THE MOTHERS

A STUDY OF THE ORIGINS OF SENTIMENTS AND INSTITUTIONS

BY

ROBERT BRIFFAULT

IN THREE VOLUMES

VOL. I

Attention Reader:

This volume is too fragile for any future repair.
Please handle with great care.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY-CONSERVATION & BOOK REPAIR

Digitized by Google Original from

COPYRIGHT, 1927,
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Set up and printed.
Published April, 1927.



PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
By J. J. Little & Ives Company, New York

Original from

Hum. Lit
Handman
2-24-49
539271
3 v.
add. cop.

PREFACE

THE present work would have been improved by having been composed under more favourable conditions. It has been my lot to write books in situations fantastically unsuitable: one for the most part in the trenches, another from beginning to end in a ship's cabin. Circumstances scarcely less unpropitious to the production of a work calling for some small measure of research and erudition have attended my task in this instance. It has been completed amid great suffering. The flight that began with still youthful buoyancy has been brought to a conclusion on broken wings. These things I mention not in extenuation, but in explanation of shortcomings which cannot be more perceptible to the critic than they are to the author.

The enquiries with which these studies deal arose out of a simple enough question of psychology. I had proposed to draw up a list of the forms of the social instincts, and to investigate their origin. I had not proceeded far before I discovered, to my surprise, that the social characters of the human mind are, one and all, traceable to the operation of instincts that are related to the functions of the female and not to those of the male. That the mind of women should have exercised so fundamental an influence upon human development in the conditions of historical patriarchal societies, is inconceivable. I was thus led to reconsider the early development of human society, of its fundamental institutions and traditions, in the light of the matriarchal theory of social evolution. That theory has of late years suffered a good deal of academic vilification; but it must be admitted that criticisms of it have been distinguished by scathing vivacity rather than by clarity of reasoning or convincing evidence. To the evolutionist who goes beyond anthropological speculation, it cannot but appear notable that no trace of patriarchal organisation is to be found in the animal world. The animal family, out of which the human social group must be supposed to have arisen, is matriarchal. The extended significance imparted by this and other considerations to the view suggested by certain features of archaic and primitive

societies, involved a reconsideration of the problems of social anthropology. These have been almost exclusively discussed in terms of the instincts and interests of the male. It remains to be seen whether, by taking into consideration also the very different mental characters and interests of women, more satisfactory interpretations are afforded.

Social anthropology being the history of social tradition, deals to a large extent with the origin of prejudices. It is hence inevitable that it should either be swayed and vitiated by these, or come into conflict with them. Almost all the questions with which it is concerned are, at the present time, controversial. I detest controversy. Every conclusion, to be adequately set forth, is, however, under the necessity of taking account of those with which it is at variance. No study is better calculated than that of social anthropology to inculcate tolerance towards the imbecilities of the human mind. Disingenuousness of method, while it calls for exposure, does not merit comment. So complex and extensive are the relevant data that bubbles of fallacy are not to be pricked with the point of a rapier; the heavy weapons of proof must in every instance be driven in to the hilt. I have for the most part allowed facts to speak for themselves; and facts are prone to be more long-winded than the most complacent eloquence. Hence one of the present work's most apparent faults, its unwieldy length. Some may think that it might have been carved into independent members; but the amputation of any of these would have left a mutilated Osiris.

The heads of primordial social groups, magic women and priestesses credited with supernatural powers, sacred queens in whom the mystic virtue of royalty was thought to reside, fateful goddesses that were the divine counterparts of earthly womanhood, have been in many primitive and ancient cultures known as 'The Mothers.'

I am for the most part denied the gratification of offering those acknowledgments of indebtedness which afford the best excuse for prefatory words. I have worked single-handed and have been spared no drudgery. To my daughter, who has unwaveringly shared my sacrifice, is due that it has not been wholly in vain. I am beholden to Mrs. C. A. Dawson Scott for valued assistance in proof-reading. The traditional courtesy and helpfulness of the officials in the National and many other libraries have been among the amenities of my labours.

R. B.

Hampstead, 1926.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

'IN THE BEGINNING WAS THE WORD'

Twofold derivation of the human mind: from actual ancestry by natural heredity, and from human society by traditional heredity, pp. 1–3; conceptual thought dependent upon language, pp. 2–3.

The doctrine of the Logos and the Theory of Ideas, pp. 3–14.—Mind identified with language, and ideas with words, p. 3; the theories of Plato and of Plotinus, p. 4; the doctrine of the Creative Word and of ideal paradigms in the theologies of the ancient East, pp. 4–7; the theory of ideas amongst uncultured races, pp. 7–8; the eternal representative of a species and the soul of a person identified with their names, pp. 8–12; magic operations on names, pp. 12–14.

The power of the Word, pp. 14–23.—Magic words of power, pp. 14–16; poetry originally a form of magic, pp. 17–22.

Experiments and observations on wild children, pp. 23–30.—Children brought up in isolation with a view to elucidating the origin of language, pp. 23–24; stories about wild children and their mental condition, pp. 26–30.

Imbeciles and deaf-mutes, pp. 30–40.—Nature of the condition of mental deficiency, pp. 30–31; social and moral sentiments not developed in imbeciles, p. 31; the mental condition of the deaf and dumb and of the blind deaf-mutes, pp. 31–40.

The distinctive characters of the human mind cannot develop apart from traditional heredity, pp. 40–42; rapid loss of those characters where traditional heredity does not operate, p. 42.

CHAPTER II

TRADITIONAL HEREDITY

Mental characters regarded as innate and inherited, pp. 43 sq.; the inheritance of instincts in man, pp. 45–47; no instinctive human disposition unmodified by traditional heredity, pp. 48–51; capacity for education in savage children, pp. 51–54; estimation of that capacity in European children, pp. 54–57; no evidence of the inheritance of specific abilities,

pp. 56–58 ; the progress of social culture due to traditional heredity, pp. 59–60 ; moral qualities determined by traditional heredity, pp. 60–61 ; supposed racial characteristics, chiefly dependent upon traditional heredity, pp. 63–66 ; characters of various social classes largely determined by nurture, p. 66 ; tendency to regard virtues and moral principles as naturally inherited, pp. 66–68 ; their dependence upon the social state and their absence in animals, pp. 68–71 ; children deficient in social and moral characters, pp. 71–75 ; conflict between naturally inherited mental characters and those acquired from traditional heredity and inhibition of the former by the latter : theories of Freud, pp. 75–77 ; the origin of specific human characters to be sought in the history of social development, p. 78.

Difficulties of the enquiry, pp. 78–80 ; the study of social anthropology facilitated by the persistence of traditional heredity, pp. 80–81 ; apparent strangeness of the products of the primitive mind, pp. 81–82 ; usually interpreted in terms of masculine instincts and interests, p. 83 ; the matriarchal theory of social evolution, pp. 83–84.

Chapter III

THE EVOLUTION OF MOTHERHOOD

Origin and function of sexual reproduction, pp. 85–92.—Every reaction of living matter attended with the renewal of wasted tissues, which is an act of reproduction, p. 85 ; different effects of favourable and of unfavourable conditions, pp. 85–87 ; the former result in reproduction by fission, the latter by fragmentation, p. 86 ; equilibrium of vital dispositions between conjoined cells, p. 87 ; origin of sexual reproduction in the conjunction of ill-nourished with well-nourished organisms, p. 88 ; reproduction of females without conjugation ; parthenogenesis, pp. 89 sq. ; sexual reproduction a device for securing the reproduction of the male, pp. 90 sq.

Limitation of offspring and development of maternal provisions, pp. 92–96.—Offspring as parasites on the mother, pp. 93 sq. ; reduction in the number of eggs, pp. 94 sq. ; care of the eggs, p. 95 ; gestation in mammals and its prolongation in the higher types, pp. 96 sq.

Effects of the prolongation of immaturity, pp. 96–110.—Infancy greatly prolonged in the higher mammalian types, pp. 99–100 ; period of immaturity chiefly employed in the development of the central nervous system, pp. 100–103 ; mental development under the influence of the environment substituted for inherited instinct, pp. 104 sq. ; relative precocity and early arrest of mental development in savages as compared with civilised races, pp. 106–110.

The maternal instinct, pp. 110–116.—Associated in its rudimentary forms with physiological stimuli, pp. 110–112 ; operates in lower animals at stated periods only, p. 112 ; infanticide amongst animals, *ibid.* ; variable and ephemeral operation of the maternal instinct among mammals, pp. 113 sq. ; its great development in the quadrumana, pp. 114–116.

CHAPTER IV

THE ORIGIN OF LOVE

Sexual hunger and cruelty, pp. 117–120.—Sexual love commonly identified with the sexual impulse, and ascribed to animals, plants, and inanimate objects, p. 117; tendency of evolution in predatory animals towards the development of cruelty, p. 118; sexual congress among animals usually attended with violence and bodily injury, p. 119; traces of the same tendencies in humanity, p. 120.

The mating instinct, pp. 121–125.—Distinct in origin, function, and character from the sexual instinct, p. 120; absent where functions of cooperation in the care of eggs and offspring are not required, pp. 121 sq.; separation of the sexes general among mammals, and sexual association rare and transient, pp. 122–124; no functions of protection or cooperation exercised by the male, pp. 124 sq.

Sexual and maternal love in primitive humanity, pp. 125–133.—Love between the sexes generally reported to be absent or feebly developed among uncultured peoples, pp. 125–127; maternal affection intense, pp. 126–129; the practice of infanticide not inconsistent with the maternal instinct, pp. 129–130; fierce and unreasoning character of maternal affection in primitive races, pp. 130 sq.; loyalty and devotion towards the sexual mate more marked in primitive women than in men, pp. 131–133.

Transference of characters from one sex to the other, pp. 133–141.—Characters of both male and female progenitors inherited by the offspring, pp. 133 sq.; characters of the opposite sex latent in all individuals, p. 135; masculine characters developed in females, pp. 135 sq.; feminine characters in males, pp. 134, 137; solicitude of male fishes, reptiles, and birds for the eggs probably a manifestation of the sexual instinct, pp. 137–140; mutual adjustment of instincts in both sexes, pp. 140 sq.

Antagonism between the mating and the sexual instinct, pp. 141–146.—Love opposed to lust, pp. 141–142; sexual differences in the forms of the mating instinct, pp. 142 sq.; cultural development of sexual love, pp. 143–145; extension of tender sentiments in the female, pp. 145 sq.

The filial instinct, pp. 146–151.—Checked in civilised societies, pp. 146 sq.; prominent manifestations of affection and respect for the mother in the lower cultures, pp. 148–151.

The social instincts, pp. 151–160.—No connexion between the operation of the filial instinct and actual relationship, pp. 151 sq.; aptitude for attachment and affection related to the extent of the operation of maternal care, p. 152; group-feeling amongst animals, pp. 152–154; no primary 'gregarious instinct,' pp. 154 sq.; general tendency of animals to disperse and wander, pp. 155 sq.; sociability in man primarily familial, p. 157; hostility towards other groups in the lower cultures, pp. 157–159; extension and ideal forms of group-sympathy and loyalty, pp. 159–160.

CHAPTER V

THE HERD AND THE FAMILY AMONGST ANIMALS

Supposed animal societies, pp. 161–168.—Groups of associated animals invariably founded on reproductive and not on cooperative or social functions, p. 161; insect-communities and differentiation of reproductive functions amongst their members, pp. 161–163; adventitious and temporary aggregations of unassociated individuals, pp. 164–167; temporary packs among canine animals; no organisation or cooperation, pp. 165–167; erroneous descriptions of beaver communities, pp. 167 sq.; and of 'Prairie-dog' societies, p. 168.

'Polygamy' and 'monogamy' amongst animals, pp. 168–180.—No relation between polygamous or monogamous habits and fertility or development, pp. 168–169; ambiguity of the terms in reference to animals, p. 169; seasonal pairing of birds not necessarily monogamous, pp. 169–170; pairing lasting beyond one breeding-season found amongst mammals in the smaller species of antelopes only, pp. 170 sq.; all quadrumana polygamous, pp. 172–179; alleged monogamous species of monkeys, pp. 172 sq.; sexual habits of the anthropoid apes, pp. 173–179; causes which determine the form of sexual association act through the reproductive system of the female, pp. 179 sq.

Jealousy amongst animals, pp. 180–184.—Absence of manifestations of jealousy in several species, p. 180; seasonal manifestations of combativeness, p. 180; jealousy amongst fishes with reference to the ova, pp. 181 sq.; competition amongst males not for possession of particular females, but for access to the largest number, pp. 182–184; 'spent' males indifferent, p. 184.

The female in the animal group, pp. 185–194.—Herds and other groups usually led by females, pp. 185 sq.; migrations determined by females, p. 186; feeble development of maternal instincts among herding herbivores, pp. 186 sq.; sympathy and social feeling more developed among carnivora, pp. 187 sq.; family constituted by mother and offspring, the male not an essential part of it, and often absent, pp. 188–191; masculine instincts dominant in herd-formation, pp. 192 sq.; the animal family dependent upon segregation, pp. 193 sq.

CHAPTER VI

THE PRIMITIVE HUMAN GROUP

The human social group derived from the animal family, p. 195; impossibility of human development in isolated groups consisting of only a few individuals, pp. 195 sq.; defeated races found at the present day living in scattered and isolated groups driven to unfavourable habitats by more powerful races, and probably culturally decayed, pp. 196–198; human society originated in favourable conditions, pp. 198 sq.; aggregation of family-groups gives rise to herd, p. 199; preservation of the characters of the maternal animal family possible only if females continue in it and males find mates elsewhere, pp. 201 sq.; the rule of exogamy and the prohibition of incest, pp. 202 sq.; older attempts to account for them, pp. 203 sq.

Alleged injurious effects of inbreeding among animals, pp. 204–217.—Close and constant inbreeding the general rule amongst animals, pp. 205 sq.; rapid propagation from a few individuals, pp. 206 sq.; experiments on inbreeding; large increase in weight and fertility produced, pp. 207 sq.; the artificial breeding of domestic animals, pp. 208–215; satisfactory results of close inbreeding, pp. 209 sq.; degeneration brought about by artificial selection of adiposity and other pathological characters, pp. 210–212; occasional cross with animal less artificially bred sometimes beneficial in those circumstances, pp. 212 sq.; unfavourable results of neglecting to inbreed, pp. 214 sq.; cross-fertilisation of some flowering plants may be beneficial for reasons not connected with inbreeding, as by securing a longer period of reproduction, pp. 216 sq.

Results of inbreeding in human communities, pp. 217–224.—Constant inbreeding prevalent among uncultured races, with no evil effects, pp. 217–219; segregated communities, pp. 219–222; no evidence of evil effects from consanguineous marriages in royal families, pp. 222 sq.; or in the general population, pp. 223 sq.

Supposed production of deaf-mutism and other conditions by consanguineous marriages, pp. 224–240.—Attempt to demonstrate the supposed evil effects of inbreeding by the statistics of deaf-mutism, p. 224; the incidence of the condition associated with enhanced fertility, pp. 224 sq.; congenital deafness extremely rare, its occurrence doubtful, pp. 225–227; statistics first produced in support of the theory of the association of deaf-mutism with consanguineous marriages erroneous, later ones inconclusive, pp. 227–230; the condition not hereditary, pp. 231 sq.; correlation of deaf-mutism with external conditions pronounced, constant, and uniform, pp. 232 sq.; no evidence of the association of mental disease with consanguineous marriages, pp. 233 sq.; theory that hereditary tendencies towards pathological conditions in both parents are summated in their offspring unproved and perhaps theoretically erroneous, pp. 234–236; the theory of the evil effects of consanguineous marriages first advanced on religious grounds, p. 237; supposed evidence from the respective liability of members of various religious denominations, pp. 237 sq.; beliefs of savages as regards the evils resulting from consanguineous unions to the offspring, the parents, the tribe, the crops, the atmospheric and other conditions, pp. 238–239; the theory concerning the injuriousness of consanguineous unions probably a survival of those beliefs, p. 240.

Theories concerning the origin of exogamy, pp. 241–249.—The rule of exogamy formerly believed to have been adopted in consequence of the observation by savages of the evil results of inbreeding, p. 241; or supposed by Dr. Westermarck to have been imposed by the operation of natural selection, p. 242; ascribed by M. Durkheim to horror of shedding the blood of the tribe by defloration, pp. 242 sq.; thought to be due to the jealousy of the elder males, p. 243; supposed to be the result of the lower stimulating sexual value of habitual associates, pp. 243–247; mating of habitual associates regarded as the most suitable in uncultured and in civilised societies, pp. 244–247; illusion by which the horror of incest appears instinctive, p. 247; segregation of brothers and sisters in savage societies, p. 248; greater attractiveness of the stranger, pp. 248 sq.; biological explanations of the prohibition of incest inconsistent with the fact that it does not exist among animals, p. 249.

Derivation of the rule of exogamy from the constitution of the maternal group, pp. 249–259.—Maternal constitution of the group destroyed if the females leave it, but unaffected by the transfer of the males to other groups, pp. 250–252 ; sedentary character of the women and roving disposition of the men, pp. 251 sq. ; opposition of maternal instincts to relations of young males with their younger sisters, pp. 252-257 ; prohibition of incest primarily applies to those relations, pp. 257 sq. ; prohibition reinforced by progress in organisation, pp. 258 sq.

The mother-in-law, pp. 259–267.—Rules of avoidance between a man and his mother-in-law, pp. 259–262 ; inconclusive explanations of the practice, pp. 262 sq. ; restrictions removed by marrying mother-in-law, p. 264 ; or by the birth of a child, pp. 264 sq. ; or by offering presents, p. 265 ; the mother-in-law as head of the group to which the man attaches himself regarded with the same awe as the mother, the head of his own group, pp. 266 sq.

Chapter VII

THE MOTHERHOOD

Matrilocal marriage, pp. 268–310.—Usage that the husband takes up his abode in the home of his wife in North America, pp. 268–276 ; in Central and South America, pp. 276–279 ; in Africa, pp. 279–287 ; among the Malays, pp 287–290 ; among other peoples of Indonesia, pp. 290 sq. ; in the Philippines and in Micronesia, pp. 291 sq. ; in Torres Straits and New Guinea, pp. 292–294 ; in Polynesia, pp. 294 sq. ; in Asia, pp. 295–302 ; residual forms of matrilocal marriage, pp. 302–304 ; matrilocal marriage for a given period, or 'marriage by service,' pp. 304–307 ; change to patrilocal marriage, pp. 307 sq. ; maternal reckoning of kinship and descent, pp. 308 sq. ; status of women in matrilocal marriage, pp. 309 sq.

The status of women in primitive societies, pp. 310–332.—Old fallacy that the status of women is an index of the degree of civilisation, pp. 310 sq. ; oppressed condition of women in some savage societies, pp. 311–315 ; high position and influence of women in most uncultured societies, pp. 316–327 ; impossibility of that status having succeeded to one of oppression, pp. 327–332 ; women content with their position, pp. 327 sq. ; toil regarded as voluntary, pp. 328–330 ; no disposition on the part of women to resent the sexual usages established in the society they live in, pp. 330–332.

The establishment of masculine domination in some societies in the lowest stages of culture, pp. 332–344.—Theory that the matriarchal order is the outcome of local circumstances, pp. 332–334 ; general transition from matriarchal to patriarchal usages with change in economic conditions, pp. 335 sq. ; evidence that the status of women was formerly different in societies in low stages of culture where male domination is now established, pp. 336–343 ; patriarchal institutions generally associated with advanced culture, pp. 343–344.

CHAPTER VIII

THE MATRIARCHAL PHASE IN CIVILISED SOCIETIES

The Indian Aryans, pp. 345–362.—Low status of women under Brahmanical law, p. 345; freedom and high position of women in Vedic and epic literature, pp. 345–347; origin of the Indian 'Aryans' and their connection with the peoples of Central Asia, pp. 348–358; matriarchal organisation of the Getae, p. 359; matriarchal descent among the ancient Hindus, pp. 359 sq.; survivals of the matriarchal order among the Rajputs and modern Hindus, pp. 360–362.

China and Japan, pp. 362–370.—Exogamic Chinese clans, p. 363; matrilocal marriage in ancient and modern China, pp. 364–366; former high status of women in China, pp. 366–368; marriage and adoption in modern Japan, pp. 368 sq.; matriarchal marriage in ancient Japan, pp. 369 sq.

The Semites, pp. 370–377.—Kinship among the Arabs, pp. 370, 372; matrilocal marriage among the ancient and modern Semites, pp. 372–374; position of women in ancient Arabia, pp. 374–377.

Ancient Egypt, pp. 377–388.—Maternal descent, pp. 379–381; position of the wife, p. 381; matrilocal marriage, pp. 381 sq.; Egyptian marriage contracts, pp. 382–385; official positions held by women, pp. 386 sq.; growth of patriarchal principles and persistence of matriarchal usage, pp. 387 sq.

The Aegean and Greece, pp. 388–414.—Lykian matriarchy, pp. 388 sq.; Karians, Lydians, Mysians, pp. 389 sq.; ancient Kretan civilisation, pp. 391–394; the Mediterranean race, pp. 394–397; gynaecocracy of the Cantaberians, p. 397; the Spartans, pp. 398–401; the Lokrians, p. 401; traditions of matriarchal usage in Athens, pp. 401–403; female genealogies, pp. 403 sq.; survivals of maternal kinship, p. 405; matrilocal marriage of Greek princes, p. 406; Athenian marriage law founded on matrilocal usage, pp. 406–409; women in the Homeric poems and in classical Greece, pp. 410–414.

