

## A Study of Ballad Tradition.

IIVAR KEMPPINEN, *The Ballad of Lady Isabel and the False Knight* (1954), 301 pp.

This work has been accepted as a doctor's thesis by the Åbo Academy, and it has already aroused attention in many places abroad. It is not difficult to understand the appreciation bestowed by the Norwegian opposer Prof. R. T. Christiansen on the gigantic bulk of the book, the astonishingly wide reading of the author, and above all the great energy and boldness with which he has set himself the task of dealing monographically with a ballad type of exceptionally broad international diffusion, presenting the unequalled number of 1,865 variants. As a matter of fact, this number is quite artificial, as the author has inconsistently included also reproductions, new editions, translations, and even summaries of the contents, counting them as independent variants. The real number of primary variants is thus considerably lower.

A detailed study of the book gives the reader a still sadder disappointment: the author's wide reading is found to be surprisingly and regrettably superficial, and the number of so-called «variants» could be augmented to almost any extent with the method used by the author, although it is really scanty with regard to the type in question. As the investigation is published in English, it may endanger the international reputation of Finnish folk-lore research, especially from the point of view of method, and therefore it is necessary to deal with this aspect of the work more than with its other weaknesses.

Every investigator of folk-poetry must understand clearly the fundamental concepts in his research work: 1) the basic theme or fundamental idea (*Zentralmotiv, Grundidee*) of a folk-song or a group of songs, and its monogenetic or polygenetic origin; 2) the type and the unconditional genetic unity of the variants representing it in any language and in any part of the world, even though mixed, transformed or fragmentary; 3) the specific motif or feature and its primary or secondary relation

to the type. Further one must study the various redactions of the types and motifs, their transformations (which may even be revolutionary), modifications, local versions, etc., in their geographic-historical, social, religious, psychological etc. stages of development or decay. In a wider sense, the research work should also include the study of groups of types and themes, sources of contamination, and analogical or parallel modifications, not to speak of the extreme cases of syncretism and so-called *generatio aequivoca*.

The author has attacked the widest task directly and presented in his list variants from one group of folk-ballads with closely related types of basic theme, but he is unable to distinguish ideologically and thematically quite closely related types from each other, and he cannot establish the limits between various redactions of the same type and independent types. The main causes of this seem to be that instead of studying a type that forms an organic whole, he has looked for corresponding or analogical specific motifs without making clear to himself whether they belong to the type originally; and that these motifs are much more widely diffused than his list of variants indicates.

In the confusion of type and motif analysis (cf. *Anthropology Today*, p. 595), the author has mixed two possibilities of analysis: the typologic and the so-called ideologic method, without noticing himself how he shifts from one method to the other, sometimes on the basis of real, and sometimes on the basis of purely formal or quite deceptive similarities. He thus judges hundreds of variants as being variants of the same type, although they have no direct genetic connection with the type in question; and on the other hand he leaves aside a number of variants which definitely belong to the so-called False Knight type. As a consequence the whole list assumes a regrettably unscientific character, brought about by the author's chaotic manner of dealing with the concept of variants. The identification of analogical formations and parallel themes with variants of a certain type is a danger to folk-lore research in general, the consequences of which are much more deceptive than, for instance, to accept pieces of plagiarism or duplicates as real variants, which Dr. Kemppinen seems to do quite consciously.

As we have to deal here with a fundamental problem of primary importance, I will not touch on minor mistakes and controversial technical questions (e.g. the clearer survey given by good tables instead of too condensed summaries in the text; the advantage of not dealing with emigrant material in connection with the interior colonisation of Europe, but according to the various continents, etc.), but concentrate purposely on the

basic problems. — It is easy to see that the author has succeeded somewhat better in his treatment of the material from the Germanic and Romanic peoples, but this is not due to his own merit but simply to the fact that sufficiently reliable preliminary work has been done in this field, the utilization of which does not demand excessive work, erudition or capability in independent reasearch. The author's deficiency in the latter respect becomes noticeable as soon as he deals with lesswell investigated fields. One's suspicion is first aroused by the circumstance that the only Irish »variant» presented is an analogical prose tale (p. 64), whose genetic connection with the ballad he does not even try to prove, which should be expected all the more as no Irish False Knight ballads are known at all, as Prof. Christiansen remarked at the public discussion of the thesis.

