(p. 228), exclude a sociological interpretation. In fact, according to Sarasin,² the larger and higher the house, the more powerful the inhabitants.

Regarding the problem of house types in the Marianas Islands, the author has not mentioned the regular extended burials, accompanied by artifacts, found between the rows of stone pillars. It is not impossible that the double rows of capped pillars were burial monuments rather than house foundations or both. There is some archaeological evidence pointing toward their having served as house pillars (as Dr Tischner concludes, page 46), especially the fact that they are set deep in the ground and reinforced with stone foundation props, that caps are fitted to the pillars, and large numbers of artifacts are found on the surface of the ground under and around them.³ Furthermore, it may be definitely concluded that Christian's statement (quoted on p. 45), concerning the use of mortar in the Marianas, is incorrect since no evidence of the use of mortar by the Chamorros has been found.

LAURA THOMPSON TUETING

BERLIN, GERMANY

GENERAL

Epitomé de Culturología. J. IMBELLONI. (Humanoir, Series A, Vol. 1. 320 pp., 61 figs. Buenos Aires; José Anesi, 1936.)

This is the first volume of an ambitious series, edited by Dr Imbelloni, which will eventually comprise thirty works encompassing all fields of anthropology with special reference to the American Indian and particularly to South America and Argentina. Since, as planned, the series will descend from the most general to the most particular, this *Epitomé* (confined to social anthropology) is on the highest theoretical level, treating the philosophy of history, the nature of culture (and its relations to race, geography, and history) and the meaning of civilization.

The point of view of the author (and one is led to believe that he shares it with his colleagues) is made perfectly explicit. Imbelloni is an enthusiastic and unquestioning adherent of the German Kulturhistorische school. The neologism culturologia is defined as the exact Spanish equivalent of kulturhistorische methode, and the author pays his full debt to Graebner, Schmidt, Koppers, Foy, et al. In his discussion of anthropological method, the author recognizes but two general points of view: that of the Classical Evolutionists and that of the Graebnerites. When he shows why the evolutionary position is untenable, he is left with only culturologia, and of it he says

We shall see that this method has been triumphant on all fronts, so that in all the world today there is hardly a student disposed to deny its fundamental criticism and its theoretical efficacy (p. 39).

Particular historical reconstructions may be open to criticism, Dr Imbelloni claims, but there are none to gainsay the validity of the theory or the method, although

² Ethnologie der Neu-Caledonier und Loyalty-Insulaner (München, 1929), pp. 130-31.

³ L. Thompson, Archaeology of the Marianas Islands (Bulletin, Bishop Museum, No. 100, 1932).

some North American anthropologists, by confusing applications of the method with the method itself, are inclined to think that they disagree.

The volume is therefore devoted, in large part, to an exposition of the *Methode*, and it appears to be excellently and coherently done, with concrete and original examples, including proofs of diffusion from Polynesia to America. This reviewer, unfortunately impatient with the *Methode*, is neither disposed to nor capable of criticizing Imbelloni's exposition and application of it.

A thought comes to the reviewer that perhaps will come to many another North American. Why is it that, apparently, South American anthropology should follow a school whose method, in large part, we have proved to our satisfaction is unprofitable? Imbelloni has obviously read English, American, and French scholars as well as German, and yet apparently with little hesitation has discarded other points of view in favor of the kulturhistorische methode. Is it that Graebner's scientific theories are actually more satisfying than those of, say, Boas (justly or unjustly), or is it simply because personal and academic connections of the Argentine are closer with Germany than with England, France, or the United States? If it is only the latter, cannot the situation be to some extent remedied? For from our point of view anthropological resources on a continent almost virgin may otherwise be wasted for decades to come. "Intervention," academic no less than political, is not in fashion; yet a more direct exchange of ideas than that to which we have been accustomed might serve a most useful purpose.

SOL TAX

CARNEGIE INSTITUTION OF WASHINGTON

The Dream in Primitive Cultures. J. STEWARD LINCOLN. (xiii, 359 pp., plate. 18s. London: Cresset Press, 1935.)

The reviewer is in the position of knowing a good deal more about psychoanalysis and a good deal less about ethnology than is required to appreciate this book; with most readers, presumably, the case will be reversed. Mr Lincoln follows the path worn hard by traditional Freudian raiders in the ethnological field; he assumes the usefulness of the Freudian concept system and then finds confirmations in ethnological literature, especially that of continental United States. Since few ethnologists have the skill to affirm or deny the Freudian postulates, the work is bound to be more or less meaningless to them; beyond that it may be harmful by further increasing the distance between the hard-bitten objector and the fertile mind of Freud.

After a spotty canvas of isolated examples to demonstrate the universality the Oedipus or nuclear family complex the author discusses dreams; sample dreams from various cultures are said to give evidence of the existence of this complex. Some proof is advanced for the hypothesis that dreams play a creative role in the formation of culture patterns and institutions. Mr Lincoln makes a contribution to the theory of distribution of culture patterns; he asserts that the assimilation of patterns from other folk is frequently due to the recurring need for new solutions