

which he has sent home, Dr. Rivers proves that his hypothesis was justified. He says, "The Hawaiians have lost nearly the whole of their old culture, and present from the point of view of the anthropologist a most depressing picture of the results of a century of contact with civilisation, and yet in the midst of the general wreckage there has persisted almost untouched the old system of kinship, which, so far as we can tell, is as it was fifty or a hundred years ago." The Niue (Savage I.) system was found to resemble closely that of the Hawaiian Islands. A short visit to Nukualofa enabled Dr. Rivers to record the Tongan system of kinship, which proved to be the representative of a stage in the process of transition in which certain distinctions, lost elsewhere in Polynesia, have been preserved. The Samoan kinship system proved to be anomalous, and falls much less into line with our knowledge of the mode of expressing relationships found elsewhere in Polynesia. The "godless Samoans," it will be remembered, differed in other respects from typical Polynesians; their Government was more patriarchal and democratic than monarchical; the village communities were quite independent and could dispossess their chiefs; there were no temples, altars, or offerings; there was a family cult of the animal god; in addition each individual has his tutelary god, as had the village.

Dr. Rivers spent nearly a month in Fiji, most of which time was devoted to the interior of Viti Levu; there he found an entirely new system of kinship of the most complicated and interesting kind, and quite different from the system previously recorded as the Fijian system; the latter is in vogue in the district dominated by Bau, though, so far as he could ascertain, it, with many minor modifications, is used by coast people generally. He elucidated the systems of some ten different tribes, showing variations of the two Fijian systems. It is rather surprising that such very considerable variations may exist in the kinship systems of people living close to one another, and differing in no way in general racial characters. Dr. Rivers is of opinion that the relationship terms of the mountain tribes must have had their origin in status relations rather than in those of kinship, and he suggests a comparison with the system of the Dieri of Australia.

Through the kindness of Bishop Wilson, Dr. Rivers was given a passage on the *Southern Cross* of the Melanesian Mission on her rounds from Auckland to the Solomon Islands. This enabled him to interview a large number of natives of various islands. He worked out fairly thoroughly the system of Raga (Arag, or Pentecost), which is by far the most complex one he has ever met or heard of; in fact, all the systems of the southern New Hebrides are so complex that he has come to look on such systems as those of Torres Straits as child's-play. The chief feature of the Raga system is that the same terms are used for certain grandparents and for certain relationships by marriage, while the mother's mother is called by the same name as an elder sister, just as in the inland systems of Fiji the father's father has the same name as the elder brother. A native of another island (who found it very amusing) told Dr. Rivers that the Raga people used to marry their granddaughters, and indeed he found that it used to be the custom in Raga for a man to marry the daughter of his brother's daughter. The Raga system also presents another set of complexities, which it shares with the system of Mota, one which puts the children of brother and sister in the relationship of parent and child. These features are all referable to the principle given by Codrington, which puts the sister's son on the same level as the uncle.

NO. 2026, VOL. 78]

In the Solomon Islands, Dr. Rivers has obtained, so far, seven systems, which are all extremely simple in their general features, and he feels certain that they are really simplified and stand in much the same kind of relation to those further south, as the coast systems of Fiji stand to those of the interior. The three systems of Ngela, Bogotu, and northern Guadalcanar are on the same general lines, and many of the terms are exactly the same, and used in the same way, as those of the Bau system of Fiji. Those of Ulawa and Saa are of the most extraordinary simplicity, almost Polynesian in this respect. The whole set of systems seems to him to furnish beautiful evidence of the progressive simplification of kinship systems which accompanies progress in general culture. In every case Dr. Rivers has obtained a large body of evidence on kinship duties and taboos, &c., or their absence, all showing that the simplification of kinship systems goes with the disappearance of these duties and taboos. He has also obtained abundant evidence to show that the maternal descent in Melanesia does not in any way exclude a very thorough recognition of kinship through the father. All this work has been accomplished by the genealogical method, without which he could have done nothing in the time to which he would have attached any value.

The foregoing account will give an idea of some of the work already accomplished by Dr. Rivers; amongst other important results, not here alluded to, is a description of totemism in Fiji, which will be published in the September number of *Man*. In his last letter from Tulagi, dated May 8, Dr. Rivers was about to settle down in a definite district, probably in Rubiana, where he will make an exhaustive study of the natives, assisted by Dr. A. M. Hocart, of Exeter College, Oxford, and Mr. G. C. Wheeler, Martin White Student of the University of London, who had already joined him. A. C. HADDON.

#### THE PRESERVATION OF WELL-ESTABLISHED NAMES IN ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE.

AS was announced in NATURE of July 30, a discussion will take place in Section D of the British Association on the abuses resulting from the strict application of the rule of priority in zoological nomenclature and on the means of protecting well-established names.

Much inconvenience is caused by the extreme application of the rule of priority, the worst feature of which is not so much the bestowal of unknown names on well-known creatures as the transfer of names from one to another, as we have seen in the case of *Astacus*, *Torpedo*, *Holothuria*, *Simia*, *Cynocephalus*, and many others which must be present to the mind of every systematist. Yet these changes are proposed in order to comply with so-called laws enacted by various committees that have dealt with the subject of nomenclature within the last few years. Many zoologists think it is time to protest against the evil resulting from the indiscriminate application of what would be an excellent rule if tempered by a little consideration for tradition. Botanists at the Vienna Congress of 1905 have considered the same subject as regards the generic names of plants, and decided not to change such as have been universally used.

In anticipation of the discussion that is to take place at Dublin, the following memorandum has been circulated among British zoologists, and the signatures which are appended to it show that strict ad-

herence to the rule of priority is far from meeting with general support, at least in this country.