In order to be altogether objective, I asked Prof. Christiansen for the statements he made on the occasion of the public discussion and also later, in which many mistakes have been corrected and some variants from Western Europe and America have been removed or added. I do not intend to repeat these, but I will scrutinize the Slavic, Baltic and Fenno-Ugric so-called »variants» for the very reason that Prof. Christiansen emphasizes that he has left out this side of the work in his scrutiny. — As a general characteristic of the investigation is to be noticed that, regardless of the preliminary research which is already at hand, the author forgets throughout that similarity of the basic theme does not always mean identity. Psychological, as well as many other circumstances, have caused various peoples to compose folk-songs on the same subject (e.g. the lover kills his sweetheart, the wife kills her husband, etc.), sometimes quite independently, sometimes as a consequence of foreign cultural influence, changing the theme within the compass of localization and assimilation, sometimes (although comparatively rarely) just borrowing or translating without changes.

It is not surprising that some ballad which is widely diffused in the Germanic-Romanic territory is also borrowed into the Slavic world. Folk-songs have further been borrowed from Polish (as well as from Russian and German) into Lithuanian. It is thus quite according to expectation that we find our Ballad of the False Knight established also among the Lithuanians as a small specific feature in the corresponding cultural stream. There are 10 variants of this ballad type printed in Lithuanian, whereas the handwritten variants in the Folklore Archives of Lithuania behind the so-called »iron curtain» are of course not available to investigators in

the free part of the world. But even out of the ten printed variants the author only mentions three (p. 122), and he does not at all take the following variants of the same type into consideration:

- 4) Šimtakojis (= J. Čaplikas), *Trakiečiu, dzūkų, dainos* (1899), No. 68.
- 5—6) *Basanavičius, Ožkabilių, dainos II* (1902), No. 294 and 371.
- 7—8) *Wisla I* (1887), p. 279, and *II* (1888), p. 159 (5).
- 9) *Tauta ir Žodis I* (1923), 177 (64).
- 10) *Lietuvių Tauta IV: 2* (1928), *Bielinis* No. 23.

With regard to theme analysis it would also be suitable to refer to the following text: *A Juškeviče, Lietuviškos Dainos* (1881), No. 985.

On the other hand, the author presents with good reason yet a fourth fragmentary and mixed variant (No. 1283 in his list), which however rather represents another ballad type: the suitor drowns the girl, but generally he is punished afterwards, when the fishermen have found the body of the girl (the latter motif is however frequently modified or left out). For some reason the author has wished to connect this drowning type with his principal type. But the Lithuanians alone have no less than 7 printed variants of this type. Besides the only and uncertain one recorded by the author, he should also have analysed the following variants, in order to establish whether we have here only a different redaction of the False Knight type, some contamination, or maybe after all a quite independent type:

- 2) *Karol M. Br(zozowski), Piesni ludu Nadniemenskiego z okolic Aleksoty* (1844), No. 26.
- 3) *Neue Preussische Provinzialblaetter XI*, 99 = G.H.F. Nesselmann, *Littauische Volkslieder* (1853), No. 246.
- 4) G. H. F. Nesselmann, *Littauische Volkslieder* (1853), No. 407.
- 5) *Mitteilungen der Litauischen Literarischen Gesellschaft V* (1912), 292 (113).
- 6) *Tauta ir Žodis I* (1923), 136 (2), cf. 139 (1).
- 7) *J. Balys, Šimtas liaudies baladžių*, (1941), No. 54.

Now, if the author regards this ballad with a related theme simply as a separate redaction of the ballad studied by him, as may partly be inferred from the Slavic »variants» included in his list, then it is incomprehensible why he does not mention at all the Mordvin parallel (See *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne IX*, 1891, p. 76/9, No. 34) and why he does not quote from the Slavic field e.g. the Polish editor Oleska (= W. Zaleski), *Piesni polskie i ruskie ludu galicyjskiego* (1833), 484/5 (2). Moreover, on this and on some other mixtures of ballad types that have misled the author, E. Seemann has already published exact information and references, which are unknown to the

author: see *Jahrbuch für Volksliedforschung* VIII (1951), 186 ff. The German expert is quite capable of distinguishing between various types and solving the complicated problems that have arisen from contaminations, but the Finnish investigator has not utilised this source, instead he has muddled again what had already been made clear.