The Teutons, pp. 414–417.—Position of women, p. 414; traces of maternal kinship, *ibid.*; maternal kinship in the Salic Laws, p. 415; matriarchal succession, pp. 415 sq.; matrilocal marriage of the Goths, pp. 416 sq.

The Celts, pp. 417–420.—Status of women in Gaul, matrilocal marriage, pp. 417 sq.; matrilocal marriage in Ireland and in Scotland, pp. 418 sq.; matriarchal succession among the Picts, Irish, and British, pp. 418 sq.

Rome, pp. 420–430.—Difficulties of the patriarchal theory applied to Roman origins, p. 421; metronymous Curiae, p. 422; land-donations by women, pp. 422 sq.; maternal succession of Roman kings, pp. 423 sq.; the Etruscans, pp. 427 sq.; 'cognomen' and 'agnomen,' p. 426; patricians and plebeians, pp. 427 sq.; Roman matriarchal tradition, pp. 428–430.

Possible effects of the early establishment of the patriarchal order on cultural development, pp. 430–432.

Chapter IX

PRIMITIVE DIVISION OF LABOUR BETWEEN THE SEXES

The primitive matriarchal constitution of society not founded upon domination by women similar to that exercised by the men in patriarchal society, p. 433; economic domination, whether by men or by women, possible in advanced conditions only, pp. 433–435; women's labour in primitive society voluntary, pp. 436–440; establishment of division of labour between the sexes, pp. 440 sq.

Physical differences between the sexes in primitive races, pp. 442–447.—Females larger than the males among the lower animals, pp. 442 sq.; women physically more developed than the men in many primitive races, pp. 443–446; physical differences between the sexes less pronounced in primitive than in civilised races, pp. 446 sq.; probably to a large extent the product of social conditions, p. 447.

Women as hunters and fishers, pp. 447–450.—Aptitude as hunters shown by primitive women, pp. 447 sq.; food-supply derived from fishing sometimes procured by women only, pp. 448 sq.; economic division of labour a consequence of women's functions of motherhood, and confirmed by professional pride of hunters and warriors, pp. 449 sq.

Women as warriors, pp. 451–459.—Women commonly taking part in war in primitive societies, pp. 451–453; generally distinguished by greater cruelty, pp. 453–454; amazons in barbaric societies, pp. 454–458; endurance of primitive women in childbirth regarded as a duty lest they should bring forth cowards, pp. 458 sq.

Primitive industry: leatherwork, embroidery, weaving, basketry, pp. 460–466.—Preparation of hides, pp. 460 sq.; manufacture pf flint scrapers, p. 461; manufacture of clothing, pp. 461 sq.; thread, needles, dyes, embroidery, pp. 462 sq.; bark-cloth, p. 463; weaving, pp. 463–465; plaiting and basket-work, pp. 465 sq.

Pottery, pp. 466–477.—Manufacture of pottery carried out exclusively by women, pp. 466–472; ritual observances, tabus, and religious conceptions associated with the manufacture of pots, pp. 472–475; sacred vessels, p. 475; development of ceramic technique, pp. 475 sq.; ceramic decorative art, pp. 476 sq.

Building, pp. 477–483.—Women the builders of primitive homes, pp. 477–481; development of Egyptian and of Greek architecture from primitive huts and food-stores, pp. 481–483.

Primitive trade, pp. 483–485.—Women the chief traders in uncultured societies, pp. 483–485.

Medicine and surgery, pp. 485–488.—Herbal lore and primitive magic, pp. 485 sq.; women the chief medical practitioners in primitive communities, pp. 486–488; practice of surgery by women in barbaric societies, p. 488.

Primitive industry and administration confined to the household sphere, pp. 489 sq.; prominent part played by primitive women in that sphere, affords no argument for doctrine of feminism, *ibid.*; women more alert than the men in the domain of primitive transactions and administration, pp. 490 sq.

Position of chiefs in primitive societies, pp. 491–497.—The exercise of the functions of chieftainship by men adduced as an objection to the matriarchal theory of social evolution, pp. 491 sq.; headmen and chiefs frequently absent in primitive societies; their functions often temporary, their power and influence small, pp. 492–495; chiefs in matriarchal societies, pp. 496 sq.; functions of male chiefs specially concerned with the external relations of the group, p. 497.

Position of the woman's brother in primitive society, pp. 498–505.—Executive and protective functions exercised by the woman's brother, not by her husband, p. 498; the paternal uncle guardian of his nephews and nieces, pp. 498–502; bonds of affection between brother and sister closer than between husband and wife, pp. 503–505.

The marital group in primitive society, pp. 505–519.—Conception of the 'family' as the group formed by husband and wife, often absent in primitive society, pp. 505 sq.; husband and wife regard one another as strangers and live separate lives, pp. 507–513; the husband a temporary and secret visitor, pp. 513–516; clandestine relations between husband and wife probably due to hostility between their respective groups, pp. 516–518; love of the clan greater than love between husband and wife, pp. 518 sq.

Chapter X

THE INSTITUTION OF MARRIAGE

Prolonged sexual association not an essential biological function; not general among animals; not called for in matriarchal groups, p. 520; marriage sometimes entered into for special purposes by certain classes, pp. 520 sq.; marriage universally regarded as a social institution, pp. 521–523; not regarded as founded on the operation of the natural instincts, pp. 523–526.

Marriage negotiated by 'go-betweens,' pp. 527–531.

Marriage arranged by parents or other persons, pp. 531–544.—Marriage or betrothal of infants, pp. 532–539; bride chosen by the father, pp. 539 sq.; by the chief or king, pp. 540 sq.; by the maternal uncle, pp. 541–543; by the mother, pp. 543 sq.

No violence offered to personal inclinations, pp. 545–549.—Prearrangement of marriage by relatives or others commonly regarded by Europeans as a disregard of personal inclinations, p. 545; opposition rarely offered to the arrangement on grounds of personal inclination, pp. 545 sq.; selection of a spouse often undertaken at the request of 'parties concerned,' pp. 546 sq.; absence of personal preference presupposed by those arrangements, p. 547; personal inclinations, when present, usually respected, p. 548; conflict between inclination and formal arrangements characteristic of the more advanced social phases, pp. 548 sq.

Marriage contracted and celebrated by all the members of the two groups, pp. 549-559.—Tribal authority as regards the prescription of a marriage has usually reference to a group and not to individual persons, pp. 549 sq.; father and other guardians act as representatives of the group, pp. 550 sq.; council of the whole clan or tribe sometimes regarded as necessary to the contraction of a marriage, pp. 551–554; presents or bride-price provided by all the members of one group and distributed among all the members of another group, pp. 554–556; marriage celebrated by all the members of the respective groups; the bride and bridegroom sometimes absent, pp. 556 sq.; wedding-meal regarded as a communion between all the members of the two groups, pp. 557–559; other rites celebrated as a marriage union between all members of both groups, pp. 559.

Reasons for instituting a marriage agreement between two groups, pp. 559–563.—Difficulty of social intercourse between members of different groups in primitive societies, pp. 560 sq.; wives not obtainable from other groups except by forcible capture or by collective negotiation and agreement, pp. 561 sq.; such agreements between intermarrying groups the usual arrangement in primitive societies, pp. 562 sq.

The marriage of cross-cousins, pp. 563–584.—The relationship of cross-cousins automatically established between members of intermarrying groups, pp. 564 sq.; cross-cousin marriage in Australia, pp. 564 sq.; in Melanesia, pp. 565 sq.; in Indonesia, pp. 566 sq.; in India, pp. 567–569; in other parts of Asia, pp. 569 sq.; in Africa, pp. 570 sq.; in America, pp. 571 sq.; intermarriage of clans or families, pp. 573–579; association of cross-cousin marriage with the intermarriage of groups, p. 580; suggested economic reasons for cross-cousin marriage, pp. 580–584; marriage with paternal uncle's daughter among Muslims, p. 581; economic motives overruled in cross-cousin marriage, pp. 582–584.

Principle of interpretation of customs: those applying to the more primitive observances of the custom usually nearer to their original intention than the motives adduced in more advanced social states, pp. 584–587.

The change from clan-kinship to family-kinship, pp. 587–589.—The rule of cross-cousin marriage founded on the clan system of kinship, abolished by the prohibition of cousin-marriage in the family system of kinship, pp. 587 sq.; breakdown of clan-organisation, pp. 589 sq.; substitution of family-relationship for clan-relationship in marriage rules, pp. 590 sq.

Primitive kinship and group-motherhood.—The clan, like the family, a reproductive group, and not a political organisation, p. 591; clan-kinship, or 'classificatory' system of relationship, and family-kinship or 'descriptive' system of relationship, pp. 591 sq.; misconception as to the artificial or conventional character of clan-relationship, pp. 592 sq.; the assumption thought to be confirmed by the collective use of the term 'mother,' p. 593; the operation of maternal and filial instincts among animals not dependent upon 'actual' relationship, pp. 593–596; collective maternal care among animals, p. 594; adoption among animals, pp. 594 sq.; manifestations of the social instincts among animals follow the 'classificatory system,' p. 596; collective

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

parental affection in primitive societies, p. 597 ; collective nursing and maternal care, pp. 597 sq. ; fosterage and adoption, pp. 598–605 ; collective terms of clan-relationship represent actual social relations and are more primitive than terms of family-relationship, pp. 605 sq.

Primitive marriage relationship, pp. 607–613.—Terms used to denote marital relationship similar in connotation to those used in reference to consanguinity, p. 607 ; they refer to collective group-relations and not to economic individual relations, p. 608 ; the relation between members of opposite sexes in corresponding marriage-groups everywhere recognised as different from those of men and women in the same marriage-group, pp. 608–611 ; collective marriage relationship condemned, as are all alien marriage institutions, where individual marriage relations have become established, pp. 611–613.

CHAPTER XI

GROUP-MARRIAGE AND SEXUAL COMMUNISM

Sororal polygyny, pp. 614–627.—The claim to a wife's sisters as wives, pp. 614–621 ; modification of the claim : husband's consent required for the marriage of his wife's sisters, pp. 621 sq. ; exchange of one sister for another, p. 622 ; sister supplied on wife's decease, pp. 622–624 ; apologetic explanations of sororal polygyny and marriage of deceased wife's sister, pp. 624–627.

The combination of sororal polygyny with fraternal polyandry, or group-marriage, impracticable as an economic association, pp. 627 sq. ; fraternal polyandry hence found surviving as a sexual association only and in the form of sororal-fraternal group-marriage, pp. 628 sq.

Collective marriage among the peoples of Northern Asia, pp. 629–634.—Collective marriage relations among the Gilyak, pp. 629 sq. ; survivals of collective marriage among the Yakut, pp. 630 sq. ; collective marriage relations in Kamchatka, p. 631 ; among the Tungus, pp. 631 sq. ; among the Chukchi, pp. 632 sq. ; among the Aleuts, pp. 633 sq.

Sexual hospitality, pp. 635–640.—The guest assimilated to a tribal brother, pp. 635 sq. ; rejection of sexual hospitality resented, p. 636 ; obsolescence of sexual hospitality, pp. 638 sq. ; duty of hospitality derived from solidarity of clan-brotherhood, and regarded as including sexual hospitality, pp. 639 sq.

Collective sexual relations in America, pp. 641–647.—Sexual collectivism among the Eskimo, p. 641 ; fraternal polyandry among the Tlinkit, pp. 641–643 ; fraternal polyandry among the tribes of British Columbia, p. 643 ; fraternal-sororal collective relations among the North American Indians, pp. 644–646 ; collective sexual relations in South America, pp. 646 sq.

Collective marriage in Tibet, pp. 647–668.—Principles of Tibetan marriage customs, pp. 647–662 ; the impartite family, and the rule of seniority in marriage, pp. 651-661 ; Tibetan polyandry upheld by the women, pp. 663 sq. ; absence or difficulty of divorce, pp. 665 sq. ; apologetic 'explanations' of Tibetan polyandry, pp. 666 sq. ; its traditional character and wide distribution, p. 668.

Polyandrous marriage in other parts of the Himalayan region and in central Asia, pp. 669–673.—Traces and survivals of polyandry in Assam, p. 669 ; survival of polyandry in various parts of the southern Himalaya, pp. 669 sq. ; former existence of polyandry in Hindu-Kush, Chitral, Turkestan, p. 671 ; polyandry in the Pamirs and Koko-Nor, pp. 671 sq. ; possibility of the former existence of similar institutions in China, pp. 672 sq.

Polyandry among the native races of northern India, pp. 673–676.—The Khonds, pp. 673 sq. ; the Gonds, p. 674 ; the Santals and other races of Bengal, pp. 674–676.

Polyandry among the ' Aryan ' Hindus, pp. 677–690.—Polyandry among the Rajputs, pp. 677 sq. ; polyandry among the Jats, pp. 678–680 ; polyandry among the ' Aryan ' people of central Asia, the Getae or Massa-Getae, pp. 680 sq. ; indications of the custom in the Sacred Laws of the Aryas and the Puranas, pp. 681 sq. ; in the Indian epics, pp. 682 sq. ; in the Vedas, pp. 684–687 ; influence of Brahmanism on the obsolescence of polyandry, pp. 688 sq. ; its survival in some Brahmanical castes, pp. 689 sq.

Polyandrous marriage among other ' Aryan ' peoples, pp. 690-697.–Use of the term ' Aryan,' and the ' Aryan ' hypothesis, pp. 690 sq. ; polyandry among the Aryas and Medes, pp. 691 sq. ; polyandry among the Spartans, pp. 692 sq. ; indications of the custom among the Etruscans and the Romans, pp. 693–695 ; among the Teutons, pp. 695 ; among the Celts, pp. 695–697.

Collective marriage in southern India, pp. 697–714.—Group-marriage among the Todas and other tribes of the Nilgiri Hills, pp. 698 sq. ; fraternal polyandry among various castes of Malabar, pp. 699 sq. ; marriage institutions of the Nayars, pp. 700–712 ; regulated by intermarriage groups, p. 703 ; no economic association, pp. 704 sq. ; fraternal in character, pp. 705–707 ; the ' tali ' ceremony, pp. 707–709 ; decay and survival of Nayar polyandry, pp. 709–712 ; repudiation of ancient usages when they become subject to moral condemnation, pp. 712 sq. ; fraternal polyandry and polygyny in Ceylon, pp. 713 sq.

Evidence of polyandry among the ancient Semites, pp. 714 sq.

CHAPTER XII

GROUP-MARRIAGE AND SEXUAL COMMUNISM (*continued*)

Sexual communism in Africa, pp. 716–722.—Clan, age-grade, and fraternal sexual communism in East Africa, pp. 716–718 ; polyandry in Nigeria, West Africa, and the Congo, pp. 718 sq. ; ' Upanga ' institution of the Herero, pp. 719–726 ; sexual communism in Madagascar, p. 722.

Sexual communism in New Guinea and in Oceania, pp. 722–726.—Age-grade sexual communism in New Guinea, p. 722 ; sexual communism and polyandry in Polynesia, pp. 723–725 ; polyandry and sexual communism in Micronesia, pp. 725 sq.

Collective Marriage in Australia, pp. 726–765.—Types of collective sexual relations, p. 726 ; complexity of Australian organisation due to superposition of usages, pp. 727–729 ; avoidance of incest, and not the safeguarding of individual marriage-rights, the purpose of Australian sexual regulations, or morality, pp. 729–731 ; individual marriage essentially economic, pp. 731–733 ; general distribution of group-marriage relations in Australia, pp. 733–735 ; familial and tribal forms of the relations, p. 735–737 ; group-marriage among the Dieri, pp. 737–739 ; group-marriage among the Urabunna, p. 739 ; the theory of the origin of Australian marriage institutions from class group-marriage, pp. 740 sq. ; questions at issue, p. 741 ; criticisms of the group-marriage theory and hypothesis of the development of Australian marriage institution from individual monogamic marriage, pp. 741–746 ; the institution of ' pirrauru ' and other forms of marriage among the Dieri, in their present form patriarchal, p. 747 ; Mr. Northcote W. Thomas's discussion of the chronological precedence of ' pirrauru ' and ' tippa malku,' pp. 747–753 ; collective sexual rights to ' noas ' in corresponding marriage class, apparently not abolished by ' tippa malku,' pp. 751–754 ; family and clan brotherhood in Australian sexual regulations, pp. 755–757 ; ' facultative ' or ' potential ' wives, pp. 757–761 ; ' facultative ' wives in Melanesia, pp. 758 sq. ; ' classificatory ' terms of kinship and the theory of group-marriage, p. 761–764 ; Dr. Westermarck's views on the bearing of Australian data on biology and social science, pp. 764 sq.

Range and extent of the survival of collective sexual relations, pp. 765 sq.

The Levirate, pp. 766–781.—Distribution of the claim to the widow of a deceased brother, pp. 766 sq. ; association of the claim with the practice of fraternal polyandry, pp. 768–772 ; similar rules in the observance of the usage and in succession to a deceased wife's sister, pp. 772–774 ; differences in the factors governing the observance of the two usages, p. 774 ; widows regarded as inheritable property, pp. 774 sq. ; inheritance of widows often combined with the observance of other usages, pp. 775–777 ; ' raising seed ' to a deceased brother, pp. 777–780 ; the economic and the semi-religious view of the levirate apparently derived from collective claims of the fraternal group to the widows, pp. 780 sq. ; the usage observed on the latter ground in primitive societies tends to fall into disuse in societies economically and religiously more developed, p. 781.

THE MOTHERS

CHAPTER I

'IN THE BEGINNING WAS THE WORD'

THE human mind has a twofold origin. It derives, on the one hand, from the evolution of organic life through the long line of man's animal ancestry; it is also the product of a development which has taken place in the course of the career of humanity itself and under social conditions. Those two portions of our mental inheritance differ profoundly in many respects.

The forces of life have given rise to various powers of control over the conditions amid which they operate, and to various dispositions to react in certain ways to given circumstances. Those powers and dispositions have become fixed in the structure and organisation of living beings, and have been handed down from generation to generation and from one race to another, undergoing various modifications in successive forms of life. Thus all the products of the evolution of life from its remotest beginnings have gone to make up the powers of action and of feeling which mankind has inherited, and have in a large measure determined the groundwork of what we term 'human nature.' As has been well said, "what was decided among the prehistoric protozoa cannot be annulled by Act of Parliament." [1]

During that stage of evolution which is covered by the career of the human race the development of new characters and powers and their transmission by natural heredity has probably proceeded in the same manner as before, but that natural process has been overshadowed by another to which there is no parallel in the life of animals. There is no true equivalent of human society in the animal world, and there is nothing corresponding to the medium by which, in human society, individual minds act upon one another. We dwell in a world of conceptual thought; the various situations to which we react do not present themselves to us as feelings merely, but as ideas. It is not to sensations alone that we respond, but

[1] P. Geddes and J. A. Thomson, *The Evolution of Sex*, p. 267.

to the significance, or value, which those sensations bear in terms of ideas, sentiments, opinions, thoughts, and the complex associations which are linked with those ideas and sentiments. If those conceptual meanings were eliminated from our minds our behaviour in relation to any given situation or set of conditions would be entirely different from what it is, and would be similar to the behaviour of animals. That conceptual mentality depends upon the symbolism of language; without language it could not exist. Thought is in fact but repressed and unuttered speech. The infant learns at the same time to think and to speak; it thinks aloud. Whether it is alone or in company its thoughts take at first the form of a continuous stream of babble. Later, social training will teach the young human the art of 'holding his tongue,' of inhibiting and restraining speech, and language will become transformed into silent and secret thought. But there is originally no distinction between the two. The uninhibited manner in which the child thinks aloud and blurts out his thought renders him an 'enfant terrible.' When anger moves him he will tell his mother that he hates her and that he would like to kill her. I can remember causing much distress to an old friend of the family when I was six years old, by telling him in cold blood that he was 'a stupid old fool.' I was not unconscious of the impropriety of the remark, but I 'couldn't help it.' When the need for repression in accordance with social requirements is not urgent, thought will even in the adult cease to be silent, and he will 'talk to himself.' In old age socially developed inhibitions grow weaker, and the old man reverts to childish soliloquy. Demented persons, whose affliction consists essentially in the loss of the higher inhibitory powers developed by social life, commonly think aloud, and their soliloquies are said to differ little from the thoughts of normal individuals.[1] There have been occasional flutters of controversy as to whether thought is possible without language. There is no real obscurity about the question. Language is but a particular system of symbolism; thought is possible by means of any other system of symbolic signs. Expert mathematicians can think in terms of mathematical symbols. The blind deaf-mute, Laura Bridgman, was observed to move her hands in sign-language when dreaming.[2] Thought is possible by means of the direct representation of things and of acts, but only to an extremely limited extent. Such a germ of thought exists, beyond doubt, in the higher animals; but notwithstanding the loose generalisations which are frequently drawn from anecdotes of animal intelligence, Professor Lloyd Morgan, a no less appreciative than philosophic student of animal psychology, concludes that animals are without the perception of relations,

[1] A. Raggi, "Osservazioni e considerazioni cliniche sul soliloquio dei pazzi," *Il Manicomio Moderno*, xiv, pp. 421 sqq.

[2] C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, vol. i, pp. 57 sq.

that their memory is entirely of the desultory type, and that "the evidence now before us is not sufficient to justify the hypothesis that any animals have reached that stage of mental evolution at which they are even incipiently rational." [1] Upon language depends the 'human faculty,' but not in the purely intellectual sense alone; those sentiments, values, feelings, emotions, affections, sympathies that govern and colour the social life of human beings, all that distinguishes the human from the animal mind, is dependent upon language. "Man is man by virtue of language alone." [2]

And language is not transmitted by natural heredity. The process of inheritance upon which the continuity of all organic evolution has depended ceases to operate where the specific characters of the human mind are concerned. These are transmitted not by natural heredity, but by the social environment as a traditional inheritance.

