

as to the unity of the human race and the antiquity of its traditions, these two testimonies were quite sufficient. They argued: "A French half-breed Dakota tells a Basque story: Some Basques speak French: Therefore, the French half-breed Dakota is a Basque." This is very bad logic. Mr. Lang would not argue this way. He says, "One has been accused of believing that identical popular tales, the same incident in the same sequence of plot, might arise simultaneously in savage imaginations in all parts of the world. In "Custom and Myth," it will be plain that I say nothing of the sort. The "Far-Travelled Tale" is one instance chosen to show that such a story must probably have drifted, somehow, round the world." Now, this "Far-Travelled Tale," Mr. Lang finds in the languages of the Greeks, the Gaels, the Russians, Scandinavians, Italians, Samoans, Malagasy, Finns, Samoyeds, Japanese, Indians, Zulus, Bushmen, Eskimos and Algonquins. To suppose that some half-breed Greek visited all these other peoples, and communicated the story, is an absurdity.

Mr. Lang thinks that the philological interpretation of mythology and folklore is rubbish, and so far he is right. Neither Sanscrit nor Greek is competent to assign values to the names of the deities and heroes who fill the Indian and Hellenic pantheons. The Latin, Teutonic, and Celtic tongues are powerless to interpret the names of Italic, Germanic and Gaelic mythical characters and scenes. Mythology arose with the Turian sub-stratum of all civilizations, and was borrowed from it by the Semite, the Aryan, and the half-breed Celt. The Turanian, and the Semitic or Aryan half-breed Turanian, in the course of the ages, has been pushed away into the corners of the earth, whither the Folk-lorist pursues him to pick up his tales. He finds that the Turanian's grandmother and his grandmother had the same stories, sometimes immortaliz-

ing the same names. When the names differ, he perceives, if his knowledge of languages be sufficient, that the one is a translation of the other, as is the "Bible Abimelech" of the "Aryan Philistine" "Padi-Shah." Mr. Lang agrees that Greek and Sanscrit, Latin, Gothic, Slavonic and Celtic cannot interpret the universal Volapuk of mythology, but, like the inmates of the school of "Stratford atte Bow," the Turanian of science "is to him unknown." He is no worse off than a great many mythologists.

His idea is that myths were originally anonymous, like the Scotch proverbs that are prefaced by "as the man said," or "as the woman said." Finally, different people were compelled to credit them to somebody, and they laid the foundlings at the doors of their mythic ancestors or of their gods, if these be not the same parties. But the myths themselves were stories invented to account for customs. Thus, if when one sneezes, another says, "God bless the child!" there must be invented a myth that sneezing was once the symptom of a plague calling for the invocation. But, Mr. Lang, how did the custom originate? Are the narratives of the institution of circumcision and the pass-over, of Christian baptism and the Eucharist, mere myths to make fabulous account of certain Jewish and Christian customs which came into existence, nobody knows how? The idea is preposterous: customs have their root in history, in the spontaneity of illustrious human beings that existed in definite space and past time. When we celebrate Christmas and Easter, the Queen's Birthday and Dominion Day, we make no myth, but pay homage to historic fact. If customs were the necessary outcome of bound and limited human nature, they would be universal, which they are not. If they are the result of human freedom in circumstance, they belong to history, which is the record of free agency. I do not say that