Seemann distinguishes two types, as John Meier has done already before, see *Deutsche Volkslieder* II (1939), 67/115 (41): *Der Mädchenmörder*, and 115/38 (42): *Der betrügerische Freier*. J. Meier also presents a comprehensive international bibliography, the utilization of which has not caused Dr. Kemppinen much trouble. But Meier and Seemann also refer to J. Horák's survey of the Slavic counterparts on the Ulinger theme (1925), and Dr. Kemppinen has not been able to utilise this work in a positive manner. As a consequence, he certainly confuses the types but is by no means complete in recording his variants. It is to be noticed in this connection that J. Meier does not mention e.g. the Ukrainian counterpart of the Ballad of the False Knight, which thus remains unknown also to Dr. Kemppinen: see F. Kolessa, *Narodni pisni . . .* (1929), No. 583.

The ballad *Der betrügerische Freier* (*Die Kosakenbraut*), which has been distinguished by Meier and Seemann, is widespread among the Slavic peoples, and also Dr. Kemppinen has partly included its variants in his list. But he does not mention e.g. one single Lithuanian variant, although there are 16 printed ones, even in four different redactions: see J. Balys, *Lithuanian Narrative Folksong* (1954), 92/3 (C17). It is to be concluded from this that the author has no clear conception of the diffusion of his only partly analysed themes, nor of the limits between definitely mixed forms, so-called Wandermotive, and features with simply similar motifs. Instead of tracing the genetic relations he only speaks in a vague manner of the ballad family or tree, by which he probably means a group or series of types with similar themes, but in reality he squeezes the whole group into one Procrustean bed.

It must be acknowledged that the establishing of the primary relations of themes is no easy matter, and therefore one should excuse occasional mistakes on the part of the author. But if they are committed constantly and the author does not even try to analyse the origin of identical or similar features appearing in different types, then it is no longer a question of a monographical study of one specific ballad type, but of an uncritical fusing together of several types with similar motifs into one conglomerate, where no one single type is listed and studied satisfactorily, or where genetic relations of the various redactions of the assumed single type are not proved. Even

the primary or secondary character of the specific features in various types will thus necessarily remain uncertain.

Among the products of folk-lore, the ballads above all belong to the class that perhaps constitutes the best artistic and compositionally finished whole. It is understandable that the author has not had time left from his other tasks to enter on a detailed estimation of the artistic qualities of the ballad studied by him. But he emphasizes himself the structural merit of the ballad (p. 7), and it is certainly very negligent of him not even to have utilised the clear and reliable criteria found in the composition in order to determine the limits of the ballad and distinguish independent types from each other, instead of throwing together types that are structurally quite heterogeneous. When a ballad is transferred from one language to another, it may of course have its outward form modified, but even when it has assumed an altogether new form (and e.g. melody as well), then on the other hand it preserves this form without dissolving it into something quite different and without being fused together with types (or their motifs) that are structurally quite different. There are exceptions, especially where the structure of folk-songs in general is simpler and thus facilitates contamination, as for instance in the case of the Estonian-Finnish schematic verse-form and to some extent in the world of Slavic poetry. Therefore it is not surprising that precisely in this field it has been easier for the author to mix independent types into different redactions. But it is surprising that he has done this so sporadically, evidently without very wide knowledge of Slavic folk-lore.

It is above all to be noticed as an unexpected and unpleasant feature that the author does not distinguish the Eastern Slavic peoples from each other, so that also the Ukrainians and the White Ruthenians are simply generalized into (Great) Russians, as was usual in the epoch of Tsaristic Panrussianism. Nowadays such a denial of independent peoples is not exercised even by communist investigators, at least not formally. But when the author organizes his material geographically, one may sometimes guess in what language the ballad appears. However, No. 1244 in the author's list is certainly taken from the Ukrainian territory, but all the same it is a variant in the Russian language, and this fact should not be neglected, especially as the author justly emphasizes the importance of taking social and such-like circumstances (thus also national differences) into consideration. In any case it is painfully wrong to place the provinces of Podolje and Volynia under the heading of White Russia, since the texts recorded from these provinces (Nos. 1235, 1236, 1238, 1241—1243) are indubitably Ukrainian. Further

it is difficult to understand why the variants Nos. 1235, 1241, and 1242 are placed correctly under the heading of Podolje, but No. 1243 from the same district of Ušinski under the heading of the government Volynia.