The Doctrine of the Logos and the Theory of Ideas.

The power of speech has commonly been regarded as identical with the mind or soul of man; and even at the present day it is one of the most persistent misconceptions of superficial psychology that conscious conceptual thought, that is, unuttered speech, constitutes the whole of the mind or soul. In Greek the same word, λόγος, stood for both 'the word' and the human faculty. To be speechless is the same thing as to be without logic, without mind, ἄλογος.[3] The word κωφός meant in Greek both 'dumb' and 'stupid'; and the Latin 'surdus' had the same double application, to deafness and to mental deficiency. "All those who are born deaf," says Aristotle, "grow up destitute of reason." [4] Our own word 'dumb' originally meant 'stupid' or 'mindless'—in German 'dumm.' Among the ancient inhabitants of northern Europe a child who was deaf and dumb was not given a name, being regarded as having no human soul; if it developed some power of speech, a name was then bestowed upon it.[5] The Australian aborigines hold the same views as Aristotle and our own ancestors; they regard the ear as the seat of the mind.[6]

When a distinction came to be drawn between words and the ideas which they represent, the latter were commonly regarded as derived from the former. "First verily are words produced," it is laid down in the Vedic commentary, "and the mind runs after

[1] C. Lloyd Morgan, *An Introduction to Comparative Psychology*, pp. 260, 119, 377, 287 sqq. Cf. A. Kussmaul, *Die Störungen der Sprache*, p. 17.

[2] W. von Humboldt, *Gesammelte Werke*, vol. iii, p. 252.

[3] E.g. Homer, *Iliad*, xv. 162; Sophokles, *Oedipus Coloneus*, 131; Plato, *Leges*, 696 e; Polybius, xxxvi, 54.

[4] Aristotle, *Historia animalium*, iv. 9.

[5] K. Weinhold, *Altnordisches Leben*, p. 264.

[6] W. E. Roth, *North Queensland Ethnography; Bulletin No.* 5, p. 19.

them." [1] The name, or 'logos,' of a thing was regarded as intimately connected with the very nature of the thing. In Plato's famous doctrine the word, or 'logos,' is not a mere label or symbol, or a representation of the thing, but on the contrary it is the true reality and has an independent existence, while the sensible, material thing is but a shadow, as it were, projected by its eternal paradigm. And just as there may be many shadows variously distorted by the accidents of the ground upon which they are cast, so all particular objects are partial presentments of the 'logos,' the 'form' (εἶδος), which is common to the whole species, and exists apart from any particular specimen of the thing—'ante rem.' As the 'logoi' rise in the order of truth towards the source of their being, they become more and more generalised and abstract, and are spirits (δαίμονες) of The Good, The Beautiful, The Just, and so forth, the Many merging into the One. The human soul, which is itself a participation of 'Ideas,' becomes reunited with them after leaving the body.[2] With Plotinus 'logoi' are 'spiritual forces,' the world is the Idea of God, the Logos His Creative Word.[3]

Those theories, which have often been explained with much eloquence as the peculiar products of the genius of Plato and of Plotinus, were but restatements of much more ancient conceptions. Herakleitos regarded all transient things as having their eternal and unchanging counterparts, their 'names,' or 'logoi,' and as having come into being through the power of the creative Word.[4] His views were doubtless, like most Ionian science, derived from the Babylonians. "The name, so the Babylonians believed, was the essence of the person or thing to which it was attached; that which had no name did not exist, and its existence commenced only when it received its name." [5] The name was identical with the 'form,' 'gar,' of the person or thing, and all things had come into existence through the utterance of their names by the Creator. That creative utterance, breath, or spirit, was known to the earlier Sumerian priests as 'mummu,' and in later Babylonian theology as the god Nebo, called by the Greeks Hermes.[6] The latter had himself been

[1] *Anugîtâ*, vi (*The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. viii, p. 262).

[2] Plato, *Symposium*, 211; *Phaedo*, 65; *Phaedrus*, 238; *Meno*, 72; *Respublica*, 597.

[3] Plotinus, *Enneades*, ii. 6.

[4] H. Diels, *Heracleitos von Ephesos*, p. ix; F. H. Cornford, *From Religion to Philosophy*, pp. 186, 188, 192. Cf. Plotinus, *Enneades*, iv. 8.

[5] A. H. Sayce, *The Religion of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia*, p. 331; Id., *Hibbert Lectures*, 1887, pp. 304 sq.

[6] S. Langdon, "The Babylonian Conception of the Logos," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1918, pp. 438, 440. The creative Word is called in the Babylonian lithurgies 'enem,' which, in Hebrew translations, is rendered by 'amatu,' the word which is translated πνεῦμα in the Septuagint (*ibid.*, p. 445). πνεῦμα, the breath or spirit, is an ancient alternative denotation of the crea-

identified as far back as the sixth century B.C. by Theagenes of Rhegium with the Logos.[1] The Egyptians similarly regarded the name of a person as the essence of his soul, and all things whatsoever had also their 'true name' which was the essence of their being.[2] The Creator brought the world into being by uttering his name. "There was a time," declares an ancient papyrus, "when no one and nothing existed except himself. A desire came over him to create the world, and he carried it into effect by making his mouth utter his own name as a word of power; and straightway the world and all therein came into being."[3] In later versions the creative utterance, or Word, is a separate person, the god Thoth, "the god who creates by his voice," whom also the Greeks identified with Hermes, and who had interpreted in words the will of the deity.[4] The ancient

tive Word and of the soul (Ψυχή; cf. πνεῦμα ἀνέμων, Herodotus, vii. 61). The term was used by Anaximenes for the creative breath of God (H. Diels, *Fragmenten der Vorsokratiker*,[1] vol. i, p. 18); and Demokritos refers to the Ἱερόν πνεῦμα, that is, 'the Holy Ghost' (*ibid.*, p. 394). With the Phoenicians, according to the Sanchoniathon fragments, the Great Mother Βααύ, Ba'u, the Babylonian Gula) was the wife of ἄνεμος Κολπία, that is, Kol-pi-Yah, 'the voice of the mouth of Yah,' the Semitic Creator (*Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, ed. C. Müller, vol. iii, p. 500; R. Eisler, *Weltenmantel und Himmelzeit*, vol. ii, p. 750, n. 4). The creative Word of God, 'amr,' is mentioned in a Yemenite inscription of the seventh century B.C. (H. Grimme, "Der Logos in Sudarabien," in C. Bezold, *Orientalische Studien Theodor Nöldeke zum siebzigsten Geburtstag gewidmet*, vol. i, pp. 453 sqq.). Some scholars have gone so far as to derive all the conceptions of the Gnostics from ancient Babylonian religion (see W. Anz, "Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des Gnosticismus," *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur*, vol. xv, pp. 57 sqq.).

[1] H. Diels, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 511. For some aspects of the early identification of Hermes with the Logos see Th. Zielinski, "Hermes und die Hermetic," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, ix, pp. 34 sqq.

[2] E. Lefébure, "La vertu et la vie du nom; Égypte," *Mélusine*, viii, coll. 226 sqq.; A. Wiedemann, *Religion of the Ancient Egyptians*, pp. 224, 240 sqq.

[3] E. A. Wallis Budge, *Osiris and the Egyptian Resurrection*, vol. ii, pp. 174 sq.; id., *On the Hieratic Papyrus of Nesi-Amu*, p. 539. It is interesting to place beside the passage of the Nesi-Amu papyrus the Gnostic account of the creation by the Word, which, it will be seen, is manifestly derived from the older Egyptian version. "When first the Father willed that His ineffability should come into being," so begins the Marcosian manuscript, "He opened His mouth and uttered a Word like unto Himself; who, appearing before Him, became the means of His seeing what He Himself was" (G. R. S. Mead, *Fragments of a Faith Forgotten*, p. 363).

[4] S. Birch, *Gallery of Antiquities selected from the British Museum*, Part i, p. 26; P. Pierret, *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Egyptienne*, pp. 545 sqq.; R. V. Lanzone, *Dizionario di mitologia egizia*, p. 1266; G. Maspéro, "Sur l'Ennéade," *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, xxv, pp. 30 sqq.; A. H. Sayce, *The Religion of Ancient Egypt*, pp. 131 sq.; H. Brugsch, *Religion und Mythologie der alten Aegypter*, pp. 23, 101, 167; E. A. Wallis Budge, *The Book of the Dead, The Papyrus of Ani*, p. lxxv; Id., *The Gods of the Egyptians*, vol. i, pp. 108 sq.; cf. J. Drummond,

Persians similarly regarded the world as the manifestation of the 'creative word,' Ahuna Variya, of Ahura Mazda, the 'Wise Lord,' "whose soul is the Holy Word." [1] All beings and things, whether present, past, or future, were conceived as existing in the divine mind as 'fravashi.' These 'fravashi,' at one time ancestral spirits or 'names,' "exist in Heaven in an ideal state even before birth; for Ahura Mazda first brought forth all immaterial existences which remained in a spiritual state until he created the material universe. At death the soul is united again with its 'fravashi.'" [2] They are thus "a kind of 'prototypes,' and may be compared to Plato's 'Ideas.'" [3] The highest order of those spiritual creations of Ahura Mazda are the 'Amesha,' the highest abstractions, such as Good, Truth, Justice, and so forth. The first 'Amesha,' Vahu Manô, was the demiurgic power which gave rise to all others and "sits on the right hand of Ahura Mazda." [4] In ancient India,

Philo Judaeus, vol. i. p. 222. On the doctrine of the creative Word among the Egyptians see further: A. Moret, *Mystères Égyptiens*, pp. 109 sqq.; G. Maspéro, "Sur la toute puissance de la parole," *Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie Égyptiennes et Assyriennes*, xxiv, pp. 168 sqq.; A. Erman, "Ein Denkmal memphitischen Theologie," *Sitzungberichte der königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1911, pp. 935 sqq.; J. Bonwick, *Egyptian Belief and Modern Thought*, pp. 104, 404 sq. In the later Gnostic version of Egyptian theology the triad Ptah, Thoth, Horus were spoken of as the Nous, the Logos, and the Pneuma. They were of one substance. In the Hermetic writings "The luminous Word is the Son of God" (L. Ménard, *Hermes Trismégiste*, p. liv).

[1] *Zend-Avesta*, *Vendidad*, xix, 14 (*The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. iv, p. 213).

[2] A. V. Williams Jackson, "Die Iranische Religion," in W. Geiger and E. Kuhn, *Grundriss der iranischen Philologie*, vol. ii, p. 643. Cf. N. Sõderblom, *Les Fravashi*, pp. 1–79.

[3] M. Haug, *Essays on the Sacred Language, Writings, and Religion of the Parsees*, p. 206.

[4] A. V. Williams Jackson, *op. cit.* pp. 634 sqq.; J. H. Moulton, *Early Religious Poetry of Persia*, pp. 58 sqq.; Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride*, 47. The characteristic conceptions of Orphic religion were probably influenced by Persian doctrines (see R. Eisler, *Weltenmantel und Himmelzelt*, vol. ii, pp. 488 sq. and *passim*); and Plato's later doctrines were Pythagorean forms of the Orphic dogmas (see F. M. Cornford, *op. cit.*, pp. 243, 247 sqq.; J. Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophy*, p. 309; Id. ed. of Plato's *Phaedo* [Oxford, 1911], Introd. pp. liii sqq.; A. E. Taylor, *Varia Socratica*, First Series, pp. 178 sqq.; H. Raeder, *Platons philosophische Entwickelung*, pp. 257 sqq.). On the other hand, as Geldner remarks, "there exists truly such a striking analogy between the λόγος θεῖος and Vohu Manô that it is probable that some features at least must have been borrowed from the one by the other. In which case Philo, whose system is a tissue of contradictions, must have been the borrower" (K. F. Geldner, "Awestalitteratur," in W. Geiger and E. Kuhn, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 39. Cf. A. F. Gfrörer, *Philo und die alexandrinische Theosophie*, vol. ii, p. 1). Darmstetter, chiefly in view of that similarity of Persian theology with Gnostic doctrines, supposed the Gâthâs to belong to the first century A.D., a view which no student of Avestic literature now countenances (see A. V. Williams Jackson, *op. cit.*, p. 634; J. H. Moulton, *op. cit.*, pp. 14 sqq.). When, however, the

according to the Vedanta philosophy, while the individual is perishable, the form, 'kriti,' is eternal.[1] The creative Word was, in Vedic and Brahmanical mythology, the goddess Vâk. "Vâk signifies 'speech,' and she is the active power of Brahma, proceeding from him." [2] "I am the Queen, the most worthy of sacrifice," Vâk declares in a Vedic hymn; "I begot the All-Father on high. I dwell in the waters, the deep, and thence extend through all creatures, and touch the heavens with my crown. Like unto the wind I blow, encompassing all creatures; above the heavens and above the earth." [3] "The world," it is stated, "originates from the Word." [4] "The Eternal Word, without beginning and without end," we are told in the 'Mahâbhârata,' "was uttered by the Self-created." [5]

Those conceptions, common to so many theologies, appear to us extremely abstruse and transcendental. They are, however, not the extravagant and daring abstractions of speculative or mystic thought, but, like most transcendental and mystic ideas of the human mind, are part of the traditional heritage of the race which has been handed down from the earliest and crudest conceptions of the primitive savage. If from ancient cultures we go still farther back to the most rudimentary ideas of uncultured humanity, we come upon the same notions as in the theories of Plato and of Eastern theologians. Thus, for example, among the wild tribes of Brazil, "every created thing has, as they say, its 'mother.' Every lake, every stream, or species of animal or of vegetable has its eternal paradigm, or 'mother.' This belief is universal among the populations of the interior in the provinces of Matto Grosso, Goyaz, Para, and among all the tribes of the Amazon." [6] It was noted among the Caribbean natives by Father d'Acosta, who remarks that "they approach somewhat near the proposition of Platoes Idees." [7] The conceptions of the North

identity of the concepts from which human thought has everywhere started is fully realised, questions as to the filiation of theories lose much of their significance.

[1] Sankarâkârya, *Commentary on the Vedânta-Sûtras* (*The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxxiv), p. 203. The ideas expounded in this treatise are manifestly a rationalised version of much older views.

[2] H. T. Colebrooke, *Miscellaneous Essays*, vol. i, p. 32.

[3] *Rig-Veda*, x. 125. 4. 7 (A. Ludwig's translation, vol. ii, pp. 644 sq.). Cf. A. Weber, "Vâc und λόγος," *Indische Studien*, vol. ix, pp. 473 sqq.; E. W. Hopkins, *The Religions of India*, pp. 142 sq., 558.

[4] *The Vedânta-Sûtras*, i. 3. 28 (*The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxxiv, p. 201). Cf. *Satapatha-Brâhmana*, iii. 8, 1. 15; iv. 1. 1. 9; vii. 5. 2. 21 (*ibid.*, vol. xxvi, pp. 189, 450 sqq.; vol. xii, pp. 145, 407).

[5] *Mahâbhârata*, *Sântiparvan*, viii. 533.

[6] J. V. Couto de Magalhães, *O Selvagem*, pp. 122 sqq.

[7] J. d'Acosta, *The Naturall and Morall Historie of the Indies*, pp. 336 sq. Cf. C. N. Bell, "Remarks on the Mosquito Territory, its Climate, People, Productions, etc.," *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, xxxii, p. 253.

American Indians suggested the same remark to Father Lafitau. "They believe," he tells us, "that each species has, in the heavens, or in the Land of Souls, the type or pattern of all individual members of that species; which is tantamount to the 'Ideas' of Plato." [1] The Déné of Alaska are perfectly familiar with the same metaphysical theory.[2] The Eskimo believe that not only animals, but all objects whatsoever have a spiritual counterpart, patron spirit, or 'inua.' "Strictly speaking, scarcely any object, or combination of objects, existing either in a physical or a spiritual point of view, may not be conceived to have its 'inua,' if only, in some way or other, it can be said to form a separate idea." [3] The same belief has been noted among the hairy Ainu of Japan.[4] It is common to all the populations of northern Asia and northwestern Europe from Bering Straits to European Russia.[5] Professor Castrén describes it as follows, in speaking of the ancient Finns: "Every object in nature has its patron deity, or 'haltia,' a spirit or being which is its creator, and thenceforth becomes attached to it. This ash-tree, this stone, this house, have each their 'haltia,' but the same 'haltiat' concern themselves also with other ash-trees, other stones, other houses. The particular ash-tree, stone, or house may perish, but its 'haltia' continues eternally in the species." These 'haltiat' are "of a spiritual nature, formless and immaterial." [6]

That incorruptible essence of the species, of which particular individuals are, as it were, but participating aspects or emanations, is no other than the name of the species; for, in all primitive thought, the name of a person, or of a thing, is identical with the person or thing itself. A person's name is regarded as the substance of his breath, which he emits when he utters it, his spirit or soul. The word 'soul' is from a Gothic root denoting wind; ψυχή is derived from ψύχω, 'to blow.' The Semitic term for the

[1] J. F. Lafitau, *Moeurs des sauvages amériquains*, vol. i, pp. 360 sq. Cf. *Relations des Jésuites*, 1634, p. 13; D. Boyle, "On the Paganism of the Civilised Iroquois of Ontario," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxx, p. 265.

[2] J. Jetté, "On the Superstitions of the Ten'a Indians (Middle Part of the Yukon Valley, Alaska)," *Anthropos*, vi, pp. 602 sqq.

[3] H. J. Rink, *Tales and Traditions of the Eskimo*, p. 37. Cf. F. Boas, "The Central Eskimo," *Sixth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 591.

[4] L. Sternberg, "The Inau Cult of the Ainu," in *Boas Anniversary Volume*, p. 426.

[5] W. Bogoras, *The Chukchee*, p. 286; W. Jochelson, *The Koryak*, p. 30; M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, pp. 271, 278, 284 (Gilyak, Yakut, Buryat); M. A. Castrén, *Vorlesungen über die Finnische Mythologie*, p. 178 (Laps).

[6] M. A. Castrén, *op. cit.*, pp. 195 sq., 161. Cf. D. Comparetti, *The Traditional Poetry of the Finns*, pp. 183 sq.

creative name of the gods is the same as that for 'breath' or 'spirit.' Similarly in most languages 'name,' 'breath,' 'soul' are closely allied words which were, there can be little doubt, originally identical: 'anima,' 'nomen,' ὄνομα, ἄνιμος, or in Celtic 'ainm' (name), 'anim' (soul), in Gothic 'anan,' 'anadl.' [1] Accordingly for a person to utter his own name is tantamount to parting with his soul, or a portion of it. The Ojibwa warn their children never to utter their own names, for, if they did, they would cease to grow.[2] It is a universal rule among primitive peoples in every part of the world that, if they consent to communicate their name at all, they will not utter it themselves, but will get a friend to do so for them.[3] Not only is the spirit emitted by uttering one's own name, but it can be drawn out, or evoked, by another person uttering it. In Melanesia "when a man sneezed they thought that someone had spoken his name. If he wished to sneeze and could not do so, he thought that someone meant to call him, but was unable to do so." [4] The Bushmen have the same belief,[5] and it has also been noted in Polynesia,[6] and in the Malay Archipelago.[7] Indeed the modern Greeks, in Macedonia and in the islands, have

[1] J. Rhys, *Celtic Folklore, Welsh and Manx*, p. 625; E. B. Tylor, *Researches into the Early History of Mankind*, pp. 124 sq.

[2] P. Jones, *History of the Ojebway Indians*, p. 162.

[3] J. Bulmer, "Some Account of the Aborigines of the Lower Murray, Wimmera, Gippsland and Maneroo," *Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society of Australasia, Victoria Branch*, vol. v, p. 17; B. Seeman, *Viti*, p. 190; G. A. Wilken, *Handleiding voor de vergelijkende volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indie*, p. 221; I. H. N. Evans, "Notes on the Religion, Beliefs, Superstitions, etc., of the Dusuns of the Tuaran and Tempassuk Districts, British North Borneo," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlii, p. 388; W. Marsden, *The History of Sumatra*, pp. 286 sq.; F. H. Sawyer, *The Inhabitants of the Philippine Islands*, pp. 311 sq.; J. P. Finlay and W. Churchill, *The Subaru*, p. 29; H. H. Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate*, vol. ii, pp. 826 sq.; S. L. and H. Hinde, *The Last of the Masai*, pp. 48 sq.; O. Temple, *Notes on the Tribes, Provinces, Emirates and States of the Northern Provinces of Nigeria*, p. 109; M. Dobrizhoffer, *Historia de Abiponibus*, vol. ii, p. 498; J. G. Bourke, *On the Border with Crook*, p. 132; P. Grant, in L. R. Masson, *Les Bourgeois de la Compagnie du Nord-Ouest*, vol. ii, p. 328; J. Gregg, *Commerce of the Prairies*, vol. ii, p. 271; R. C. Mayne, *Four Years in British Columbia and Vancouver Island*, pp. 278 sq.; E. W. Nelson, "The Eskimo about Bering Strait," *Eighteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, Part i, p. 289.

[4] G. Brown, *Melanesians and Polynesians*, p. 240; cf. *ibid.*, p. 205; R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians*, p. 226.

[5] L. C. Lloyd, *A Short Account of Further Bushman Material*, p. 20.

[6] G. Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Among the Maori a child was given its name by the tohunga, or priest, who performed the baptismal ceremony by sprinkling it with water by means of a bunch of twigs; the names of the child's ancestors were meanwhile recited, and when the child sneezed his true name had been pronounced (R. Taylor, *Te Ika a Maui, or New Zealand and its Inhabitants*, p. 185).

