

tect the Prophet Mohammed when at prayer in the animal's shade, Mr. Leland and I would never have thought of omitting it.

In connection with my statement that the Indians' belief in their wizards has been "subordinated to" their Roman Catholic doctrine, I cheerfully correct it to read "coordinated with."

I hesitate to assert so glibly as does your correspondent that ophiolatry had its origin in phallism, although I believe that true worship certainly has. This question, however, is far too complicated for me to discuss at length at this time.

With regard to cannibalism, I still believe it had its origin in a primitive sacramental usage and that the physical pleasures of such feasts were only secondary. I have never hesitated in my lectures to state my conviction that the ceremony of the Christian Eucharist is a physical survival of the original sacramental cannibalistic feast, just as Baptism is a lineal descendant of the ancient ceremonial washing for purification. I strongly question also your critic's statement that the missionaries put it into the Maoris' heads to ascribe a sacramental character to the New Zealand cannibalism. From what I have seen of Christian missionaries of all denominations in the East, I should say that such an idea is much to "Broad Church" to emanate from them.

Miss (or Mrs.) Nare's quotation from Petronius is apt and important. I wish I had known it when my pages went to press.

Furthermore, I plead guilty with much penitence to the error regarding "the great soft staring eyes" and the "cantering of the moose." I have hunted and killed these animals and know that your critic is quite right in this respect. The lines in question escaped my eye when I edited the book.

Finally, let me thank your critic for presenting so able and comprehensive a recension of Mr. Leland's and my efforts. If we have not given "the real epopee of Kuloskop," we have done all we could for the Indians—to cite from our little *Envoi*, "We have taken what they had to give."

I am yours faithfully,

J. DYNELEY PRINCE.

A LETTER ANSWERED. Through the courtesy of the editor I have been allowed to see and answer the above letter.

I am glad Mr. Prince recognizes the European element in the Kuloskop legends and it is quite refreshing to find that versatile journalist, Mr. Andrew Lang, on the right side for once.

All the same it is rather absurd to accuse me of knowing nothing of Mr. Leland's former work. I know some of it very well indeed and I freely concede his readiness to call a spade a spade. As to his calling it a shovel I confess that I have noticed nothing in his work to justify this imputation of the worst kind of inaccuracy. I believe, however, that he has not habitually collaborated with Mr. Prince. I will take it on Mr. Prince's authority that piano legs now go naked even in Boston. Perhaps pantalettes have become too "suggestive" (I believe that is the word) for the school marms of either sex to sanction any display of them. Apart from this, however, I was careful to say in my review that the Amerindian narrators may have been responsible for the Bowdlerising of the legends. I may remark incidentally that as far as religious instructiveness goes, the Legend of Lox is by no means on all fours with that of Mahommed's camel.

Mr. Prince is perhaps right in hesitating to assert that ophiolatry had its origin in phallism but then I never—glibly or otherwise—asserted any such origin for it.

As to cannibalism Mr. Prince and I are at issue. After long and careful study of the question in my intercourse with cannibals I have come to the conclusion that they eat human flesh because they like it. This is the primitive phase. The sacramental embroideries come later when the feast has become of more or less infrequent occurrence in the community. But I never said nor ever thought that the missionaries put it into the Maori's heads to ascribe a sacramental character to New Zealand cannibalism. They did, I believe, put it into their quasi converts heads to excuse the custom on the ground of utility. The missionaries found it hard to believe that people could eat human flesh because they liked it and to these rather inconsequent good