One little circumstance alone reveals how the author has proceeded and dealt with his subject. From the White Ruthenians there is a good collection of material, V. Romanov, *Belorusskij Sbornik I* (1885), from which the author has listed 6 variants with the mark DVA. By this he wanted to confer the impression that he had procured these variants for himself from the *Deutsches Volksliedarchiv*. But the author has evidently not utilised the book itself, for on the page quoted by him (p. 199 No. 46), there is only one text printed, and divergences in the lines of the other variants are added without mentioning the number of variants. It is true that the important piece of information is added that the melody of the song is remarkably sad, like a funeral melody. But instead of listing as many as six »variants» of one text, it would have been much more important to take from the same book p. 70 (No. 70) yet another redaction, of which the author has presented other variants without knowing Romanov's book.

From the White Ruthenians there is yet another and much more extensive collection of material: P. V. Šejn, *Materialy dlja izučenija byta i jazyka . . . I: 1* (1887), from which the author lists 3 texts (Nos. 604—606), but evidently again without having seen the book, for on p. 492 the latter refers to the historical background of one redaction, to which the author pays no attention, and also to other variants, of which the author mentions one (No. 1230 in his list), but only according to Sobolevskij's anthology, without knowing that the text first appears not as a separate book but in a certain series, which is not quoted. It is however still worse that Dr. Kempainen does not seem to know of the existence of another variant pointed out by Šejn and which is White Ruthenian (published anonymously by Jan Čečot). And worst of all is that Šejn's book gives no less than four texts more on p. 345/7 (Nos. 411—414), counterparts of which are listed by the author from other sources, but without knowledge of Šejn's variants.

In the same way the author records from P. P. Čubinskij's collection of materials *Trudy . . . V* (1874) some Ukrainian variants under the wrong heading of White Russia, but he does not know what is perhaps the most interesting variant from the same book p. 1082 (No. 218). It seems unavoidable to con-

clude that the author has not made himself acquainted with the books themselves, but has listed variants from them only with the aid of second-hand references.

The Great Russian variants have been listed without difficulty from Sobolevskij's Nos. 216—244, but here the author's inability to distinguish the one single False Knight type from a whole group of types becomes particularly clear. Moreover there is from the Great Russians a recent publication of ballads from the communist epoch, which the author does not know: see V. J. Černyšev, *Russkaja ballada* (1936).

Regarding the collecting of East Slavic material, a special danger is brought to mind, which has been expressed by John Meier already in 1939: »Neben unzweideutigen Ausformungen des Ulinger-Stoffes finden sich im Slavischen vielleicht auch Balladen, die infolge Fehlens gerade charakteristischer Züge diesem Stoff bereits sehr fern stehen» (*Deutsche Volkslieder* II 92, footnote 4). And thus Dr. Kemppinen's statement on p. 8 rather gives the impression of self-irony: »It is hardly possible to formulate a generally acceptable rule for identification but the scholar must possess a sound sense of reality in the application of his methods and he must at the same time be content to employ as evidential material in his comparisons only variants which derive from oral tradition.»

Moving on to the Fenno-Ugric field, it is first to be regretted that e.g. a clear Mordvin variant has been completely forgotten: see *Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* XCI (1947), p. 276/80 (No. 88). Because of lack of books I have not been able to scrutinize the Hungarian texts, but the chaotic method that is characteristic of the author irritates the reader in the list of variants: a lot of new editions, translations, and even summaries (e.g. No. 1326) are recorded as independent variants, so that the number of Hungarian (just as that of Slavic) variants is in reality much lower than that given by the author. It may for instance be asked what value as an independent variant Gragger's text has (in the author's list: No. 1327, FH 24), but in any case it has at least been provided with the warning »literary variant», and of the general value of such variants the author says on page 8: »Literary modification cannot be accepted as evidence.»

This warning would have been still more apt in the case of the Roumanian variants: here the paradoxical feature is found that the Roumanian variant No. 808, which is listed twice by the author (No. 809 is only a Hungarian translation of the same text), is not derived from popular poetry but is simply an adaptation by the writer Marienescu from a Hungarian ballad, deprived of the hanging episode found in the Hungarian



poem (the title of the book, which the author does not know, is this: *Poesia popurola ballade, culese si corese de At. Mariancu Marienescu*, 1859, p. 22—27). The Roumanians have yet another adaptation of the Hungarian ballad, by the writer Alexandri, which Dr. Kemppinen does not mention but to which the Hungarian folklorist S. Solymossy refers on that very page of his investigation which Dr. Kemppinen quotes in his bibliography. The paradox becomes even greater if we add that Solymossy is of course able to distinguish the types confused by Dr. Kemppinen and treats them on other pages of his book (see p. 116/8 and the bibliography p. 145 f.), not taken into consideration by Dr. Kemppinen.