[7] A. C. Kruijt, *Het Animisme in den Indischen Archipel*, p. 93.

exactly the same notion as those savages; when a man sneezes he and the bystanders express the pious wish that whoever uttered his name "may split." [1] The Malays, when they sneeze, call back their soul in a loud voice; [2] when a Dayak baby sneezes, his mother will call out, "Soul! come back here!" The Toba Bataks, if they have a violent fit of sneezing, immediately send for the doctor that he may fetch back their soul.[3] It was the opinion of learned Jewish Rabbis that until the time of Jacob men only sneezed once in their lives, for when they did so they gave up the ghost. It was only through the special intercession of the patriarch that the souls of men have been permitted to return to their bodies after being expelled through sneezing.[4] It is laid down in a Hindu treatise on Omens that one should be very careful not to blow one's nose after sneezing, for such an augmentation of the effects of the act might endanger one's life.[5] A Hindu will never set out on a journey if he happens to sneeze while facing in the opposite direction to that in which he intends to proceed.[6] A like reluctance is manifested by many savages;[7] and their sentiments were shared by the ancient Greeks, who "were wont to go to bed again if they sneezed while putting on their shoe." [8] It is, in fact, universally supposed that when a person sneezes, his name has been pronounced either by an ill-wisher or by some malignant spirit; hence the evil influence is, in every part of the world, counteracted by some protective formula, such as "God bless you!" On the same principle the state of 'ecstasis' of a shaman, in which his soul is supposed to leave his body and travel far and wide, was called by

[1] G. F. Abbott, *Macedonian Folklore*, p. 113; W. H. D. Rouse, "Folklore from the Southern Sporades," *Folk-lore*, x, p. 181.

[2] W. W. Skeat, *Malay Magic*, p. 533.

[3] A. C. Kruijt, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

[4] M. Jastrow, article "Asusa," in *The Jewish Encyclopaedia*, vol. ii, p. 255.

[5] J. E. Padfield, *The Hindu at Home*, pp. 297 sq. In Norway, should a person sneeze while he is milking a cow, he will certainly hear of a death before the milk has turned sour (F. Liebrecht, *Zur Volkskunde*, p. 312).

[6] *The Autobiography of Lutfullah*, edited by E. B. Eastwick, p. 62. Cf. F. Hahn, "Some Notes on the Religion and Superstitions of the Oraos," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, lxxii, No. 3, pp. 17 sq.; L. Milne, *Shans at Home*, p. 83.

[7] R. H. Codrington, *loc. cit.*; A. C. Kruijt, *op. cit.*, p. 93; M. de Loarca, "Relación de las Yslas Filipinas," in E. H. Blair and J. A. Robertson, *The Phillippine Islands*, 1493–1803, vol. v, p. 165; R. H. Nassau, *Fetichism in West Africa*, p. 208; A. J. N. Tremearne, "Bori Beliefs and Ceremonies," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlv, p. 30; P. S. Pallas, *Voyages en différentes provinces de l'Empire de Russie*, vol. iv, p. 67.

[8] Sir T. Browne, "Pseudodoxia Epidemica," *Works*, vol. i, p. 413, after St. Augustine. Cf. Xenophon, *Anabasis*, iii, 2. 9; Aristotle, *Probl.* xxxviii. 7; *Anthologia Graeca*, vol. iii, p. 95 (ed. Brunck); Petronius Arbiter, *Satyricon*, 98; Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, xxviii. 5.

the ancient Finns "olla haltiosa," that is to say, "to be *named* by a spirit." [1] Among the Khonds a fit of sneezing is a sign that a prophet has thus been chosen by the spirit as his interpreter.[2]

Not only can the spirit or soul of a man, and therefore also the ghosts of the dead and all spiritual beings or gods, be drawn or evoked by uttering their names,[3] but the uttered word is regarded as having the power actually to translate a man bodily from one place to another. The natives of Duke of York Island, for instance, "believe that by persistent calling on a man whom they wish to get hold of, he will by their calling be drawn to them even from a great distance." [4] The Zulus believe the same thing quite as vividly.[5] "To name a being is to evoke him, to render him present." [6] Hence wild animals whose presence is undesirable are not mentioned by name lest they should suddenly put in an appearance.[7] On the other hand an animal, such as a lion, may be held at a distance by simply declaring that "he is not there." [8] When Adam named the animals the act had a creative character, conferring upon him a power over the animal creation; and Adam was in fact by some regarded as having been the creator of animals.[9] Inanimate objects are equally subject to the power of the spoken word. Thus the natives of Madagascar are reluctant to speak of lightning; [10] the Baziba never mention earthquakes; [11] rain is not mentioned by name in Samoa;[12] fire is not named in China where there is a risk of a conflagration;[13] the ancient Scandinavians also observed the same precaution, and they did not use the ordinary word for water while making beer, lest the brew should turn out flat.[14]

[1] M. A. Castrén, *Vorlesungen über die Finnische Mythologie*, p. 170.

[2] E. Reclus, *Primitive Folk*, p. 302.

[3] See J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, vol. iii, pp. 349 sqq.; E. B. Tylor, *Researches into the Early History of Mankind*, pp. 142 sq.; R. Andree, *Ethnographische Parallelen und Vergleiche*, pp. 165 sqq.

[4] G. Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 240.

[5] H. Callaway, *The Religious System of the Amazulu*, p. 432.

[6] P. Giran, *Magie et religion Annamites*, p. 51.

[7] For numerous examples, see J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, vol. iii, pp. 396 sqq. The inevitable evocative effect of mentioning the devil is counteracted by the peasants of Andalusia by repeating three times "Jesus is here" (A. Guichot y Sierra, *Superticiones populares andaluzas*, p. 230).

[8] A. Certeux and E. H. Carnoy, *L'Algérie traditionelle*, p. 175. Cf. A. J. N. Tremearne, *The Ban of the Bori*, p. 203.

[9] *Clementine Homilies*, iii. 2. 21.

[10] H. F. Standing, "Malagasy 'Fady,'" *Antananarivo Annual and Madagascar Magazine*, No. vii, p. 70.

[11] H. Rehse, *Kiziba, Land und Leute*, p. 146.

[12] G. Brown, *Melanesians and Polynesians*, p. 250.

[13] H. Friend, "Euphemism and Tabu in China," *The Folk-lore Record*, iv, pp. 81 sq.

[14] B. Thorpe, *Northern Mythology*, vol. ii, p. 84. Conversely Italian peasants save the expense of procuring drugs from a chemist by swallowing the doc-

Euphemistic expressions applied to dreaded beings, such as the name Eumenides used by the Greeks in speaking of the Furies, have not only a conciliatory effect, but tend actually to impart to those beings the desired disposition. It is a current theory in India that "by the use of a flattering divine name the worshipper, if he has really learnt it, may coerce the deity to grant his desires." [1] The ancient Vedic god Rudra ('the Howler') was the maleficent and destructive power of nature, the cause of storms, conflagrations, pestilence, disease, and all evils; [2] he was, therefore, never referred to except by the euphemistic epithet of 'Siva,' 'the Gracious One,' and his attributes, as well as his name, have accordingly become entirely changed. It is probable that many of the attributes of deities, such as justice, love, compassion, owe their origin in the first instance to the use of euphemistic terms applied to dreaded and dangerous beings.

Persons and things can thus not only be evoked, but also operated on, changed, destroyed, or modified in any desired manner by speeches expressive of the intention, that is, by spells, curses, blessings, incantations. The Bechuana, when they go to war, have a priestly personage who marches with the troops and keeps continually calling out: "The army is not seen!" [3] This, of course, helps to conceal the troops from the enemy. In New Britain, when warriors approach the territory of their foes, they make a point of referring to the latter as "rotten tree-trunks," and believe that they will thus cause them to be infirm and heavy of limb.[4] Similarly elephant hunters among the Akamba of East Africa, when they spy their quarry, refer to it as a stone, thinking thereby to immobilise it.[5] Among the Lengua Indians of the Gran Chaco, if a man expresses a desire for rain or a change in the wind, and his companions do not concur in the desirability of the change, they beseech him to retract his words lest the atmospheric conditions should be influenced thereby.[6] The Kaffirs have a simple method of reforming a person's moral character. If a youth is

tor's prescription, on which the names of the drugs are written. The procedure is adopted in China on the recommendation of the doctor himself (J. F. Davis, *China*, vol. ii, p. 215). Cf. L. A. Waddell, *The Buddhism of Tibet or Lamaism*, p. 401. In Gambia it is usual for the medical practitioner to write his prescription on a slate. The slate is then washed, and the dirty water swallowed by the patient (L. A. Waddell, *loc. cit.*, note).

[1] W. Crooke, "The Cult of Mother Goddesses in India," *Folk-lore*, xxx, p. 300.

[2] H. Oldenberg, *Die Religion des Veda*, pp. 216 sq.

[3] W. C. Willoughby, "Notes on the Totemism of the Becwana," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxv, p. 304.

[4] R. Parkinson, *Dreissig Jahre in der Südsee*, p. 198.

[5] G. Lindblom, *The Akamba in British East Africa*, p. 290.

[6] W. B. Grubb, *An Unknown People in an Unknown Land*, p. 138.

given to thieving, some medicinal herbs are boiled in a pot, and his name is repeatedly shouted over the pot until it has become thoroughly mixed with the decoction. "The boy, who is utterly ignorant of the liberties taken with his name, is said to be cured of the habit of thieving." [1] The potent effects of prayer, which does not primitively take the form of a request to the deity, but of a compelling spell, are originally ascribed to the power of the words themselves. That power is, of course, commonly used by barbarous people as a convenient weapon against their foes. Saint Patrick could strike a man dead by uttering an appropriate prayer.[2] An American Indian "believes that injury will result as surely from malicious handling of his name as from a wound inflicted on any part of his physical organism"; [3] and that he can kill an enemy by pronouncing his name in appropriate incantations.[4] An Australian's curse will strike a foe dead at a distance of a hundred miles.[5] The Veddahs of Ceylon believe that if a man be cursed by another he must inevitably go mad.[6] The Arabs, when anyone curses them, duck their heads, or drop flat on the ground in order to avoid a direct hit.[7] Irish peasants think that a curse, if it does not reach its destination at once, will float in the air for seven years, and may at any time during that period alight on its victim.[8] But, on the other hand, no sorcerer can either harm or benefit a person if he is ignorant of his name.[9] An Irish poet quite failed to curse a certain king of Ulster whose name would not scan in any known meter.[10] Hence it is a universal rule in primitive society that the real name of a person, that is, the name bestowed upon him at the proper naming ceremony, is not divulged. Thus on the Gold Coast "a man's name is always concealed from all but his nearest relations, and to other persons he is always known by an assumed name." [11] In Trinidad so seldom is the real name of a person heard, that often his own relatives

[1] D. Kidd, *Savage Childhood*, p. 73.

[2] *Analecta Bollandiana*, vol. i, pp. 542 sq.

[3] J. Mooney, "Sacred Formulas of the Cherokees," *Seventh Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 343.

[4] J. T. Sharf and T. Westcott, *History of Philadelphia*, vol. i, p. 50.

[5] R. Brough Smyth, *The Aborigines of Victoria*, vol. i, p. 469.

[6] J. Bailey, "An Account of the Wild Tribes of the Veddahs of Ceylon," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society*, N.S., ii, p. 295.

[7] I. Goldziher, *Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philologie*, vol. i, p. 29; J. Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidentums*, p. 139, n. 4.

[8] J. Grimm, *Teutonic Mythology*, p. 1227.

[9] M. Parkyns, *Life in Abyssinia*, vol. ii, p. 145; P. S. Pallas, *Voyages en différentes provinces de l'Empire de Russie*, vol. i, p. 621; Philostratus, *Vit. Apollon. Tyan.*, iv. 16.

[10] J. Rhys, *Celtic Folklore, Welsh and Manx*, p. 635.

[11] A. B. Ellis, *The Tshi-speaking Peoples of the Gold Coast*, p. 109.

forget it.[1] Among the Australian natives no one has a right to call a woman by her name except her husband;[2] and amongst the Melanesians, as amongst ourselves, it is a mark of intimacy to use a person's individual name.[3] The same reluctance to communicate their name which is shown by savages was also felt by the ancient Irish;[4] and in some parts of Scotland "folks calling at a house of a better class on business with the master or mistress had a very strong dislike to tell their name to the servant who admitted them."[5] It is even more risky to part with one's name in writing. The King of Dahomey positively refused to append his signature to an official letter to the President of the French Republic, lest M. Carnot, who occupied the position at the time, should make use of the written name to bewitch the monarch.[6] The hesitation is very natural. In Java all that is needed to kill a person is to write down his name on a piece of bone and bury it in a damp place; as the name gradually fades away, so will the person to whom it belongs.[7] The ancient Greeks were wont to write the names of their foes on tablets, and to drive nails through them.[8] It is a very solemn affair for many country people to write down their name *in full*, for, of course, it is only the baptismal name that matters;[9] hence it is not usually written, but merely represented by initials.

The Power of the Word.

Words, then, are primitively regarded as much more than mere signs, and the power of speech is far from being but a means of communicating ideas; all language possesses, in the conceptions

[1] J. H. Collens, *A Guide to Trinidad*, p. 42.

[2] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race*, vol. i, p. 246.

[3] W. H. R. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society*, vol. i, p. 183.

[4] J. Rhys, *op. cit.*, p. 624.

[5] W. Gregor, *Notes on the Folk-lore of the North-East of Scotland*, p. 30. I have noticed the same reluctance in Italian peasants.

[6] E. S. Hartland, *The Science of Fairy Tales*, p. 310.

[7] A. C. Kruijt, *Het animisme in den Indischen Archipel*, p. 71.

[8] F. B. Jevons, "Graeco-Italian Magic," in R. B. Marett, *Anthropology and the Classics*, pp. 108 sq.

[9] In Abyssinia the baptismal name is never divulged (M. Parkyns, *Life in Abyssinia*, vol. ii, p. 145). A child, on the other hand, who has not yet received its name is not regarded as a human being; if it dies, the body is disposed of without any ceremony (A. C. Kruijt, *loc. cit.*). In the north of England a child is not expected to thrive before it has received its baptismal name, which is the true name registered in Heaven (W. Henderson, *Notes on the Folk-Lore of the Northern Counties of England*, p. 14). The argument for infant baptism is, of course, very strong. If, in spite of having been baptised, a child did not do well, the Lapps of Finland were wont to re-baptise it, in the belief that its true name had not been properly given at the first ceremony (Knud Leems, "An Account of the Laplanders of Finmark," in J. Pinkerton, *A General Collection of Voyages and Travels*, vol. i, p. 483).

of early humanity, a thaumaturgic or demiurgic power. The ancient Egyptians "believed that every word spoken in certain circumstances must be followed by some effect, good or bad." [1] That power depends upon the nature of the uttered words themselves, and not on the intention of the user. Among the Eskimo "a 'serrat,' or song, was supposed to have a power by itself, independent of the person who happened to know, or make use of it." [2] "The whole virtue of the 'zagovór,' or spell," the Russian peasants believed, "depended upon its absolute correctness. If any change was made in its wording its pronouncer became powerless." [3] Most primitive peoples do not know the meaning of the words which they use in their incantations.[4] The Hindus believe that the power of 'mantrams,' or sacred formulas, words, or syllables, is able to enchain the might of the gods themselves. "The universe," they say, "is under the power of the gods; the gods are under the power of the 'mantrams'; the 'mantrams' under the power of the Brahmins; therefore the Brahmins are our gods." The most powerful, or 'fundamental,' mantrams are single syllables, such as 'h'ram,' 'h'rim' 'h'rom,' etc.; "to those who have the key to the true pronunciation of them, and know how to use and apply them, nothing is impossible; there is no limit to the miracles they can perform." The most powerful of all mantrams is the sacred syllable 'Um'; it is the creative name of God. "As long as there has been a Hindu Faith the power of sound has been recognised in the Sacred Word. In that word lie all potencies, for the Sacred Word expresses the one and latent Being, every power of generation, of preservation, and of destruction." [5] In Egypt "to possess the knowledge of the sacred name of God,

[1] E. A. Wallis Budge, *The Book of the Dead, The Papyrus of Ani*, p. lxxv.

[2] H. J. Rink, *Tales and Traditions of the Eskimo*, p. 51.

[3] W. R. S. Ralston, *The Songs of the Russian People*, pp. 357 sq.

[4] W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 296, 460; C. Wilhelmi, "Manners and Customs of the Australian Natives, in particular of the Port Lincoln District," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Victoria*, v, p. 176; S. H. Roy, "*Melanesia and New Guinea*," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxi, pp. 436 sqq.; W. Churchill, "The Duk-Duk Ceremonies," *Popular Science Monthly*, xxxviii, p. 242; H. Callaway, *The Religious System of the Amazulu*, p. 43; H. Ward, *Five Years with the Congo Cannibals*, p. 57; F. Boas, "The Central Eskimo," *Sixth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 594; D. Brinton, *The Myths of the New World*, p. 285; W. J. Hoffman, "The Menomini Indians," *Fourteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 61; J. Mooney, "Sacred Formulas of the Cherokees," *Seventh Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 343; V. Frič and P. Radin, "Contribution to the Study of the Bororo Indians," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxvi, p. 388.

[5] J. A. Dubois, *Hindu Manners, Customs, and Ceremonies*, vol. i, pp. 140, 143, 144. Cf. W. T. and K. Pavitt, *The Book of Talismans, Amulets and Zodiacal Gems*, pp. 26 sqq.; L. A. Waddell, *The Buddhism of Tibet, or Lamaism*, p. 142.

of the gods, and of things animate and inanimate was the magician's chief object in life; and his desire to acquire it is easy to understand, for according to the beliefs of the period it made him master of all the power of this world." [1] In Persia the magic art was called "the science of names." [2] With the Eskimo all that is required in order to command the spirits who control all things is a knowledge of their names.[3] The same view was held in early Rome; the 'pontifices' in the days of the 'religion of Numa' derived their power from lists of names and sacred formulas, or 'indigitamenta'; they were supposed to lay all the forces of the world at their mercy.[4]

[1] E. A. Wallis Budge, *Osiris and the Egyptian Resurrection*, vol. ii, p. 175. Cf. J. H. Breastead, *The Development of Religious Thought in Ancient Egypt*, p. 116.

[2] J. Chardin, *Voyage en Perse et autres lieux de l'Orient*, vol. iv, p. 435.

[3] W. Thalbitzer, "The Heathen Priests of East Greenland (Angakut)," *Verhandlungen des XVI internationales Amerikanisten-Kongress, Wien*, 1908, vol. ii, p. 454.

[4] Arnobius, *Adversus gentes*, ii. 73; L. Preller, *Römische Mythologie*, p. 119; F. S. Granger, *The Worship of the Romans*, p. 277; F. de Coulange, *La Cité antique*, pp. 195 sq. Cf. F. von Andrian, "Ueber Wortaberglauben," *Correspondenz-Blatt der deutsche Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie, und Urgeschichte*, Jahrg. xxvii, pp. 109 sqq.; C. Fossey, *La magie Assyrienne*, pp. 46, 58, 95; V. Henry, *La magie dans l'Inde antique*, p. 31. Those conceptions have not been confined to the primitive days of Roman religion. The Jesuit missionaries who, in the seventeenth century, endeavoured to convert the Gallas to the Catholic Faith, relate the following incident: "A certain heathen woman was possessed by a malignant spirit, and in addition suffered from a fever. After many remedies and orisons of the idolators had been tried, which proved entirely useless, she finally caused a Christian doctor to be called, who, having blessed with the sign of the cross a medicine which he had prepared, presented it to the patient, who opened her mouth and took it, a thing which she had previously been unable to do. The doctor, seeing such a promising beginning, was encouraged to proceed with his treatment. He accordingly hurried to his house, and wrote on a piece of paper the most holy names of Jesus and of Mary, and took it to the afflicted person. At this sight she began to utter frightful screams, in order that the names should be taken away far from her room. This virtuous Christian did not, however, desist on that account, but having, moreover, added the words 'Agnus Dei,' he secretly left the paper under her bed. Scarcely two days had passed when the devil was compelled to vacate the house. The patient, who had previously been on the point of death, was restored to perfect health" (M. de Almeida, *Histoire de ce que s'est passé es Royaume d'Éthiopie en l'année 1626*, pp. 141 sq.).

The peasants in modern Greece, when their cattle suffer from any distemper, attach verses of the Gospel imprinted on pieces of paper, and which may be obtained from the parish priest, to the legs of the animals. Quotations from Holy Writ are also said to be very efficacious in diseases of silk-worms (F. C. H. L. Pouqueville, *Voyage en Morée, à Constantinople, en Albanie et dans plusieurs autres parties de l'Empire ottoman*, vol. i, p. 311).