The undersigned zoologists, whilst fully realising the justice and utility of the rule of priority in the choice of scientific names for animals, as first laid down by a committee of the British Association in 1842, wish to protest against the abuse to which it has been put as a result of the most recent codes of nomenclature, and consider that names which have had currency for a great number of years should, unless preoccupied, be retained in the sense in which they have been universally used. Considering the confusion that must result from the strict application of the rule of priority, they would welcome action leading to the adoption of a scheme by which such names as have received the sanction of general usage, and have been invariably employed by the masters of zoology in the past century, would be scheduled as unremovable.

(Signed)

E. Ray Lankester.	A. Günther.
A. Sedgwick.	J. C. Ewart.
P. Chalmers Mitchell.	d'Arcy W. Thompson.
Sydney J. Hickson.	Henry Woodward.
R. Bowdler Sharpe.	E. A. Minchin.
A. E. Shipley.	P. L. Sclater.
J. Arthur Thomson.	W. N. Parker.
Gilbert C. Bourne.	W. J. Sollas.
E. S. Goodrich.	Edward B. Poulton.
J. J. Lister.	Chas. O. Waterhouse.
W. C. McIntosh.	A. Smith Woodward.
F. Jeffrey Bell.	S. F. Harmer.
W. T. Calman.	W. Bateson.
W. E. Hoyle.	D. Sharp.
A. M. Norman.	J. Stanley Gardiner.
J. Graham Kerr.	G. A. Boulenger.

#### THE SOUTH AFRICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE.

THE visit of the British Association to South Africa in 1905 in many ways undoubtedly represented the high-water mark of scientific effort in the various colonies for some time to come. Three years ago the results of the commercial inflation consequent upon the war were only feebly foreshadowed, and Governments and people still hoped that the depression then beginning to loom would pass away. To-day no reasonable person questions that the colonies will, for a time, have to be run on a lower level, and unfortunately education and scientific endeavour have to be adapted to this standard. As regards association matters, Cape Town apparently exhausted itself in the 1905 effort, but now congratulates itself as the headquarters of the newly chartered Royal Society of South Africa. The Transvaal maintains its vigorous interest in the aims of the association, and has largely contributed to the success of the subsequent meetings, Kimberley in 1906, Natal in 1907, and the Grahamstown gathering just concluded.

The Grahamstown meetings, held at the Rhodes University College, were attended by about seventy visiting members, an encouraging number when one considers distances in South Africa. These, together with about one hundred local members and associates, served to justify fully the continuance of the annual gatherings of the association, and afforded that personal touch with fellow-workers so much needed by the comparatively isolated colonial man of science. The meetings were held under the presidency of Sir Walter Hely-Hutchinson, G.C.M.G., Governor and Commander-in-Chief of Cape Colony, and in his unavoidable absence, owing to Parliament being in session, his place was taken by Prof. S. Schönland, one of the vice-presidents of the association. The

Governor's presidential address, which dealt mainly with the progress of scientific research in South Africa, was read by the Hon. Mr. Justice Graham, a grandson of the founder of Grahamstown.

Though Grahamstown was not deemed worthy to receive the British Association in 1905, a function reminiscent of the parent association was the first annual award of the South African medal and grant of 50*l.*, raised in commemoration of the visit, "for achievement and promise in scientific research in South Africa." This was presented to Dr. Arnold Theiler, C.M.G., bacteriologist to the Transvaal Department of Agriculture, in recognition of his researches on animal diseases.

The meetings were divided into five sections, as follows:—Section A (mathematics, physics, astronomy, meteorology, and geography); president, Dr. Alex. W. Roberts; address, "Variable Star Research." Comparatively few papers were contributed to this section. Sections B and C (chemistry, metallurgy, geology, engineering, mining); president, Prof. E. H. L. Schwarz; address, "The Geological Discoveries of Economic Importance made by the Albany Pioneers." A dozen papers were offered on geological, mining, and engineering subjects. Section D (botany, zoology, agriculture, forestry, bacteriology, physiology); president, Prof. S. Schönland; address, "Some Aspects of Recent Progress in Pure and Applied Natural Science." This was the strongest section in contributions, the papers being mainly of zoological, botanical, and agricultural interest. Section E (education, psychology, history); president, Mr. E. G. Gane; address, "Tendencies in Modern Education." A special debate on native education took place in this section, the chief points of dispute being whether the native should be educated in the vernacular or the English language, and whether his education should be continued as far as university standards. About fifteen other papers dealt largely with different aspects of education. Section F (economics, archæology, ethnology); president, Mr. W. Hammond Tooke; address, "Notes on the Earlier Contributions to South African Anthropology." A dozen other papers were devoted mainly to anthropological subjects, and a demonstration of the ethnological exhibits in the Albany Museum was included.

The social functions included a reception by the Mayor and Corporation, receptions and entertainments by the various educational organisations of the city, visits to local institutions and places of interest, including a day at Port Alfred, and half a day at an ostrich farm. The evening popular lectures included one by Prof. G. E. Cory, on the history of the Eastern Province, and another by Dr. Theiler, on animal diseases in South Africa.

At the closing meeting of the council it was decided to hold the next (seventh) annual meeting of the association at Bloemfontein, under the presidency of the Governor of the Orange River Colony.

The annual meetings of the South African Ornithologists' Union were held conjointly with the meetings of the association, and were comparatively well attended. The president, Prof. J. E. Duerden, gave an address devoted to his researches upon the domesticated ostrich in South Africa, and several other papers on more orthodox ornithological subjects were contributed. At the business meeting a discussion took place as to the conduct of the Journal of the Union, when it was decided to issue a series of popular bulletins in addition to the Journal, with a view to encourage a wider interest in ornithological matters amongst sportsmen, farmers, and others.

J. E. DUERDEN.