The Finnish material dissolves into airy nothing, as already demonstrated by J. Hautala in his review (see *Suomalainen Suomi* No. 5, 1954). I agree with the criticism given in that review and do not intend to repeat it here; instead I will now turn to scrutinizing the Estonian material. So far I have brought typological and structural criteria not utilised by Dr. Kemppinen. Now I shall have to emphasize the psychological factors more than before. Besides the Finnish variants of the type of the man-killing maiden, a group of Estonian variants of the Maie-ballad have also been considered to belong to the type of the False Knight Ballad. The specific features of the ballad of the wife who kills her husband (Maie and other names) differ from those of the False Knight Ballad to such a great extent that there can be no question of original relationship. And it is still more impossible to unite the psychological predispositions of the two ballads: if the False Knight could really be, according to Dr. Kemppinen, some supernatural demon or deceased person, who comes from the other world in order to bring new victims to Hades, then in any case the wife who murders her husband is a perfectly natural woman, perhaps partly some psychopathologically abnormal human type, who for many quite natural reasons has been able to carry out the murder of her husband, as is explained in the Estonian variants (e.g. the constantly quarrelling, reproving and unbearable husband, the wicked mother-in-law or one who simply praises her son, etc.), but also with quite different consequences from those found in the Ballad of the False Knight: not the knight, but his wife gets her ethically justified mortal punishment. Dr. Kemppinen has left without notice the completely different predispositions and consequences, he forgets the difference of the entire structure, and clinging only to the similar specific themes he has confused two independent ballad types. It is well-nigh impossible to comprehend the mania for fusing together, since the grand old man of Estonian folk-lore J. Hurt

has indicated clearly the various types of contamination and published in German an excellent survey of the normal redaction of the Maie song among the Setukesians. I will quote it as an instance from which it may be seen how far Dr. Kemppinen goes to seek for non-existing counterparts or »variants» of his Ballad of the False Knight:

Eine Jungfrau, namens Maie, sucht sich einen Mann, der ihr gefiele und entspräche. Auf dem Markt glaubt sie einen solchen gefunden zu haben. Die Heirath wird vollzogen, aber die Hoffnung der Jungen Frau wird nicht erfüllt. Der Mann gefällt ihr nicht, sie will sich seiner entledigen. Sie setzt des Abends scharfe Werkzeuge ins Bett, durch die der Mann zum Tode verwundet wird. Am Morgen steht die Maie auf und treibt das Vieh auf die Weide. Die Weiber des Dorfes fragen sie: »Warum ist dein Stiefel blutig, dein Strumpf blutbesprengt?» Sie erwidert: »Ich habe ein Schaf [*ušsokene* is a hypochoristic name for 'sheep' and not a »snake», as Dr. Kemppinen incorrectly translates it] geschlachtet, daher das Blut.» Die Weiber glauben dem nicht und erklären, die Maie habe ihren Mann umgebracht. Nun flieht die junge Frau und sucht Schutz, resp. Rettung, an verschiedenen Orten: beim Brunnen, beim Hanf, bei der Birke, Kiefer, Tanne, beim Wacholder. Alle entschuldigen sich und begründen es, warum sie die Fliehende nicht schützen können. Zuletzt kommt sie zu der Espe und zur Erle, die nehmen sie auf, die Espe unter ihre Blätter, die Erle unter ihre Rinde. Dort lebt die Gattenmörderin weiter; darum zittern die Blätter der Espe beständig, darum ist die Rinde, resp. der Splint, der Erle roth.

Dr. Jakob Hurt. *Setukeste laulud I* (1904) C: Ausführliche Inhaltsangabe der Lieder in deutscher Sprache, p. 35 (No. 37).

At the same time Dr. Kemppinen's lack of knowledge of the Slavic and in general of the international world of poetry, even that of ballads, is revealed in a drastic manner. For the ballad of the woman who kills her husband is also international and has particularly many counterparts among the Slavic peoples, which Dr. Kemppinen does not list at all, not even from books from which he has otherwise registered variants with the aid of intermediaries. Once he includes the Maie-ballad in his list, he should have recorded at least the following ones also:

From the Great Russians: Sobolevskij not 126—129, Černyšev No. 211; from the White Ruthenians: Romanov No. 4 (p. 2), Šejn I: 1, Nos. 537—539;

from the Ukrainians: Čubinskij, *Trudy* . . . V, No. 410 (p. 839/41);

from the Poles: Oleska No. 26 (p. 505), *Bystron I* No. 1 A—G, II No. 1 A—C;

from the Czechs: Fr. Sušil, *Moravske narodni pisne* (3rd edition, 1941), No. 98 (p. 45);

from the Mordvins: Paasonen—Ravila (*MSFOu XCI*) No. 31, cf. Nos. 24—28;

from the Hungarians: Gragger 48 ff.