The written word is held by most uncultured peoples as particularly sacred. Thus, for example, in Japan, paper bearing any writing or printed mat-

The character of Creator, as an attribute of the Deity, fails to impress the mind of primitive peoples, not because they are incapable of grasping the metaphysical conception of creation out of nothing, but because they are accustomed to regard such powers as quite commonly exercised by ordinary mortal individuals. Medicine-men among the Australians can stop the sun, cause thunder, raise mountains, create lakes and rivers.[1] "The powers who are masters of life and death are subject to" the angagut, or magicians, of Greenland, and they "could do everything."[2] Among the Algonkin tribes of North America the powers of the wizards "were believed to be almost unlimited";[3] mountains and rivers, and even the sun and moon, were regarded by the Apaches as having been brought into existence by medicine men.[4] In Brazil "the poor savages are so foolish as regards their sorcerers" that they are persuaded that they can control the course of nature and of human life.[5]

Those creative acts are effected chiefly through the power of the uttered word. "None merits the name of creator save God only and the poet," said Tasso. But the exalted title of 'poet,' that is to say, 'maker,' or 'creator,' was not originally bestowed upon composers of verse on account of special honour attaching to artistic and imaginative creation, but because 'poets' were originally magicians, wonder-workers, and were primarily in that sense 'creators.' The Italian 'fattura' and the old French 'faiture,' which have the meaning of magical enchantment, are derived from the Latin 'facere.' In Sanskrit the magic art is denoted by the word 'krtya,' which is derived from the root 'kr,' meaning 'to make,' which appears in our terms 'craft' and 'creation.' In Norse and Slavonic languages likewise the terms for 'magic' mean 'making.'[6] In Madagascar a sorcerer is called

ter must on no account be crumpled, dirtied, or put to any base use. If it is necessary to destroy it, it should be carefully burnt. "I have been gently reproved in a little hotel at which I stopped," says Lafcadio Hearn, "for tearing up and crumpling some papers with my own writing" (L. Hearn, *Glimpses of Unfamiliar Japan*, vol. ii, p. 503).

[1] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race*, vol. i, p. 50; A. W. Howitt, "The Jeraeil, or Initiation Ceremonies of the Kurnai Tribe," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xiv, p. 35; E. Thorne, *The Queen of the Colonies*, pp. 321 sqq., 324; W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 490.

[2] K. Rasmussen, *The People of the Polar North*, pp. 126, 151.

[3] G. C. Leland and J. D. Prince, *Kuloskap the Master, and other Algonkin Poems*, p. 35.

[4] F. Russell, "Myths of the Jicarille Apaches," *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, xi, p. 254.

[5] Yves d'Évreux, *Voyage dans le nord du Brésil*, p. 288.

[6] F. B. Jevons, "Graeco-Italian Magic," in R. B. Marett, *Anthropology and the Classics*, p. 94.

'mpiosa,' that is 'maker,' 'creator,' or 'poet.' [1] All poetry consisted in the first instance of charms, or incantations. 'Vates' means both 'prophet,' or sorcerer, and 'poet'; 'carmina' are both 'verses' and 'charms'; an 'ode' or 'epode' meant originally, in Greek, a magic spell.[2] The Nordic word 'ljoδ,' the German 'lied,' the English 'lay,' mean primarily spells or magic incantations.[3] A 'rune' is likewise essentially a magic spell.[4] "Verse making," observes Sir John Rhys, "appertained from the outset to magic, and it was magicians, medicine-men, or seers who for their own use first invented the aids of rhythm and meter." [5] In ancient Arabia poetry was not originally esteemed for its artistic, but for its magical charm, and poets were regarded primarily as sorcerers able to bestow blessings and curses.[6] Similarly among all the barbaric nations of northern Europe poetical compositions were nought but magical spells pronounced for the express purpose of producing thaumaturgic effects.[7] Songs among the Australian aborigines are chiefly connected with the working of magic.[8] Among the North American Indians a singer, or poet, is equivalent to a magician, and almost any marvel may be wrought by means of a song.[9] Among the Finns "the shaman became a poet, and the word 'runa' came to mean first of all the poet's magic word, and then poetry in general." [10] The classical invocation, 'Sing, heavenly Muse,' was originally the formula by which, like the primitive shaman, the 'inspired' poet attributed his words to a spirit or god who possessed him. The Australian blacks, like the ancient Greeks, believe that songs are 'inspired,' or revealed to them by ghostly visitors.[11] Among the negroes of Senegambia, poets are permitted a good deal of licence, for it is believed that their compositions

[1] W. Ellis, *The History of Madagascar*, vol. i, p. 73.

[2] F. B. Jevons, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

[3] E. Schröder, "Über das Spell," *Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum und deutsche Litteratur*, xxxvii, p. 258; E. Mogk, review of Finnur Jónsson, "Den oldnoske og oldislandske litteraturs historie," *Arkiv för Nordisk Filologi*, xii, pp. 277 sq. The word 'spell' is the same as the German 'spiel,' 'a tune,' or 'song.'

[4] D. Comparetti, *The Traditional Poetry of the Finns*, pp. 30, 274, 287; E. Mogk, *loc. cit.*

[5] J. Rhys, *Celtic Folklore, Welsh and Manx*, p. 636.

[6] I. Goldziher, *Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philologie*, vol. i, pp. 15 sqq.

[7] E. Mogk, *loc. cit.*; Id., "Mythologie," in H. Paul, *Grundriss der germanischen Philologie*, vol. iii, pp. 404 sq.; J. Grimm, *Teutonic Mythology*, pp. 1226 sq.; D. Comparetti, *op. cit.*, p. 187, and *passim*; H. G. Porthan, *Opera selecta*, vol. iii, p. 373.

[8] A. W. Howitt, "Notes on Songs and Song-makers of some Australian Tribes," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xvi, pp. 328, 330, 333 sq.

[9] J. F. Lafitau, *Moeurs des sauvages amériquains*, vol. i, p. 372.

[10] D. Comparetti, *op. cit.*, p. 274.

[11] A. W. Howitt, *loc. cit.*, p. 330.

are the utterances of spirits dwelling within them.[1] Among the ancient Arabs, poets were supposed to be inspired by 'jinni,' who entered their bodies.[2] The ancient Hindus had similar notions.[3] "Incantations," says Signor Ferraro, "do not consist in words pronounced in a low voice, but in formulas uttered with solemnity, like the responses of an oracle. The mind of the common people, and not theirs alone, is impressed by words pronounced with a certain rhythm, cadence and emphasis, whatever be their actual meaning; the ear, rather than the brain, so to speak, is impressed."[4] The Hindus and the Arabs have a simple means of depriving a sorceress of the power to do harm; they extract her front teeth, so that she is unable to sing or articulate distinctly.[5] The Greeks, when poetry had come to be regarded from a purely aesthetic point of view, gave up the use of rhyme, the effect of which they considered harsh and cacophonous; but they were perfectly acquainted with rhymed verse.[6] Oracular and prophetic verses were commonly rhymed.[7] The sorceress Medea, in the tragedy of Euripides, is made to end three of her speeches with assonant couplets.[8] Rhyme was regularly used in ancient Italian incantations. Thus the formula by which Latin peasants treated sore feet was:—

Pestem terra teneto
Salus hic maneto.[9]

In Greenland the songs employed by the shamans, although unintelligible to most natives at the present day, "are not sheer abracadabra, but obsolete, or metaphorically used, Eskimo words,

[1] A. Raffenel, *Voyage dans l'Afrique occidentale*, pp. 15 sq.

[2] I. Goldziher, *op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. 3 sqq., 41 sqq.

[3] S. Muir, *Original Sanskrit Texts*, vol. iii, pp. 217 sqq.

[4] G. Ferraro, *Superstizioni, usi e proverbi monferrini*, pp. 16 sq. Cf. B. Malinowski, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*, pp. 36 sq.; W. R. S. Ralston, *The Songs of the Russian People*, p. 361: "The spells were originally uttered in a loud clear voice. Nowadays many of them are always whispered, a practice which may have gradually crept in as the subject of conjuring assumed more and more the character of something secret and forbidden."

[5] E. Thurston, *Omens and Superstitions of Southern India*, pp. 257 sqq.; W. Crooke, *The Popular Religion and Folklore of Northern India*, vol. ii, p. 281; Muhammad Abu Jafar Al-Tabari, *Chronique*, H. Zotemberg's translation, vol. iii, p. 318.

[6] A. W. Verrall, *The Bacchants of Euripides and Other Essays*, pp. 245 sqq.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 268.

[8] Euripides, *Medea*, 314, 408, 757.

[9] G. Ferraro, *op. cit.*, p. 17. The following quaint formula was employed to reduce dislocations:—

Huat, hanat, huat
Ista pista sista.
(Cato, *De re rustica*, clx.)

a kind of inherited art language." [1] Those songs, which are believed to have the power "to draw heaven down to the earth," [2] are in fact couched in poetical diction. Epic, no less than lyrical poetry, is originally of a magical character. The Eddas, the Kalevala epic of the Finns, the fragmentary epics of the Slavs are "the remains of a widespread system of sorcery." [3] Epic poetry consists essentially in the praise of departed ancestors, and their ghosts were doubtless thought to be propitiated and placated by the administration of judicious flattery. The recital of their deeds is thought to instil magic valour into their descendants and to confound and paralyse their foes. Fragments of epic poems are even used for medicinal purposes; the recital of the healing of the wounds of a hero is regarded in Finland as an invaluable means of checking haemorrhage from wounds.[4] "It is probable," remarked Mr. Andrew Lang, "that such songs as were sung over the wounds of Odysseus had the same influence in Greece as in Finland." [5] "Whosoever knew poems could heal sickness, render enemies powerless and weapons harmless, extinguish conflagrations, lay the winds and the waves, and compel the affections of women." [6] "Those wonders," observes Grimm, "lie in the very nature of poetry." [7] Vergil assures us that verses possess such power that they can draw down the moon from heaven; [8] and in regarding the great Latin poet in the light of a mighty wizard, popular Italian thought but preserved the original conception of the character of a poet.[9] Among the ancient Italian populations the rainfall was customarily controlled by means of songs, and the poet was a rainmaker.[10] Amphion and Orpheus were reputed to have not only controlled wild animals by means of their poems, but caused rocks and stones to move and build themselves up into walls. Words of praise and flattery bring about increase and all manner of benefits, while invectives and satires are fraught with appalling

[1] W. Thalbitzer, "The Heathen Priests of East Greenland (Angakut)," *Verhandlungen des XVI internationales Amerikanisten-Kongress, Wien*, 1908, vol. ii, p. 456.

[2] E. Petitot, *Les grands Esquimaux*, pp. 59 sq.

[3] W. R. S. Ralston, *The Songs of the Russian People*, p. 1; D. Comparetti, *The Traditional Poetry of the Finns*, pp. 307, 234.

[4] D. Comparetti, *op. cit.*, p. 307.

[5] A. Lang, in the introduction to the English edition of D. Comparetti's above-mentioned work, p. xix.

[6] E. Mogk, "Mythologie," in H. Paul, *Grundriss der germanischen Philologie*, vol. iii, pp. 404 sq.

[7] J. Grimm, *Teutonic Mythology*, pp. 1226 sq.

[8] Vergil, *Eclog.*, viii, 69.

[9] For the feats of magic ascribed to Vergil, see D. Comparetti, *Virgilio nel medio evo*, vol. ii, pp. 28 sqq.; *The Wonderful History of Virgilius, the Sorcerer of Rome.*

[10] Seneca, *Naturales quaestiones*, iv, 7.

dangers to their victims. "Blessed is he who is praised, woe unto him who is satirised," said St. Columba.[1] The streams and lakes of Ireland were thought to rise or sink according as they were praised or blamed by the poets.[2] Poets have, accordingly, among all uncultured peoples extraordinary rights and privileges. Among the Bororo Indians, poetical and musical talent constitute the indispensable and sole qualification for the exercise of supreme power. The chieftain amongst them must be a poet, and he issues his orders in the form of poetical chants. "Every evening after sunset he goes before the 'Bahito' (or club-house of the men) where all the men are assembled, and, singing, gives his commands. The whole village listens attentively, while the men give expression to their feelings by accompanying those parts they like with whistling. The singer always begins his commands with a religious chant, in a language not easily understood by the Bororos. He then recounts some hunting trip, describes a journey or some subject of general interest, and ends with definite commands to each person of the village, regulating his work for the next day." Should the son of a chief be but an indifferent singer and poet, he remains a commoner; the succession is regulated exclusively by poetical and musical talent.[3] No one, in barbaric societies, is willing to incur the wrath of a poet by refusing his requests.[4] The poet Laidchenn composed against the people of Leinster a satire which was so powerfully written that it blighted the whole face of the country, and "neither corn, grass, nor foliage could grow for them during the whole year." [5] The Khalif Al-Mansur dared not proceed with his intended marriage to a beautiful and noble lady from fear of the effects of a poem in which a disappointed suitor, the poet Djarir, had vented his annoyance.[6] The ancient Irish were convinced that a satire inevitably caused blisters to appear on the face of the victim of poetical wit.[7] Poetesses, in Ireland, commonly got rid of rivals by means of their poetical compositions, and poets sometimes succeeded in abolishing a lit-

[1] Whitley Stokes, "The Bodleian Amra Choluimb Chille," *Revue Celtique*, xx, p. 44.

[2] F. N. Robinson, "Satirists and Enchanters in Early Irish Literature," in *Studies in the History of Religions presented to Crawford Howell Toy*, p. 119.

[3] V. Frič and P. Radin, "Contributions to the Study of the Bororo Indians," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxvi, p. 388.

[4] F. N. Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 119; E. O'Curry, *On the Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish*, vol. ii, p. 70.

[6] F. B. Jevons, *op. cit.*, p. 17. The Holy Prophet himself stood in the greatest dread of poetical satires (Muhammad Abu-Jafar Al-Tabari, *Chronique*, H. Zotemberg's translation, vol. iii, pp. 7 sq., 133).

[7] J. Rhys, *Celtic Folklore*, p. 632.

erary competitor by the same means.[1] Irishmen, says Reginald Scott, "will not stick to affirm that they can rhyme either man or beast to death." [2] Poems were habitually employed in Ireland as substitutes for rough-on-rats, and great was the fame of the poets who could destroy the most vermin.[3] The same use of poetry was made in Scandinavia;[4] and a famous poet, Sir Hallgrim, is mentioned as having "rhymed a fox to death." He was also noted for his power of raising the ghosts of the dead by means of his poetical efforts.[5] But the poetry of the Scandinavian bard, Nildung, was even more weird in its effect. When visiting the court of a chieftain against whom he had a grudge he sang a poem which sounded unobjectionable. But presently his host was seized with uncontrollable itching, so that he had to get servants to scratch him with combs; his hair began to fall out; the light of the sun was extinguished and darkness fell over the hall; the weapons that hung on the walls began to move and to fight of their own accord, and numerous warriors among the audience fell mortally wounded.[6] It is little wonder that the exercise of poetical talents should in some countries have been regulated by law. The ancient legislation of Iceland deals very strictly with poets;[7] and penalties are enacted in the laws of the XII tables against bad poets.[8]

Poetical eloquence is thus primitively regarded as possessing a demiurgic power akin to that of the creative fiat of a god. But the powers of poets differ only in degree from those belonging to ordinary humanity and which appertain to the power of speech. Human speech, according to the Koryak, has a separate existence of its own independent of that of the person who utters it.[9] In Polynesia there is a widespread myth which relates how, when Tangaroa had fished the islands out of the sea, he surveyed his work, exclaiming at its beauty; but he was answered by a Voice. "What is this?" he exclaimed, "I thought I was the first." The Voice replied, "I was the first." [10] Among the Bataks of Sumatra the priests, or rather priestesses, are called 'siboro,' which means literally 'the word.' [11] In the Niger region of West Africa the first

[1] F. N. Robinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 121, 103.

[2] R. Scott, *The Discoverie of Witchcraft*, p. 35.

[3] F. N. Robinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 97 sq.; E. O'Curry, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 89.

[4] F. Hollhausen, "Zu der altschwedische Ratten- und Maüser-Zauber," *Arkiv för Nordisk Fololog*i, xiv, pp. 93 sq.

[5] W. A. Craigie, *Scandinavian Folklore*, p. 369. [6] *Ibid.*, pp. 348 sq.

[7] K. Weinhold, *Altnordisches Leben*, pp. 341 sqq.

[8] F. B. Jevons, *op. cit.*, p. 95. Legislation against the practice of homicide by means of incantations appears in the Justinian code (Justinian, *Instituta*, iv. 18. 5).

[9] W. Jochelson, *The Koryak*, p. 117.

[10] W. W. Gill, *Myths and Songs from the South Pacific*, p. 114.

[11] G. K. Nieman, in P. A. van der Lith en J. F. Snelleman, *Encyclopaedie van Nederlandsch-Indie*, vol. i, p. 135.

man was called Obbabisich, that is, 'The Lord of Speech.' [1] Thus the theories of Plato, Plotinus, and the Gnostics are commonplaces of savage and primitive thought; the creative Logos dwells in every man, and is one with the substance of his spirit.

Experiments and Observations on Wild Children.

It logically follows that to doubt that language is innate in every human being that comes into the world is tantamount to denying the existence of the soul. St. Basil was charged by Eunomius with atheism for holding the view that babies learn to talk.[2] The matter has several times been put to the test. The emperor Frederic II is said to have caused several children to be brought up by nurses to whom strict injunctions were given not to let them hear a single word spoken. Fra Salimbene, to whom we owe the report, informs us that the experiment had disastrous results, for all the children died; and he adds the remark that no other result could have reasonably been expected, since no baby could possibly slumber or rest unless induced to do so by the lullabies of a nurse.[3] He, doubtless, also had some notion that a child deprived of the opportunity of developing the power of speech would have no soul, and therefore be deficient in vitality. The view that the words of a language are naturally inherited has been taken for granted since the time of Herodotus, who reports as a quite natural thing that Psammetichus, King of Egypt, performed an experiment exactly similar to that ascribed to the emperor Frederic, with a view to determining whether the Egyptian or the Phrygian language was the older. It was fortunately not attended with fatal results, and the children, when they began to desire more substantial food than the goat's milk upon which they had been brought up, asked for bread, so Herodotus avers, in the Phrygian tongue.[4] The same experiment was performed by the great Akbar, Emperor of Delhi, on no less than thirty children, but they did not speak at all,[5] an unsatisfactory result, which is doubtless to be set down to the advanced opinions of that monarch. "That children committed unto the school of Nature, without institution, would naturally

[1] A. Bastian, *Geographische und ethnographische Bilder*, p. 178.

[2] Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium*, i, xii, pars altera, in Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series Graeca*, vol. xlv, cols. 258, 999.

[3] Fra Salimbene, the minorite, *Cronaca*, C. Cantarelli's translation, vol. i, p. 233. The good friar mentions the matter in the course of an enumeration of Frederic II's manifold impieties and rationalistic heresies, and makes it quite clear that he regarded such an enquiry as wicked and as tending to scepticism and the subversion of religion.

[4] Herodotus, ii, 2.

[5] *Purchas his Pilgrimage* (1613), p. 40, after Joannes Oranus.

speak the primitive language of the world was," as Sir Thomas Browne puts it, "the opinion of ancient heathens, and continued by Christians, who will have it our Hebrew tongue, as being the tongue of Adam." [1] That general belief was proved to be correct by the learned King James IV of Scotland, who once more repeated the old test. "Two bairns" were placed in charge of a dumb woman on the island of Inchkeith, and we are assured that when they came to the age of speech "they spak guid Hebrew." [2]

Those notions are now apt to raise a smile; but the view that language is a natural endowment of the human mind has been upheld in modified forms until very lately. It was generally maintained in the eighteenth century against the disciples of Locke. A German pastor published a book proving that "language had its origin not from men, but solely from the Creator"; [3] and a French writer also demonstrated in a voluminous work that language is an innate endowment, primitive, inspired by God Himself, natural, necessary, universal, and imperishable. He points out the absurdity of supposing that the word 'lamb' could ever be applied to a wolf, or vice be in any language called 'virtue.' [4] The same view was even more eloquently maintained in the last century by the famous Catholic philosopher, Vicomte de Bonald, who insisted that "language was given to man, not invented by man," and that "it was primitively imparted to the human race in the person of the first man, and transmitted to his descendants." [5] De Bonald had a numerous and enthusiastic following, and Renan drew upon himself much odium by controverting his views. In England, within recent years, no less an authority than Professor Max Müller expounded the doctrine that language arose from a certain number of 'phonetic types,' which represented 'general ideas'; and, pouring scorn on the

[1] Sir T. Browne, *On Vulgar Errors*, v, xii, 2.

[2] R. Lindsay of Pitscottie, *Chronicles of Scotland*, vol. i, pp. 249 sq. Though Hebrew was generally regarded as the original language of mankind, there is scarcely a language, living or dead, that has not had that honour bestowed on it. Becanus demonstrated that the language spoken in Paradise was no other than Flemish (Joannes Goropius Becanus, *Origines Antwerpianae*, Antwerp, 1569, pp. 539 sq). It has also been shown that the Basque language was the original tongue (J. B. Erro, *El Mundo primitivo filosofico de la Antequedad y Cultura de la Nacion Bascongoda*, Madrid, 1815). More recently the original speech of mankind has been discovered among the Redskins of North America (Vicomte E. Ouffroy de Thoron, *La Langue primitive depuis Adam jusqu'à Babel; son passage en Amérique*, Paris, 1886).

[3] J. P. Süssmilch, *Versuch eines Beweise dass die erste Sprache ihre Ursprung nicht von Menschen, sondern allein von Schöpfer erhalten habe* (*Berlin*, 1766).

[4] A. Court de Gébelin, *Monde primitif analysé et comparé avec le monde moderne*, vol. iii, pp. 66 sq. and *passim*.

[5] L. de Bonald, *Oeuvres Complètes*, vol. iii, pp. 87 sq.

theory of evolution, he asserted his conviction that those 'phonetic types' had been implanted in the human mind by the hand of God.[1]

There still exist lingering survivals of those ideas. Some have supposed that the sounds which develop into the syllables 'pa' and 'ma' are uttered instinctively by babies.[2] But if the babies are congenitally deaf they do not utter those sounds.[3] Even singing birds do not inherit their songs as innate characters. If reared so as never to hear another bird sing, most species will remain completely dumb. If brought up with a songster of another species, the nestling will acquire the form of song characteristic of that species; and a bird that has thus acquired an extraneous form of song will in turn impart it to its offspring.[4] Common sparrows

[1] F. Max Müller, *Lectures on the Science of Language*, pp. 427 sqq.

