorded with the hope of ultimately elucidating the phenomenon. Not to do so appears to me to fly in the teeth of the principles Professor Uhlenbeck has enunciated on p. vii.

In the case of *ä* (p. vii), Professor Uhlenbeck says: "It is usually a contraction of the diphthong *ai* (*äi*). In these texts I have always written *ai*, though perhaps it would have been better to write sometimes *ä*, and sometimes *ai*, according to the pronunciation of the moment." Here Professor Uhlenbeck hits the mark: it would have been better for those who have no knowledge of the language; and it would have furnished the means of gauging his accuracy in hearing. The same remarks made above apply with equal force here.

According to Professor Uhlenbeck χ' occurs only after *i*. That is a point on which we differ: I have heard ɣ (his χ') in many cases when not after *i*.

We are told (p. viii) that the Piegans often waver between *a* and α . I agree that they seem to, but think it is the fault of our hearing, though it may be due to some undiscovered phonetic law or laws. The same apparent fluctuation occurs in Cheyenne, Menominee, Micmac, Malecite, Penobscot, Fox, Sauk, and Kickapoo.

Doubtless induced by a laudable desire to avoid the use of diacritical marks, Professor Uhlenbeck has not employed the makron; but has given directions as to quantity, p. vi. I quite agree that accented vowels are longer than unaccented ones. According to Professor Uhlenbeck there are only a few constant long vowels. All such should be carefully marked as such, and where apparently not constant, the vowels under question should be designated as long and short; though if the makron were consistently used for longs, the brevis could be omitted. I am glad to confirm the statement that a vowel even if accented is short before *mm* and *nn*. I am not positive that it is before *x* (χ).

Whether *kyáio* or *kyáiyio* be written is merely a matter of taste as long as we are told that the latter phonetically is more proper.

The most serious defect in Professor Uhlenbeck's phonetics is the non-recording of final whispered vowels. Occasionally he has heard them as full sounding; or possibly they were rhetorically lengthened in the cases in which he has heard them: if Professor Uhlenbeck had consistently used the makron this point could be determined. Examples of these are: *amóma* (60.11) this; *nápiwa* (36.17; 39.13, 26; 63.11) old man; *matápiua* (65.7) people; *kanáitsitapiua* (67.28, 29) all Indians; *mata'keua* (65.13) another woman; *ake'ua* (6.11; 14.6, 29; 56.18, 27) woman; *kípitákeua* (37.10) old woman; *kanáitapiua* (13.11,¹ 19.21) all the people; *aka'itapiua* (57.1) the ancient people; *na'tsitapiua* (13.13) two persons; *einíua* (13.25, 15.21, 21.11) buffaloes.

But we find variants of most of these without the final *a*, and even on the same pages as the forms with *a*: *nápiu* (35.2, 9, 25; 37.14; 39.5, 10; 40.2, 4); *amom* (44.19), *matápiu* (44.20), *akéu* (5.13, 6.20; 14.1, 16; 50.2; 54.3), *kípitákeu* (37.16; 51.9, 20, 31; 62.3). In the recording of personal names and the names of peoples Professor Uhlenbeck is nearly consistent in writing final *a* when the word ends in *ua*. There are other scattered instances in which the final whispered vowels are recorded as full sounding; but there are dozens of cases where final whispered vowels are not recorded in any way. It is difficult to understand how Professor Uhlenbeck failed to hear them as Wissler-Duvall in their works on the Blackfoot have properly indicated them. Professor Uhlenbeck might say that Tims does not record them (in reality a few are recorded as full sounding). It is not to be expected that missionaries should make such fine phonetic distinctions. Baraga does not record final whispered vowels in Chippewa; he does record some as full sounding; but whispered vowels exist, at least in the dialect of the Mississippi band at White Earth, Minn. For example *kiwábamag* really is *kiwá'bamāg^h* THOU SEEST THEM (an.). The case is more serious when the word ends in *o*; here in verbs the pronominal ending *-w^h* is left out. An example is *sta'mitoto* he then went to (41.21) which I would write *sta'mmitōtōw^h* (the first *ō* is slightly shorter than the second). *Sta'mistapò* (51.1) then he went, *ix'tapo'* he went that way 51.2, *itsito'to* (51.3) he came to, *sta'mitapo* (14.27) he went, are other examples. Final *-w^h* after *ō* is far more difficult to hear than when after *i*; at times it is nearly inaudible, the movements of the lips alone betraying its existence. Very fortunately final whispered vowels are not as common as in Fox,—at least I have not recorded so many. On a future

¹ Secondary accent omitted.

occasion I hope to determine whether they really exist after *s* and stops: I find I have been inconsistent in such cases.

From my remarks on the phonetics, it will be seen that these texts do not come up to the standard set by Boas, Sapir, Jones, Goddard, and others. Yet considering his brief stay with the Piegans (three months), and that this was his first experience with any spoken American Indian language, Professor Uhlenbeck has accomplished much,—more than could have been expected under the circumstances.

TRUMAN MICHELSON.

Some Technological Notes from the Pomeroon District, British Guiana. By DR WALTER E. ROTH. Part II, Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, XL, January-June, 1910, with 14 plates.

These papers on aboriginal technic by Dr Roth are models which one wishes students of material culture might emulate. The results attained are in the truest sense original contributions to knowledge corresponding to the characterization of exact science. Unlike specific characters, the arts and industries of mankind change rapidly or disappear at once with contact of a higher civilization and usually the ripe time for their study passes unnoticed. Dr Roth has preserved a record of the manufacture of cotton and other fiber twines and the cords and hammocks into the composition of which they chiefly enter among the Caribs, Warrau, and Arawak, of the Pomeroon District, illustrating every detail with clear and adequate pen drawings of his own.

WALTER HOUGH.

Die Australischen Bumerangs im Städtischen Völkermuseum. Von FRANCIS C. A. SARG. Frankfurt am Main: Joseph Baer & Co., 1911. 4to. Pp. 40, 59 figs.

This paper of Mr Sarg represents a most conscientious study of the large collection of Australian throwing weapons of the boomerang series possessed by the Städtischen Völkermuseum of Frankfurt am Main. This collection, which has been gathering for over 55 years, now contains perhaps the fullest exposition of the boomerang in any museum and it is fortunate that Mr Sarg was able to take up the subject so fully equipped with material and that he has rounded out the work with a knowledge of the bibliography of the boomerang. Mr Sarg divides the series into return or play boomerangs, not returning or war boomerangs, with intermediate forms (Kaile) for both play and war. The war class is divided into hurling and slashing and only slashing, these in turn being