For these as well as the Lithuanian variants mentioned earlier, see J. Balys, *Lithuanian Narrative Folksongs* (1954), 90 (C11).

As a separate redaction of the Ballad of the False Knight the author also presents the Estonian type of ballad »The chaste maiden» (Karske neiu), which has been dealt with already in 1901 by O. Kallas in his doctor's thesis and which differs completely from the False Knight ballad type, structurally and in other ways. The author mentions Kallas's investigation in his bibliography, but he has not made himself sufficiently acquainted with its contents. There is further a more recent presentation of »The Chaste maiden» group of songs, which is unknown to the author: see L. Põdras in the series *Õpetatud Eesti Seltsi Kirjad III* (1935), p. 74—94. From this group the author records only a couple of dozens of variants, while actually there are hundreds of them. And once »The chaste maiden» is brought up for analysis in the capacity of a related type, one could have found other Estonian types of folk-songs with related themes as well. The same refers to other nations too, of course: if one includes the Croatian heroic poem (No. 896 in the author's list), then it is inconsistent not to take into consideration e.g. the famous Russian Roman bylina, variants of which are found even in Sobolevskij's anthology (Nos. 90—95, cf. Nos. 96 ff.) and which has been the subject of several investigations, e.g. Iv. Ždanov, *Russkij bylevoj epos* (1895), p. 425 ff. The latter scholar gives e.g. on page 526 a text from which Dr. Kemppinen might well have profited. Further the bylina of Roman (Michailo, Demjan, etc.) with its related theme would have shown Dr. Kemppinen — instead of a mythical knight — a perfectly natural prince as the murderer of his wife.

But it is futile to enter on the study of types with related themes, if the author has not acquired a reliable survey of the real False Knight type and prepared an adequate list of variants. As the author has not studied in detail the genetic relationship of types and specific features with similar themes, the comparative analysis given in the second chapter of the book is unable to reach a really scientific level. The author's theme analysis is incomplete and sporadic; it has some ideological interest but no typological value. Many dilettantes used to pursue such ideological *Betrachtungen* spanning the whole world in the last century. Nowadays no need is felt of such unfounded summaries.

The third chapter of the book gives a tragic impression: it is true that earlier explanations or »theories» are reported to some extent, but in »solving the problem» the author moves on such marshy ground that there does not seem to be any bottom at all, whether linguistically or typologically, not even ideologically, for the arbitrary emphasizing of the quite different Finnish material in the argumentation is not apt to prove the

so-called mythical origin of the False Knight, as has already been demonstrated by J. Hautala. It is likewise quite hopeless to look for a mythical origin e.g. of the Estonian or Russian »variants». Nos. 226—244 in Sobolevskij's anthology do not belong to the False Knight type, but have been listed there only because of Dr. Kemppinen's incompetence. But even Sobolevskij's Nos. 216—225 (actually only one tavern redaction, which Dr. Kemppinen has broken up into three on the basis of minor points) are anything but mythical. And out of them, only Nos. 217 and 225 present specific features that are similar to those of the False Knight type, as has been pointed out by J. Balys (see Lithuanian Narrative Folksongs, p. 93, No. C18), not to speak of original genetic relationship, which still remains to be proved. Already John Meier (Deutsche Volkslieder II 97) states cautiously that the ballad presents a certain »Mischung von Dämonischem und Menschlichem», but even after the appearing of Dr. Kemppinen's dissertation this point remains to be definitely clarified.

Thus a fruitless investigation has been printed in vain, and its effect is rather negative than positive, for internationally it will have a disturbing influence on scholars who do not have time to scrutinize the unreliable list of variants and who accept the results *bona fide*, which in its turn will throw a shadow on the more reliable results of previous research work. The scientific study of folk-lore demands rigorous training and self-criticism, both of which the author seems to lack. It is really a pity that a man, who in all probability has tried his best, should have wasted so much time and energy to reach his goal and still have failed so sadly, thus proving the truth that it is impossible to build a monumental edifice of research on tottering ground.

Uppsala.

OSKAR LOORITS.