[2] W. Preyer, *Die Seele des Kindes*, p. 321; J. C. E. Buschmann, "Ueber den Naturlaut," *Philologische und historische Abhandlungen der Königliche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1852, pp. 391 sqq.; E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. i, p. 244. It would be necessary to postulate that, in addition to uttering those syllables spontaneously, babies of different races should also instinctively associate the 'm' syllable with their mother and the 'p' syllable with their father, in accordance with what, with very few exceptions, is the general rule for those terms of kinship.

[3] A. Hartmann, *Deafmutism and the Education of Deaf-mutes*, p. 4. Many people are under the impression that a child will acquire its mother-tongue more readily than a language foreign to its ascendants, or will naturally speak it with a purer accent than a foreign tongue. That is certainly untrue. In support of the popular notion, Dr. Roux states that European children brought up from infancy among the Namaqua had much greater difficulty than the native children in acquiring the language, and were longer in doing so (W. Roux, *Der Kampf der Thiele im Organismus*, p. 38). But savage children are invariably very much more precocious in every respect than European children (see below, pp. 106 sq.), and it is well known that in Africa "native children learn to walk and to talk much sooner than white children" (D. Macdonald, *Africana*, vol. i, pp. 119 sq.). It is quite unnecessary to go to Africa for examples. It is a commonplace experience that children who have learnt a foreign language before acquiring the mother-tongue of their parents will thereafter speak the latter with the accent of the language first learnt. The late King Edward VII, who learnt German before English, always spoke the latter with a distinct German intonation; while, on the other hand, the ex-Kaiser Wilhelm, who learnt English in the nursery before he learnt German, speaks the latter language, I am told, with a detectable English accent. The children born of Italian parents in America and in England, who have learnt Italian at home and English from habitual intercourse, almost invariably speak Italian very badly and with a strong English accent. Children of Belgian refugees born in England during the late war had considerable difficulty in learning Flemish, and preferred to speak English. It is, for that matter, within the experience of most people that persons who have spent a large part of their lives abroad scarcely ever preserve the purity of their native accent, and frequently, like Gibbon, half forget their mother-tongue.

[4] Barrington Daines, "Experiments and Observations on the Singing of Birds," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, lxiii, part i,

brought up with canaries have acquired the trills of the latter, and have even adopted their call-notes.[1] It would appear that the same is true of all animal sounds. A cow that is born deaf will not low, but will make "a very short, deep, rattling sound" in attempting to call her calf.[2]

The equivalents of the experiments of Psammetichus and King James were sought in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in stories concerning children that had been found living in a 'state of nature,' isolated from human society. Quite a number of instances of such wild children were cited, and they were often embellished by supposing the children to have been brought up by wolves or by other wild animals.[3] Thus in the year 1344 a boy who appeared to be from seven to twelve years old was brought to the Landgraf of Hesse; he was said to have been found among wolves. He walked on all fours, and ate raw flesh. He learnt to speak, but died not long after his capture.[4] Another wild boy was found towards the end of the sixteenth century near Bamberg; he was said to have grown up amongst wild goats.[5] A boy was reported to have been found in Denmark at the age of fourteen or fifteen, living among bears and "could not be distinguished from them except in shape." He subsequently learnt to speak.[6] A similar instance was reported from Lithuania in the year 1657.[7] Two boys were found in Poland in 1661 running wild in the woods; one escaped, the other was captured and presented to King John Kasimir. He never learnt to speak.[8] A wild girl who with difficulty acquired the rudiments

pp. 249 sqq.; C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, vol. i, pp. 55 sq.; C. A. Witchell, *The Evolution of Bird Song, with Observations on the Influence of Heredity and Imitation*, pp. 253 sqq.; Id., *Cries and Call-notes of Wild Birds*, pp. 84 sq.; W. H. Hudson, *The Naturalist in La Plata*, pp. 394 sqq.; W. E. D. Scott, "Data on Song in Birds," *Science*, xiv, pp. 522 sqq.; xv, pp. 178 sqq.; xix, pp. 154, 957 sqq.; xx, pp. 282 sq.

[1] E. Conradi, "Song and Call-notes of English Sparrows when Reared with Canaries," *The American Journal of Psychology*, xvi, pp. 197 sq.

[2] A. Hartmann, *Deafmutism*, p. 4, note.

[3] A. Rauber, *Homo sapiens ferus, oder die Zustande der Verwilderten;* J. F. Blumenbach, *Anthropological Treatises*, pp. 329 sqq.; E. B. Tylor, "Wild Men and Beast-Children," *The Anthropological Review*, i, pp. 21 sqq.; W. W. Ireland, *The Mental Affections of Children*, pp. 371 sqq.

[4] W. Dilich, *Hessische Chronica*, Part ii, p. 187; J. Pistorius Nidanus, *Rerum Germanicarum Scriptores aliquot insignes*, vol. i, p. 439.

[5] P. Camerarius, *Operae horarum subcisivarum, sive meditationes historicae*, vol. i, p. 343.

[6] *The Life of Lucilio (alias Julius Caesar) Vanini, burnt for Atheism at Thoulouse, with an Abstract from his Writings*, pp. 65 sq.

[7] P. Gabriel Rzaczynski, *Historia naturalis curiosa Regni Poloniae, Magni Ducatus Lituaniae*, etc., p. 354; A. Kircher, *China monumentis illustrata*, p. 194.

[8] C. Hartnock, *De Republica Polonica*, p. 108; B. Connor, *The History of Poland*, in Letters to Persons of Quality, vol. i, pp. 342 sq.

of education was found in 1717 at Oberyssell, near Cranenburg.[1] A boy was found near Hameln, in Hanover, in 1775, who was brought to England and attained considerable notoriety as 'Peter the Wild Boy.' Blumenbach proved that when he was found he had not long been absent from his home; he lived in England till he was over seventy, but only learnt to speak a few words.[2] Several instances of wild children and men are reported from the Pyrenees. A wild man was caught there in 1723 by some hunters; they endeavoured to tame him, but he escaped.[3] Rousseau speaks of two boys found in 1719, "who ran about the mountains after the manner of quadrupeds."[4] Another wild boy was found in the Pyrenees in 1775.[5] A girl about ten years old was found near Chalons in 1731. Several unsuccessful attempts were made to capture her, and she baffled her pursuers by the agility with which she moved among the branches of trees. She could not utter a word, and her yells and howls are described as terrifying. She was extremely skilful in catching fowl and rabbits, which she skinned with her nails in a twinkling and greedily devoured raw. All her life she thought cooked meats insipid, and when ill was provided with live pigeons of which she sucked the blood. She was brought up in various convents and became quite educated, so that she could converse with considerable intelligence. She was known as Mlle. Leblanc, and was seen by a number of distinguished persons, among whom were the Queen of Poland, mother of the French Queen, the physicist La Condamine, and Lord Monboddo. It appears that she was kidnapped in some part of America by some sailors and brought to France, where she was acquired by a lady, who, however, kept her locked up; and that she had effected her escape. She stated that her memory of her pre-linguistic days was very dim, for she had at that time no thoughts at all, but only the sense of her needs and the desire to satisfy them; she had an intense feeling of hunger, and a strong sense of self-preservation rather than of fear. To the end of her life she had considerable

[1] *Sammlungen von Natur- und Medicin- wie auch hierzu gehörigen Kunst- und Literatur- Geschichte*, etc., *von einigen Breslauischen Medicis*, 1718, pp. 548 sq.; H. C. Koenig, *De hominum inter feras educatorum statu naturali solitario*, p. 11.

[2] Lord Monboddo, *Antient Metaphysics*, vol. iii, pp. 57, 367; J. F. Blumenbach, *Anthropological Treatises*, pp. 329 sqq.; Jonathan Swift, "it cannot rain but it pours, or London strewed with rarities," *Works* (1755), vol. iii, pp. 132 sqq.; *The Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. xxi (1751), p. 522; vol. lv. (1785), pp. 113, 236, 851.

[3] "Examen filosofico de un peregrino suceso de estos tiempos," *Semanario erudito*, 1788, vol. viii, p. 53; Lord Monboddo, *op. cit.*, vol. iv, pp. 36 sq.

[4] J. J. Rousseau, "Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité," *Oeuvres*, vol. i, p. 568.

[5] J. D. Le Roy, *Mémoire sur les travaux qui ont rapport à exploitation de la mâture dans les Pyrénées* (Londres, 1776), p. 8.

difficulty in restraining herself from attacking people when they laid a hand on her.[1] In the year 1767 a girl of about eighteen was found in lower Hungary in a completely wild state.[2] A speechless wild boy was discovered in 1798 by some sportsmen in the woods of Caune, in the Department of Aveyron; he was brought to Paris and his education was undertaken by Dr. Itard. Considerable discussion took place between the latter and Pinel as to whether the boy was a congenital idiot or not.[3]

Special interest attaches to a case of a somewhat different kind, that of Kaspar Hauser, a youth who was found on the 26th of May, 1828, at one of the gates of Nuremberg, bearing a letter, obviously intended to deceive, and repeating a phrase—"I wish to be a trooper, like my father"—which he had just been taught. He was otherwise completely ignorant of language, and could only with difficulty stand upright. He was given in charge to Professor Daumer, who undertook his education and has written a careful account of him. He was entirely ignorant of the world; his mind was that of a child, and he mistook inanimate objects for living things. He had an acutely developed sense of smell, and smelt his food before partaking of it; he would not touch meat, but took bread and milk greedily. Under proper care he made good progress and showed excellent aptitudes. He was then able to explain that he had been brought up in solitary confinement in a small room, his food being brought to him by a man who never spoke, except just before he brought him to the town gate, when he taught him the phrase mentioned. Considerable interest was excited by the circumstances of the case, and many persons possessing good information, including the jurist Feuerbach, regarded it as a moral certainty that Hauser was no other than the heir to the grand-ducal crown of Baden, born in 1812, a view which appears to be confirmed by his mysterious murder in 1833, obviously by some persons who desired the secret of his birth to remain unknown. A post-mortem showed his brain to be less developed than normal, the convolutions being simpler and the hemispheres not overlapping the cerebellum.[4] The alternative suggestions that Hauser was

[1] C. M. de la Condamine, *Histoire d'une jeune fille sauvage trouvée dans les bois à l'âge de dix ans*, etc. (Paris, 1755); "Lettre écrite de Chalons en Champagne le 9 Décembre 1731 par M. A. M. N. . . . au sujet de la fille sauvage trouvée aux environs de cette ville," *Le Mercure de France*, December 1731.

[2] J. J. Virey, in *Nouveau dictionnaire d'histoire naturelle appliquée aux arts*, vol. xv, p. 226.

[3] J. E. M. G. Itard, *De l'éducation d'un homme sauvage, et des premiers développements physiques et moraux du jeune sauvage de l'Aveyron* (Paris, 1801); J. J. Virey, *Histoire naturelle du genre humain*, vol. ii, pp. 289 sqq. Itard's book is of particular merit, and is one of the classics in the education of the feeble-minded.

[4] G. F. Daumer, *Enthüllung über Kaspar Hauser* (Frankfurt, 1859); art. "Hauser, Kaspar," in *Meyers Konversations-Lexikon*.

congenitally deficient or that he was an impostor are definitely excluded by the facts, and both Dr. Séguin and Dr. Tredgold, the foremost living English authority on mental deficients, regard the case as being of particular significance. "A careful examination of the facts regarding his condition when first found, his subsequent limited progress, his intentional and mysterious death, and the state of his brain," writes Dr. Tredgold, "seem to show that his account was a truthful one, and that he exemplifies in a unique manner the effect of prolonged isolation upon the cells of the brain." [1]

Several instances of wild boys have been reported from India. Two boys, said to have been fostered by wolves, were received at different times during the year 1872 at the Secundra Orphanage of the Church Missionary Society near Agra. The older of the two, who seemed to be about seven or eight years old, had, from the formation of his head, the appearance of a congenital idiot, though his face was "by no means dull." The younger one, on the other hand, is described by Mr. Erhardt as "the finest boy in the institution," and from the refined type of his features was judged to have been born of high caste parents. They were, however, both in exactly the same condition, that is, purely animal, "with the habits, actions, and appetites of a wild beast." They had no speech and could only whine. They would eat nothing but raw flesh, and it was some time before they could be induced to take rice. In their original condition they were never seen to smile, or show signs of joy, shame, or gratitude, but the younger boy subsequently developed manifestations of those emotions. He died four months after being received into the institution.[2] Sir William Sleeman also gives accounts of several boys found in a wild state, and, like the former, fostered by native report upon she-wolves. Indeed, on learning the Resident's interest in the subject, the native officials appear to have hastened to produce numerous 'wolf-children' to gratify his curiosity. The first of the cases mentioned by him is the only one which seems of interest. He was handed over to Captain Nicholetts, commanding the 1st Regiment Oude Local Infantry, who, in his letters, mentioned the following particulars. "He is very inoffensive except when teased, and will then growl surlily at the person who teases him. He has come to eat anything that is thrown at him, but always prefers raw flesh, which he devours most greedily. He formed no attachment to anyone. He never played with any of the children around him, or seemed anxious to do so. When not hungry he used to sit petting and stroking a pariah or vagrant dog, which he used to permit to feed out of the same dish with him. A short time before his death, Captain

[1] A. F. Tredgold, *Mental Deficiency (Amentia)*, p. 323.

[2] W. W. Ireland, *The Mental Affections of Children: Idiocy, Imbecility, and Insanity*, pp. 425 sqq.

Nicholetts shot this dog, as he used to eat the greater part of the food given to the boy. The boy did not seem in the least to care for the death of the dog. He shunned human beings of all kinds, and would never willingly remain near one. He had lived with Captain Nicholetts' servants about two years, and was never heard to speak till within a few minutes of his death, when he put his hands to his head, and said, 'It ached,' and asked for water." [1] The last detail might seem to throw a doubt on the nature of the case, but instances are known of idiots who had remained mute all their lives, and who in the same manner spoke a few words just before their death.[2] Like the majority of the older accounts of wild children, most of the Indian instances appear to refer to imbecile, or congenitally idiotic children who had wandered away into woods and desert places.

Imbeciles and Deaf-mutes.

But the condition of idiocy or imbecility consists precisely in a failure of development whereby the sufferer is debarred from acquiring that traditional heredity which is normally imparted by the human environment. Esquirol, one of the most distinguished founders of scientific psychiatry, emphasised his view that "idiocy is not a disease: it is a condition in which the intellectual faculties have never appeared or become developed sufficiently to enable the patient to acquire that knowledge and education which are normally acquired by individuals of the same age and in the same surroundings." [3] Séguin, another pioneer in the same field, took a similar view and regarded idiocy as consisting essentially, as the Greek word implies, in a segregated condition of the patient's mind which cuts him off from the influence of his social environment; he considered that exactly the same result might be produced artificially by isolation.[4] Those views have been confirmed by more modern knowledge. The condition of idiocy, or amentia, is the effect of an arrest of development in those structures of the brain which normally mature under the stimulus of experience and social intercourse. Those structures are the microscopical offshoots of the pyramidal-shaped cells in the upper of the six layers of grey matter situated in the frontal and optical lobes. The brain in cases of simple congenital idiocy, compared with a normal brain, may show no gross anatomical differences, and is usually perfectly developed in most respects. The lower layers of cells in the cortex

[1] W. H. Sleeman, *A Journey through the Kingdom of Oude*, vol. i, pp. 206 sqq.

[2] W. W. Ireland, *op. cit.*, p. 383.

[3] E. Esquirol, *Des maladies mentales*, vol. ii, p. 284.

[4] E. Séguin, *Idiocy, and its Treatment by the Physiological Method*, pp. 16 sqq.

Nicholetts shot this dog, as he used to eat the greater part of the food given to the boy. The boy did not seem in the least to care for the death of the dog. He shunned human beings of all kinds, and would never willingly remain near one. He had lived with Captain Nicholetts' servants about two years, and was never heard to speak till within a few minutes of his death, when he put his hands to his head, and said, 'It ached,' and asked for water." [1] The last detail might seem to throw a doubt on the nature of the case, but instances are known of idiots who had remained mute all their lives, and who in the same manner spoke a few words just before their death.[2] Like the majority of the older accounts of wild children, most of the Indian instances appear to refer to imbecile, or congenitally idiotic children who had wandered away into woods and desert places.

Imbeciles and Deaf-mutes.

But the condition of idiocy or imbecility consists precisely in a failure of development whereby the sufferer is debarred from acquiring that traditional heredity which is normally imparted by the human environment. Esquirol, one of the most distinguished founders of scientific psychiatry, emphasised his view that "idiocy is not a disease: it is a condition in which the intellectual faculties have never appeared or become developed sufficiently to enable the patient to acquire that knowledge and education which are normally acquired by individuals of the same age and in the same surroundings." [3] Séguin, another pioneer in the same field, took a similar view and regarded idiocy as consisting essentially, as the Greek word implies, in a segregated condition of the patient's mind which cuts him off from the influence of his social environment; he considered that exactly the same result might be produced artificially by isolation.[4] Those views have been confirmed by more modern knowledge. The condition of idiocy, or amentia, is the effect of an arrest of development in those structures of the brain which normally mature under the stimulus of experience and social intercourse. Those structures are the microscopical offshoots of the pyramidal-shaped cells in the upper of the six layers of grey matter situated in the frontal and optical lobes. The brain in cases of simple congenital idiocy, compared with a normal brain, may show no gross anatomical differences, and is usually perfectly developed in most respects. The lower layers of cells in the cortex

[1] W. H. Sleeman, *A Journey through the Kingdom of Oude*, vol. i, pp. 206 sqq.

[2] W. W. Ireland, *op. cit.*, p. 383.

[3] E. Esquirol, *Des maladies mentales*, vol. ii, p. 284.

[4] E. Séguin, *Idiocy, and its Treatment by the Physiological Method*, pp. 16 sqq.

may not differ from the corresponding elements in the brains of normal individuals. But the upper cells in the particular regions just mentioned are found to have remained in the same condition as at birth—that is to say, they are ovoid or globular and smooth, instead of being, as in fully developed brains, pyramidal, and they have thrown out no offshoots connecting them with other cells of the brain. The number of those connecting fibres, which constitute the 'white matter' of the brain, is so diminished that the difference is plainly visible to the naked eye. That arrest of development is confined to those pre-frontal and parietal regions which are the last to appear in the course of evolution and the last to develop in the course of the growth of the individual.[1]

Imbeciles and idiots, who are unable to acquire the traditional heredity of their social environment, remain not only defective as regards the intellectual faculties, but also fail to develope human sentiments and moral instincts. "They are practically devoid of the higher emotions, and many are passionate and cruel. For them, as a whole, there is no sense of right or wrong. Truth, morality, religion have for them no meaning. They have passing likes and dislikes, but their laughter and noises are mostly devoid of significance."[2] "Imbeciles," says Dr. Sollier, the leading authority on their psychology, "have but little affection. They readily forget persons who have shown them the greatest affection. They hardly manifest any natural feelings towards their parents and prefer any pleasure to that of seeing them. . . . No moral or intellectual restraint exists any more than it does in animals. Their instinct of destruction is more marked than in the child. The imbecile is refined in his persecutions. He loves to make animals suffer, to mutilate them and to hear them cry. He loves to do evil for evil's sake."[3]

Where a human being is prevented from acquiring the socially transmitted traditional inheritance, not by any defect in the structure or growth of the brain, but by the sensory channels through which that inheritance is usually obtained remaining closed, the result is much the same. We have in the study of individuals who have been born deaf, or have become deaf in early life, a much better opportunity of observing the effects produced by the elimina-

[1] W. Bevan Lewis, *A Text-book of Mental Diseases*, pp. 85, 531; Id., in *Brain*, 1879, p. 371; A. F. Tredgold, *Mental Deficiency (Amentia)*, pp. 80 sq.; Id., "Amentia (Idiocy and Imbecility)," *Archives of Neurology from the Pathological Laboratory of the London County Asylums*, ii, pp. 386 sqq.; J. Shaw Bolton, "The Histological Basis of Amentia and Dementia," *ibid.*, pp. 424 sqq.; Id., "Amentia and Dementia: a Clinico-Pathological Study," *The Journal of Mental Science*, li, p. 330. Cf. below, p. 102.

[2] R. H. Cole, *Mental Diseases*, p. 153.

[3] P. Sollier, article "Idiocy," in *Twentieth Century Practice*, vol. xii, pp. 311, 305, 309, 312.

tion of traditional heredity than is afforded by old and doubtful accounts of wild children. Congenitally, or almost congenitally, deaf children remain dumb unless special means are adopted to communicate with them through the other senses; and it was consequently thought for a long time that such children are devoid of the power of speech.[1] They were accordingly regarded as being devoid of reason, or of soul, until their education began to be seriously undertaken, thanks chiefly to the initiative of the Spanish Benedictine Friar Don Pedro Ponce in the sixteenth century, and more particularly to the Abbé de l'Épée in the eighteenth century.[2] Where such artificial education is not undertaken they remain in a condition which is not to be distinguished from that of imbeciles or idiots, and they are in fact classified as such by modern alienists as they were by the ancients.[3] "Such an individual," says Dr. Ireland, "even when in possession of a potential intellect of good capacity, is in reality an idiot."[4] If the education of deaf-mutes is delayed until after the twelfth or thirteenth year little can be effected by it.[5] A congenitally deaf individual "soon passes the age at which such (education) would be of avail, and becomes an incurable ament. Although such a state of affairs still exists, it is less common than in years gone by."[6] According to Dr. Graham Bell, there were forty-six times as many idiots among the deaf-mutes in the United States than among the rest of the population.[7] The census of England and Wales for 1891 showed a total of 14,192 deaf and dumb, of which 525 were classified as of unsound mind.[8] Allowance must be made for cases in which the same inflammatory condition affects both the organs of

[1] The first definite recognition of the fact that "it is lack of hearing which deprives deaf persons of the power of speech" is found in Alexander of Aphrodisias' *Problemata* (*Physici et medici graeci minores*, ed. Ideler, vol. i, p. 47); but the notion that mutism is due to a defect of the organs of speech was general until the publication of a work by the Swiss physician Jan Coenraad Amman (*Surdus, Loquens; seu, Methodus, qua qui surdus natus est loqui discere possit*, Amsteloedami 1692). At the present day mothers and nurses are still anxious to be assured by the doctor that the baby is not 'tongue-tied,' and medical men perform with the solemnity of a savage rite the absurd operation of snipping the 'fraenum linguae.'

[2] T. Arnold, *Education of Deaf-mutes*, pp. 17 sqq., 77 sqq.

[3] W. W. Ireland, *The Mental Affections of Children: Idiocy, Imbecility and Insanity*, pp. 258 sqq.; G. H. Savage, *Insanity and Allied Neuroses*, pp. 455 sq.

[4] W. W. Ireland, *op. cit.*, p. 259.

[5] G. H. Savage, *op. cit.*, p. 456; J. C. Reamer, *Mental and Educational Measurements of the Deaf* (*Psychological Monographs; Psychological Review Publications*, vol. xxix, No. 3), p. 129.

[6] A. F. Tredgold, *Mental Deficiency* (*Amentia*), p. 328.

[7] J. Kerr Love, *Deaf Mutism*, p. 261.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 212.

hearing and the brain; but the large proportion of incurable idiots in the older statistics is mainly due to lack of efficient education and not to any natural deficiency in potential aptitudes. Deaf-mutes whose artificial education is undertaken at an early age and skilfully carried out by modern methods show, unless they have suffered from concomitant disease of the brain, a normal degree of mental capacity in the circumstances.

It is significant that, although sight is man's dominant sense and sums up the sensory data upon which the conception of his natural environment is founded, while the auditory sense is an insignificant element of that apprehension, yet the congenitally blind are immeasurably less handicapped as regards mental development than the deaf-mute. "The deaf and dumb," remarks Dr. Ireland, "are in a much worse condition for obtaining knowledge than the blind. The deaf-mute sees everything, but understands nothing; whereas, in using the senses still remaining to him, the blind man is guided by the words of others into true interpretations."[1] Even without special training the congenitally blind commonly attain to a conspicuous degree of intelligence, which appears to be intensified rather than diminished by the exclusion of distracting influences from miscellaneous visual sensations. Deafness, on the other hand, although the channel of much richer visual experience remains open, usually involves, even where ordinary education by sign-language has been supplied, a certain degree of mental dulness and an imperfect development of those characters which are specifically human. Some congenitally deaf persons have, in favourable conditions of painstaking training and with the constant assistance of devoted helpers, developed admirable mental powers; but, as Dr. Mygind remarks, "no deaf-mute has as yet written his name in the pages of history," [2] and with the great majority there is an undeniable falling short as regards both intellectual and emotional characters. "It is a remarkable fact," says Dr. Kerr Love, who is disposed to minimise the mental inferiority of educated deaf-mutes, "that although the Glasgow deaf-mutes examined by the author were found quite up to the average in physique, the head measurement was always below that of their hearing competitors." [3] The same results have, however, been obtained by other observers wherever measurements of the deaf-mute have been undertaken.[4]

[1] W. W. Ireland, *The Blot upon the Brain: Studies in History and Psychology*, p. 287.

[2] H. Mygind, *Deaf-mutism*, p. 202.

[3] J. Kerr Love, *Deaf Mutism*, p. 27.

[4] H. Schmaltz, *Die Taubstummen im Königreich Sachsen*, p. 108; C. Lemcke, "Die Taubstummenschüler in Ludwiglust," *Zeitschrift für Ohrenheilkunde*, xvi, pp. 1 sqq.

Investigations as to the reaction-time, attention, memory, etc., of deaf children as compared with hearing children have shown the former to be uniformly inferior to the latter in respect of all tests applied.[1] Recently even more elaborate psycho-physiological enquiries have been conducted by Dr. Jeanette C. Reamer. Her results show that the average difference in mental ability between deaf and hearing children may be expressed by saying that the former are two years behind the latter in mental development; while in capacity to acquire education they are five years behind.[2] As regards the mental characters of the deaf compared with those of the blind Dr. Kessel writes: "Experience in blind and deaf-and-dumb institutions has taught that the blind man is capable of high cultivation and that depth of mind is one of his characteristics; but that the deaf and dumb never attains to the same acuteness of thought, that his conceptions are apt to remain confused, and that he is entirely destitute of depth of feeling."[3] The facial expression characteristic of blind people is one of intellectual and often spiritual refinement, whereas that typical of the deaf is one tending to dulness and moroseness—"a dull, heavy-looking face, vacant, wandering eyes,

[1] D. P. MacMillan and F. H. Bruner, *The Children attending the Public Day Schools for the Deaf in Chicago; Special Report of the Department of Child-Study and Pedagogic Investigation*, Chicago, 1906.

[2] Jeanette Chase Reamer, *Mental and Educational Measurements of the Deaf (Psychological Monographs; Psychological Review Publications*, vol. xxix (1921), No. 3), pp. 129 sq. Arnold complained that "the memories of deaf-mutes are unusually bad" (J. Kerr Love, *Deaf Mutism*, p. 291). Dr. J. Kerr Love states that a deaf-mute is "intellectually like a learning child minus the power of sustained reasoning" (*op. cit.*, p. 27).

[3] I. Kessel, "Ueber das Mobilisiren das Steigbügels durch Ausschneiden des Trommelfelle," *Archiv für Ohrenheilkunde*, xiii, p. 77. Those whose life-work is devoted to the training or treatment of deaf-mutes, and who in many instances are themselves sufferers, are unwilling to admit any mental inferiority in the finished product of such training as compared with normal individuals; and it seems unkind to press the point. It is to be noted that deaf-mutes enjoy much freer access to traditional inheritance in the form of literature than do the blind, who are dependent upon Braille type. The fact is significant; it is, as is further shown in the observations of Helen Keller presently to be cited, the element of human intercourse, of full communication with other human minds and of sympathy with their sentiments and emotions which counts for even more than intellectual education. The deaf-mute who is dependent upon sign-language is necessarily greatly restricted as regards general human intercourse. That disability is in a great measure removed by the German method of lip-reading. "It cannot indeed be disputed," says Dr. Hartmann, who belongs to the 'optimist' school, "that there are also deaf-mutes whose character leaves much to be desired; but if shortcomings occur, they can always be traced back to a defective education" (A. Hartmann, *Deafmutism*, p. 12). On the other hand such defects are rare in the blind, except in cases of gross neglect.

and thick, hanging lips." [1] It is not surprising that while the ancients associated blindness with superior intellectual gifts, and even with divine and prophetic powers, they regarded deafness as equivalent to lack of mind, or soul. "The blind," said Aristotle, "are greatly superior to the deaf in intelligence." [2] In the one case, although the dominant sensory channel is closed, traditional heredity remains unimpaired; in the other it is abolished or defective. And this latter deficiency counts for immeasurably more, as regards the development of human mental characters, than the absence of the fuller and more direct experience of the outer world conveyed by the sense of sight, out of which human conceptions have for the most part been, in the first instance, fashioned.

Even those who are both deaf and blind from infancy possess capacities for mental development identical with those enjoyed by other individuals of the same race; their minds are susceptible of the same activities and the same sentiments when, by the use of great patience and skill, the remaining senses are utilised to impart to them the traditional heredity of their social environment. This is conspicuously testified by the well-known instances of Laura Bridgman and Helen Keller. But antecedently to that education they remain purely animal in their mentality. They may scarcely be regarded as possessing a consciousness, says Dr. Riemann; "the character and the will of a child thus afflicted suffers as grievously

[1] J. Kerr Love, *Deaf Mutism*, p. 271. Protests against supposed statements that the physiognomy of the deaf and dumb is prone to have an animal appearance resembling that of a hare or an ape have been reproduced in several books, whose authors would seem to have copied them from one another without tracing the imputation to its source. The reference is to an exceedingly able and judicial article by the French publicist Maxime du Camp. He does not say a word of what is imputed to him, without naming him, by the Rev. T. Arnold, Drs. Hartmann, Kerr Love, and others. What he says is that in those cases where brain disease is superadded to deafness, or where, owing to neglect of all education at a sufficiently early age, the congenitally deaf have been allowed to remain under the full weight of their affliction and have thus drifted into a condition of confirmed idiocy, their facies is liable to assume the well-known appearance produced by a small head and relatively large face, a receding forehead and chin, and prominent ears, which is characteristic of idiots and suggests a resemblance to a hare or to an ape, or the morose expression of a ruminant (M. du Camp, "L'enseignement exceptionnel: L'institut des sourds-muets," *La Revue des Deux Mondes*, civ (1873), p. 553). The description is entirely correct. Such an appearance develops gradually in a neglected case, and gradually disappears as the mental undevelopment is remedied by education. It is far more seldom met with now in institutions than was the case formerly. Old residents in the neighbourhood of the Glasgow institution have frequently remarked that the boys are at the present day altogether different in appearance from their predecessors of even ten years ago (J. Kerr Love, *op. cit.*, p. 271; A. F. Tredgold, *Mental Deficiency*, p. 328).

[2] Aristotle, *De sensu et sensitu*, i.

as its mind and intellect. The changing play of expression in suffering and in joy affords such children no occasion to share in joy and in pity. The will knows no control."[1] Some, whom subsequent results have shown to possess unimpaired potential mental faculties are, before their education, "like logs"; they show no reaction whatever, remain standing or seated wherever they are placed, and are unable to coordinate their movements so as to use a spoon in feeding. They have "no personality."[2] A boy, Thomas Stringer, who became deaf and blind about the age of four, and who developed into a bright and intelligent lad, boasting of many scholastic accomplishments, was, when he was admitted to the Perkins Institute in Boston, "a mere lump of breathing clay, showing no signs of intelligence beyond an instinctive recognition of the needs of existence. He crept instead of walking, and was in all other respects like a baby."[3] His photograph at the time of his admission, given in Wade's book, is that of a particularly bad case of idiocy and might even be more probably taken for that of a dement. A congenital deaf-mute, Inocencio Juncar y Reyes, who became blind at the age of six, and acquired a very wide education, is described as having been "a being inferior to a mole."[4] Helen Keller herself writes as follows in reference to her condition before her education began: "I had neither will nor intellect. I was carried along to objects and acts by a certain blind natural purpose. I had a mind which caused me to feel anger, satisfaction, desire. These facts led those about me to suppose that I willed and thought. . . . I never viewed anything beforehand or chose it. I also recall tactually the fact that never, in a start of the body or heart-beat, did I feel that I loved or cared for anything. From reminiscences like these I conclude that it is the opening of two faculties, freedom of will, or choice, and rationality or the power of thinking from one thing to another, which makes it possible to come into being, first as a child, afterwards as a man. Since I had no power of thought I did not compare one mental state with another. So I was not conscious of any change or proces going on in my brain when my teacher began to instruct me. I merely felt keen delight in obtaining what I wanted more easily by means of the finger motions she taught me. It was not the sense of touch that brought me knowledge. It was the awakening of my soul that first

[1] G. Riemann, "Taubstumm und blind zugleich," *Zeitschrift für pädagogische Psychologie und Pathologie*, ii, p. 256.

[2] L. Arnould, *Ames en prison. L'école française des sourdes-muettes, aveugles et leurs soeurs des deux mondes*, pp. 426 (Case of Joanna Schlottmann, after *Erster Jahresbericht des deutschen Taubstummblindenheims zu Nowawes*, pp. 7 sqq.), 432 (Case of Max Schankin, *ibid.*, *Zweiter Jahresbericht*, pp. 8 sqq.).

[3] W. Wade, *The Blind-Deaf*, p. 94.

[4] L. Arnould, *op. cit.*, p. 328, after Fr. de Asi Valls y Ronquillo, in *Revue internationale de l'enseignement des sourds-muets*, 1889.

rendered to my senses their values, their cognisance of objects, names, qualities, and properties. Thought made me conscious of love, joy, and all emotions." [1] Helen Keller developed, as everybody knows, into a very cultivated personality characterised by a gentle, tolerant, and benevolent idealism of an evangelical type. When asked to define 'love,' she once replied that it was "what everybody feels for everybody else." [2] But there was no inkling of any such amiable dispositions before her education was undertaken. In her notes, her teacher, Miss A. M. Sullivan, thus refers to the "wild little creature": "She is irresponsive and even impatient of caresses . . . Every thwarted desire was the signal for a passionate outburst, and as she grew older and stronger these tempests became more violent. . . . She kicked and screamed herself into a state of stupor. . . . She accepted everything I did for her as a matter of course and refused to be caressed, and there was no way of appealing to her affection or sympathy. To get her to do the simplest thing, such as combing her hair, or washing her hands, or buttoning her boots, it was necessary to use force. Her table manners are appalling. She puts her hands in our plates and helps herself, and when the dishes are passed she grabs them and takes whatever she wants." When prevented from doing so she threw herself on the floor and lay "kicking and screaming and trying to pull my chair from under me." She pinched and tried to hurt those who opposed her. When first taught to use a spoon "she threw it on the floor; I forced her out of the chair and made her pick it up. Finally I succeeded in getting her back in her chair again, and held the spoon in her hand, compelling her to take up the food with it and put it in her mouth." The scene ends with Helen Keller on the floor again, kicking and screaming, and venting her fury on the furniture.[3] The training, although 'done by kindness,' necessitated, as with wild animals, such measures of discipline that it was advisable to have her removed from her home in order to spare the family the painful sight of the process. Maude Safford, a deaf-mute girl who became blind at the age of eight, and whose education was delayed until the age of fifteen, was "like a wild beast." [4] It should be noted that Helen Keller was in full possession of all her sensory faculties up to the age of a year and seven months, and that she retained visual memories. Deaf-mutes who are not such from birth, even when hearing has been lost early in infancy, acquire language more easily than congenital cases.[5]

[1] Helen Keller, *The World I live in*, pp. 142, 144 sq.

[2] J. A. Macy, in Helen Keller, *The Story of My Life*, p. 295.

[3] A. M. Sullivan, in Helen Keller, *The Story of My Life*, pp. 305, 307 sqq.

[4] W. Wade, *The Blind-Deaf*, pp. 66 sq.

[5] G. Riemann, cited by L. Arnould, *op. cit.*, p. 442; A. Hill Payne, art. "Deaf and Dumb," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. vii, p. 882; J. C. Reamer, *Mental and Educational Measurements of the Deaf*, p. 129.

Laura Bridgman did not lose her sight and hearing until she was two years and two months, and she retained sensations of sight in the right eye up to eight years of age.[1] Before her education was begun at that age by Dr. Howe, she had already been treated with great care and judgment by her parents, and had been taught by her mother to sew, knit, and braid, occupations which remained her favourite employment through life. Nevertheless, she remained "worse than a baby," and "as she grew in strength and age her will developed and restraint became more difficult. On her father devolved the unpleasant task of compelling obedience." [2] "There was nothing to reach her moral sense," wrote Dr. Howe; "the earlier exercise of this must be reverence for something; and all that Laura could revere was strength. Thus when thwarted she began to disregard the will of her mother, and only yielded to the signs made by the heavier hand of her father." [3] Laura had the capacity for becoming a gentle, docile woman; but she had also the capacity for becoming a ferocious and unmanageable one.

In two known instances highly satisfactory results have been obtained in the education of children who were deaf and blind from birth. Joseph Sure, born in 1886 in Westphalia, was educated by the Schwestern der christlichen Liebe, learnt sign-language and the use of Braille, and progressed so far as to be able to be instructed in the Catechism.[4] Marie Heurtin, who had been blind and deaf from birth, was at the age of ten "in a completely brutish state." "It was not a girl of ten who was admitted to the asylum of Notre-Dame de Larnay, but a raving monster." For two months after she entered the institution she rolled on the ground "barking horribly," so that the whole neighbourhood was disturbed. Attempts to take her for walks resulted in her having to be carried back home by the feet and shoulders. Through the patience and perseverance of Sister Sainte Marguerite she acquired about as much mental development and education as most French girls of her class; she showed an amiable and bright disposition, and became able to write, and even to speak, in an unnatural, gurgling manner.[5]

Those cases testify to the skill and patience of the educators. Long before such achievements had been attained Diderot had expressed the opinion that human beings reduced to the sense of

[1] H. H. Donaldson, "Anatomical Observations on the Brain and several Sense-organs of the Blind Deaf-mute Laura Dewey Bridgman," *American Journal of Psychology*, iii, p. 294.

[2] M. S. Lamson, *Life and Education of Laura Bridgman, the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind Girl*, pp. 3 sq.

[3] M. Howe and F. H. Hall, *Laura Bridgman, Dr. Howe's Famous Pupil*, and *What He Taught Her*, pp. 41 sqq.

[4] L. Arnould, *Ames en prison*, pp. 389 sqq.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 4 sqq., and *passim*; G. Harry, *Man's Miracle: The Story of Helen Keller and her European Sisters*, pp. 142 sqq.

touch alone could be educated.[1] Nearly three centuries earlier Cardan had expressed a similar view.[2] But even the most persevering efforts are not always successful, and against the brilliant successes obtained are unfortunately to be set many failures. The census of the United States in 1880 showed the existence of 256 blind deaf-mutes; of these 217 were classified as 'idiots,' and 30 as 'insane.'[3] Julia Brace, whose instruction commenced about the same time as Laura Bridgman's, but who was much older, showed very little in the way of results. "When left alone," notes Dr. Howe, "she loses consciousness, and lies flat upon her face sleeping and dozing for hours together."[4] A congenital deaf-blind girl born in 1894 in Switzerland had "learnt nothing" after eight years of patient efforts in an institution for the blind.[5] Another congenital case, Addie Lee Pruitt, born in 1892 and treated in the Deaf-and-dumb Institution in Texas, has proved utterly discouring.[6] A Swedish case, Valborg Andersson, admitted in 1901 at the Venersborg school, had made little progress in three years, and was still very wild, bad-tempered, and refractory.[7] Maurice Karlsson, another congenital deaf-blind, who entered the same institution in 1889, "showed great intelligence," but his character was so difficult to deal with that he had to be discharged as "hopeless" in 1894.[8] A Belgian boy, Alexis Decramer, who was born deaf and became blind at the age of six months, and whose education was undertaken by Canon P. A. Naeghells of Bruges, showed very little, if any, advance above an animal condition after eight years of patient efforts. He was not congenitally defective in mind; he is even described as "very intelligent." But although he learnt a few words of finger-speech, he never spontaneously attempted to communicate with others, and was chiefly concerned with sleeping and with gratifying his insatiable appetite.[9]

Failing successful artificial education the congenitally deaf, and 'a fortiori' the deaf-blind, remain on the level of pure animality.[10]

[1] D. Diderot, "Lettre sur les aveugles," *Oeuvres* (ed. Assézat), vol. i, p. 294.

[2] Hier. Cardan, "De utilitate ex adversis capienda," ii. 7, *Opera omnia*, vol. ii. pp. 73 sq.

[3] F. H. Wines, *Report on the Defective, Dependent, and Delinquent Classes of the Population of the United States, as returned at the Tenth Census* (*Tenth Census of the United States: Statistical Reports*, vol. xiii), pp. 438 sq.

[4] W. Wade, *The Blind-Deaf*, pp. 149 sq.; M. Howe and F. H. Hall, *Laura Bridgman, Dr. Howe's Famous Pupil*, pp. 109 sq., 134.

[5] L. Arnould, *Ames en prison*, pp. 415 sq.

[6] W. Wade, *The Blind-Deaf, Supplement*, p. 13.

[7] L. Arnould, *op. cit.*, pp. 401 sq. [8] *Ibid.*, pp. 358 sq.

[9] G. Harry, *Man's Miracle*, pp. 43, 199 sq.; L. Arnould, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

[10] The ineradicable love of sentimental edification has even here caused some writers to set facts at defiance and to enlarge upon the superiority of the deaf-blind" over even the most intelligent animals" (see Dugald Stewart, *Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind*, vol. iii, pp. 300 sq.).

It will be noted that, as shown in several of the above-mentioned cases, and in Helen Keller's admirably clear account of herself, the deficiency does not bear on intellectual powers merely, but even more markedly on those mental characters—sympathy, affection—upon which human social life is founded. "The blind-deaf," says Dr. Riemann, "are often ill-natured, selfish, quarrelsome." [1] With his own most brilliant pupil, Hertha Schulz, although very fair intellectual development was produced, it was found impossible to impart sentiments of sympathy and affection, and the education of character proved extremely unsatisfactory. With Julia Brace, who had been imperfectly educated at home, Dr. Howe did not find it possible to effect the same transformation in character as was accomplished as regards Laura Bridgman. When the two first met, Laura endeavoured to elicit signs of affection from Julia. "She manifested little interest, and in a moment or two began to withdraw from the child, who clung to her, put around her neck a chain of her own braiding, and kissed her. Vain impulse of affection! What a contrast in their characters! Such is the effect of education; such the consequences of evolving the moral and social nature, as has been done in the case of Laura; or of exercising only the lower propensities, and allowing the human being to live as do the brutes, within himself and for himself alone. The kind and good people who have charge of Julia Brace seem to do all they can do." [2]

The result is thus very much the same whether traditional heredity is eliminated by material isolation, by a defect in those portions of the brain which normally develop under the stimulus of educative experience, or by the closing of those sensory paths through which it is acquired. In each instance the human individual is reduced to the physiologically inherited, 'innate,' or 'natural' mind; he is devoid of those characters, not only intellectual but also moral and emotional, which we regard as distinctively human, and his behaviour and mentality are scarcely distinguishable from those of brute-animals. The mental characters upon which that distinction depends are transmitted by natural heredity as potential aptitudes only; these cannot come into operation unless they are elicited by the action of the human social environment. If that action is not available, all those characters which belong to the purely human part of an individual's natural inheritance remain in effect null. Human mental characters have arisen amid the peculiar conditions of human

[1] G. Riemann, "Taubstumm und blind zugleich," *Zeitschrift für pädagogische Psychologie und Pathologie*, ii, p. 256.

[2] M. Howe and F H. Hall, *Laura Bridgman, Dr Howe's Famous Pupil*, p. 94

social relations, of conceptual thought or silent speech, of language, of social tradition; and, unless the same conditions are present in a similar form and in an adequate degree, the reproduction of those characters by natural heredity alone is not possible.[1]

Just as the conditions amid which those characters have developed are without parallel among animals, so also the fact that they cannot be reproduced in the absence of those conditions is without analogue in animal biology. Organic characters transmitted by physiological heredity develop in the individual independently of the action of the environment, and whether or not that environment offers any scope for their exercise. Limbs and organs are formed by physiological heredity before any opportunity has arisen of using them. Animals born and bred in total darkness develop eyes as a part of their hereditary structure. Those organs are as fully formed as in animals of the same species born in the daylight. They atrophy from disuse, and in the second and third generations the atrophy becomes more pronounced, until they may become so reduced as to have virtually disappeared.[2] But hereditary transmission of those organic structures to the individual does not depend upon the action of the environment upon that individual; it takes place independently of such action. The socially developed characters which are distinctive of the human mind do not manifest themselves at all in the absence of the eliciting action of an appropriate social environment; failing that action the human mind is reduced to inherited instincts and impulses, and consequently remains similar to that of the lower animals. Not only do human mental characters not manifest themselves as such, but the anatomical structures which form the physical basis of those characters do not develop—a phenomenon which is unique in biology. While the eye is reproduced physiologically whether the stimulus of light be present or not, those organs of the brain which constitute the physiological basis of the mind, as regards its

[1] In his delightful study on "Fear," Dr. Mosso wrote: "Though we should be abandoned in the midst of woods, imprisoned in the depths of some tower, without guide, without example, without enlightenment, yet the experience of our fathers and of our most remote ancestors would still be awakened in our minds like a mysterious dream" (A. Mosso, *La Paura*, p. 311). The genial physiologist and philosopher must surely have been nodding when he wrote those words, lulled not by hereditary dreams, but by an inveterate traditional heredity. That they are untrue is not a speculative inference, but a matter of fact. The deaf-mutes are, like Kaspar Hauser, "imprisoned in the depths of some tower, without guide, without example, without enlightenment," and, unless they are liberated, not only ancestral memories, but even ordinary human mental characters, are not awakened.

[2] A. Viré, *La faune souterraine de France*, pp. 100 sqq. Cf., however, F. Picard, "Note préliminaire sur l'atrophie de l'oeil chez le mâle d'un hyménoptère," *Bulletin de la Société Zoologique*, xlvii, pp. 404 sqq.

human characters, are incapable of being reproduced by the physiological process alone; unless they are formed under the stimulus of actual social experience and traditional heredity they are not formed at all.[1] Human heredity must be acquired in order to be inherited. The paradox was thus expressed by Goethe:—

> That which from thy fathers hast inherited,
> Acquire it! that it may be thine.[2]

The form of the traditional heredity acquired from the social environment is lost with surprising rapidity when not maintained by constant cultivation. Language itself is lost before long unless the social educative experience which led to its acquisition continues to operate. Children who become deaf, even if they have learnt to talk fluently, usually lose the power of speech. "If the hearing is lost between the ages of four and seven, the child may possibly retain whatever speech it had already learnt, but, as a rule, owing to neglect, it gradually becomes inarticulate in its speech, and finally dumb." [3] Persons who have led a completely solitary life for long periods, such as shepherds in some parts of the Australasian Colonies and in the wilder districts of America, are found to speak with considerable difficulty; their speech is often so inarticulate that it is hard to understand them, and cases are cited where young lads thus isolated have become quite unintelligible.[4] When Alexander Selkirk, the original of Robinson Crusoe, was rescued after four years from the island of Juan Fernandez, he was scarely able to make himself understood, and his attempts to speak his native tongue were almost inarticulate.[5]

Europeans cut off from civilisation soon sink to the level of their social surroundings. When in 1790 an expedition under Jan Holthausen set out to seek for survivors of the 'Grosvenor,' an Indiaman carrying British officers and their wives which had been wrecked on the coast of South Africa, they came upon three old English women living in a native kraal. They were survivors of an earlier wreck. They spoke Bantu only, and their manners and sentiments were identical with those of the Kaffir women.[6]

[1] Cf. below, p. 102.

[2] Goethe, *Faust, erster Thiel*:—

> "Was du ererbt von deinen Vätern hast,
> Erwirb es, um es zu besitzen!"

[3] Hunter Tod, *Diseases of the Ear*, p. 297. Cf. A. Hartmann, *Deafmutism*, p. 83: "If speech has been already perfectly acquired, it will be lost again, sometimes quickly, sometimes more gradually."

[4] A. Rauber, *Homo sapiens ferus*, p. 71.

[5] Woodes Rogers, *A Cruising Voyage round the World*, p. 129.

[6] D. Fairbridge, *A History of South Africa*, pp. 103 sq.

CHAPTER II

TRADITIONAL HEREDITY

AN immemorial and tenacious bias of the human mind disposes it to regard its most valued qualities as 'innate' and 'natural.' Sir Thomas Browne, who firmly believed in witchcraft and in a thousand quaint 'vulgar errors' derived from the traditional heredity of his age and society, voiced the general conviction when he affirmed the inborn character of all the virtues. "Bless not thyself only," he says, "that thou wert born in Athens, but among thy multiplied acknowledgments, lift up one hand unto heaven that thou wert born of honest parents, that modesty, honesty, and veracity lay in the same egg, and came into the world with thee." [1]

In the same manner as Sir Thomas Browne regarded the social virtues as contained in the egg, Professor Bateson declares that "superstition is due to the presence of a specific ingredient" in the germ-cells.[2] The conception of scientific determinism and our growing knowledge of the operation of natural heredity have disposed some men of science to lay great stress on the part played by that heredity in the transmission of mental characters. "Failure to recognise the fact of mental inheritance," says Dr. Gates, "comes largely, now, from certain psychologists and educationalists whose biological ignorance and lack of understanding of heredity is a matter for commiseration." [3] There may, however, be room for the exercise of those charitable sentiments on the part of the psychologist also when certain confusions in regard to fundamental psychological conceptions, which appear to be

[1] Sir Thomas Browne, *Christian Morals*, Part i, sect. xxxv (*Works*, vol. iii, p. 107).

[2] W. Bateson, *The Methods and Scope of Genetics*, p. 34. It appears difficult to reconcile Professor Bateson's belief with the hope which he expresses almost in the same breath, that the world may be entirely transformed by the adoption of his views and by their supplanting in traditional heredity "the terrific code which Moses delivered from the flames of Sinai." Cf. Id., *Mendel's Principles of Heredity*, pp. 303, 306.

[3] R. Ruggles Gates, "Heredity and Eugenics," *The Eugenics Review*, xii, p. 4.

involved in many estimates concerning the respective parts of natural and of traditional heredity, come to be considered. Professor Conklin affirms that "the modifications which may be produced by the environment or education are small and temporary as compared with those whch are determined by heredity." [1] Those modifications are the same in magnitude with Professor Conklin as with Helen Keller; and it is not easy to see on what scale of values those modifications are, with quite extravagant modesty, pronounced to be small which differentiate the learned and genial professor from an idiot and moral imbecile. One can not but suspect that some of the more ardent exponents of certain views concerning mental inheritance do not always exactly mean what they say. Dr. Karl Pearson, summing up the results of statistical investigations on school children, says: "We are forced, I think literally forced, to the general conclusion that the physical and the psychical characters in man are inherited within broad lines in the same manner and with the same intensity." [2] If the statement means, as it is liable to be understood to mean, that the activities which occupy human consciousness and the sentiments by which human conduct outside asylums is actuated are transmitted "in the same manner" as organic structures, it is simply, as we have seen, not true.

Nobody nowadays supposes that there is any fundamental difference in respect of natural heredity between one character and another because the one is physical and the other psychical, or that the process by which impulses, instincts, and dispositions are transmitted by natural heredity differs from that by which structures and organs are reproduced. In animals generally mental characters are transmitted in much the same manner as organic characters. As is well known, very specialised and elaborate instincts are perpetuated in the race by hereditary transmission. Such, conspicuously, are the instincts which govern the behaviour of many insects. Similar specialised instincts abound among the higher animals; they may become modified and adapted to different situations and uses, and may even persist after they have ceased to fulfil any useful function, provided always that they are not inconsistent with actual conditions and antagonised by new requirements. A dog still 'hides his tracks' by the futile proceeding of scratching an asphalt pavement with his hind-legs, although the reaction, which was once of great importance, no longer serves any advantageous purpose. Smilarly a squirrel in a

[1] E. Grant Conklin, *Heredity and Environment in the Development of Man*, p. 306.

[2] Karl Pearson, "On the Inheritance of Mental and Moral Characters in Man," *Biometrika*, iii, p. 156.

cage will pat the nuts which it does not eat as if to bury them in the ground, as is the habit with squirrels in their natural state.[1] But as we rise in the scale of organic efficiency the part played in behaviour by such definite, particularised instinctive reactions, or as they are technically called 'pure instincts,' becomes smaller, and that of more general, modifiable, and adaptable dispositions greater. It is the most prominent characteristic of the inherited dispositions which determine the behaviour of the higher animals that, in contrast with the rigidly fixed instinctive behaviour of lower creatures, they are inherited in extremely labile and modifiable forms, as generalised tendencies rather than determinate and fixed modes of reaction. To that greater lability correspond, as we have already noted and as we shall come to see in greater detail, certain very marked and important physiological and anatomical conditions. The physical basis of those tendencies to reaction in nervous structure is undeveloped at birth, and cannot develop at all except in relation to the actual conditions in which the individual animal lives, and under the combined action of the hereditary force and of education. We have seen that birds cannot develop the power of song unless they have the opportunity of imitating the song of other birds, and that the result is largely determined by the pattern of the model and not by the inherited disposition. The large felines inherit a strong instinctive disposition which may be termed the hunting instinct; but lion and tiger cubs take from a year and a half to three years under painstaking tuition from their parents to perfect their power of catching and killing a prey—their earlier attempts are bungled.[2]

That generalisation of inherited tendencies, which transfers the adaptation of behaviour from heredity structure to experience, is enormously increased in man; it is not only increased in degree, but it is also profoundly modified in its mode of operation. Human beings are ultimately actuated by impulses, such as those towards nutrition and reproduction, which are common to all animals. They are also actuated, like animals, by more specialised instinctive dispositions. But after the first period of infancy, during which specialised instincts, such as the sucking instinct, which are in reality at the level of physiological reflexes, play an important part, there exists no instance in normal man of a determinate 'pure instinct' causing him to behave in a predetermined manner in a given situation.[3] There are in man instinctive tendencies, and his behaviour may be said to be ulti-

[1] C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, vol. i, p. 80.

[2] P. Chalmers Mitchell, *The Childhood of Animals*, p. 169.

[3] J. Drever, *Instinct in Man*, pp. 152, 167, 168, 205 sq.; G. F. Stout, "Instinct and Intelligence," *British Journal of Psychology*, iii, p. 245.

mately governed by these in the same manner as the behaviour of other animals. The instinctive behaviour of animals takes place, there can be no doubt, in response to feelings which impart to a given object or situation an emotional value or interest. Such feelings, emotional values, or interests are the only form in which instinctive tendencies operate in man. It has been noted as an important psychological law that the more powerful those instinctive feelings and emotions, the more indeterminate, variable, and modifiable the effects to which they lead in behaviour. While a fixed instinctive reaction, which takes place automatically and is not distinguishable from a reflex physiological act, is not accompanied by any strong feeling or emotion, powerful instinctive emotions and passions will exhaust every possibility offered, and employ every ingenious means, however circuitous, to achieve satisfaction, and are proportionately apt to become disguised and transformed.[1] In man, however definite and instinctive feeling may be, "it is impossible to say beforehand what the response to a given situation will be." [2]

Feelings connected with inherited instincts may in man as in animals be related to particular objects. Chicks a week old will hide in terror when a sparrow-hawk sweeps overhead, while they take no notice of a flying pigeon.[3] Straw that has served as a litter in a lion's or a tiger's cage is useless for horses, for they are terrified by the scent of it, even though they have never seen a lion or a tiger.[4] It is probable that numerous similar instinctive feelings and emotions exist in man. It has been alleged that children are particularly frightened of creeping things, and of snakes in particular; and the snake is the animal most dreaded by arboreal monkeys.[5] Sir David Brewster is said to have been obsessed with a dread of losing his life by drowning. His daughter

[1] A. F. Shand, *The Foundations of Character*, p. 371; J. Drever, *Instinct in Man*, p. 159.

[2] J. Drever, *op. cit.*, p. 163. Instinctive fear, for instance, may result in hiding, running away, standing stock-still. In the young of animals who are accustomed to maternal protection, fear is usually manifested by howling for help, and in the human baby the usual manifestation is likewise a paroxism of crying and screaming. I have seen soldiers on the battlefield lie on their backs, kick, cry, and scream, thus reverting exactly to the reaction of the human baby. With most trained soldiers, of course, all those reactions are suppressed and modified; they neither run away, hide, nor are paralysed or scream.

[3] D. A. Spalding, "Instinct; with Original Observations on Young Animals," *Macmillan's Magazine*, xxvii, p. 286.

[4] T. Laycock, "A Chapter on Some Organic Laws of Personal and Ancestral Memory," *The Journal of Mental Science*, xxi, p. 175.

[5] J. O. Quantz, "Dendro-psychoses," *The American Journal of Psychology*, ix, p. 461; cf. G. S. Hall, "A Study of Fears," *ibid.*, viii, pp. 147 sqq.; A. Mosso, *La Paura*, pp. 273 sq.

mentions in her biography of him that this fear "was discovered to haunt the minds of his descendants, even when too youthful to be prepossessed by any knowledge of his having felt the same." [1] It has been suggested that the interest shown by children in stories about bears and wolves is related to the dominant part played by those animals in the traditions and folklore of some primitive peoples.[2] Dr. Davenport has endeavoured to show that a disposition to lead a wandering life [3] and the love of seafaring are hereditary.[4] Montaigne thought that a horror of medicinal treatment, "a dyspathie unto physicke," as Florio renders him, was hereditary in his family.[5] Specific aversions for particular foods, such as meat, herrings, or for vinegar, have been noted in several generations of the same families.[6] Vague and uncertain as is all such evidence, it appears probable that many emotional values, such, for instance, as the impressions made by colours and by natural scenery, have their basis in feelings arising from inherited instincts. Those instinctive feelings are the more likely to be found unmodified where they are of little importance in reference to social behaviour.

When we are considering the transmission of human mental characters we are not, however, concerned with the inheritance of impulses and instincts which are common to man and to the lower animals. Since all living beings are actuated by the same fundamental impulses, there is in this respect no difference, not only between man and other animals, but between any one animal species and another; there is, in that point of view, no more difference between man and the oyster than between man and the higher mammals. What constitutes differences in mental characters is not the nature of the primary impulses and fundamental instincts, but the modifications in the mode of operation by which they are manifested. It is thus irrelevant in this connection to note the inheritance in man of instincts similar to those of animals; for a human being whose mind should consist of his unmodified inherited instincts only, and whose behaviour should be solely governed by these instincts, would not differ from an animal, and would be locked up in a criminal asylum.

[1] M. M. Gordon, *The Home Life of Sir David Brewster*, p. 137.

[2] W. M. Brewer, "The Instinctive Interest of Children in Bear and Wolf Stories," *Proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science*, 1893, pp. 309 sqq.

[3] C. B. Davenport, *The Feebly Inhibited. Nomadism, or the Wandering Impulse, with special reference to Heredity.*

[4] Id. and M. T. Scudder, *Naval Officers, their Heredity and Development.*

[5] Michael, Lord of Montaigne, *Essays*, xxxvii, Florio's translation, vol. iii, pp. 624 sq.

[6] P. Lucas, *Traité philosophique et physiologique de l'hérédité naturelle*, vol. i, p. 390.

Those modifications which constitute the specific character of human social conduct, and the mechanism by which they are brought about are definitely not inherited "in the same manner" as are instincts and impulses or organic physical structures. Natural heredity alone is powerless to reproduce them as it reproduces physical characters. The distinctive features of human mentality exist in the human being at birth in the same sense as they exist in the germ out of which it has grown; but, as Professor Lloyd Morgan remarks, "we are not nowadays to be put off with the ambiguous assertion that consciousness and intelligence are 'potentially' present in the germ." [1] The difference between the mode of transmission of human mental characters and that of physical characters is even more profound.

The action of traditional heredity, including under that term what is spoken of as the social environment, is not that of a developer on a photographic plate which merely brings out and renders manifest what already existed there in a latent state. The same conditions which are indispensable in order that human mental characters should be reproduced at all, are also the means of an hereditary transmission which does not depend upon the physiological process, but hands down independently of it the products of human evolution to the individual. The confusion which appears to pervade much scientific opinion on the subject lies in assimilating the human social environment to the biological environment as it operates on the organisms and functions of animals. The mode of operation of traditional heredity and that of the physical environment differ not only in degree but in kind; they do not belong to the same order of factors. The latter transmits nothing, the former actually transmits mental characters. The physical environment modifies organic characters and instincts existing in the individual so slightly and gradually that the modification is often scarcely perceptible except by its accumulated effect in the race. Traditional heredity does not permit a single mental character that is produced under its influence to develop unmodified, and that modification is commonly so profound that the question arises whether it does not constitute the whole of the character. "Character," observes Compayré, "is, as it were, a work written in collaboration, where it is hard to discover which parts really belong to each of the collaborators, to nature or to education." [2] "Here we are in a region," says Dr. Gates, "where the structural basis of the developed inheritance is so tenuous, and the contact with the environment so intimate—character and environment being mutually involved and interpenetrated—that it is conceivable that the laws applying to structural character

[1] C. Lloyd Morgan, *An Introduction to Comparative Psychology*, p. 324.

[2] G. Compayré, *L'évolution intellectuelle et morale de l'enfant*, p. 303.

are not applicable with the same rigidity in the elements or methods of reaction that go to make what we call human character." [1] "The development of the mind," remarks Preyer, "is subject in so marked a degree to the influence exercised by the environment, and educational influences vary to such an extent that it is not possible to exhibit a perfectly normal development." [2] In other words, no mental character whatsoever, as it is manifested in any individual, is such as it is by virtue of natural inheritance alone. Not only can it not be reproduced by the physiological process alone, and requires the combined operation of that process and of traditional heredity, but it cannot develop unmodified by the latter. That modifying influence varies within wide limits. The opposite dogmas which, in estimating the respective importance of the two factors, set nature above nurture or culture above heredity are, when laid down as general laws of absolute value, equally fallacious. For whether the one or the other is the dominant factor in respect of a particular character in a given instance will depend upon the respective force of the factors in that particular instance, and the proportion may vary from almost zero to infinity. Where there is little educational influence in regard to a particular tendency, heredity will determine; where the hereditary disposition is feeble or irrelevant and the social influence great, the latter will overshadow the former. It is well known that mannerisms, tricks of gesture, peculiarities of gait are naturally inherited, often in a striking manner. For example, every person when he clasps his hands does it naturally in one of two ways—with the fingers and thumb of either the left or the right hand uppermost, the alternative way being to each person forced and unnatural. It has been shown by Dr. Lutz that the character is strictly hereditary.[3] Such facts are frequently mentioned to illustrate the detailed and minute operation of heredity in mental and motor characters, a minuteness of detail which it would be quite unscientific to doubt, whether the characters be physical or mental. But why is it that the transmission of such unimportant trifles is conspicuous, while, by comparison, the natural inheritance of mental characters of paramount moment in human life, such as intellectual and social qualities, is disguised and difficult to demonstrate? The reason is precisely that such trifles are irrelevant as regards social behaviour, and are consequently not subject to the modifying action of the social environment and of traditional heredity in the same degree as the characters that

[1] R. Ruggles Gates, "Heredity and Eugenics," *The Eugenics Review*, xii, p. 1.

[2] W. Preyer, *Die Seele des Kindes*, p. 221.

[3] F. E. Lutz, "The Inheritance of the Manner of Clasping Hands," *The American Naturalist*, xlii, pp. 195 sq.

matter in relation to those conditions. The social environment is not greatly concerned how a person clasps his hands, but some social environments may burn the person alive if he omits to clasp his hands on given occasions. Every social environment is concerned with modifying profoundly the inherited impulses and instincts which would cause a person to behave like an animal. Those fundamental instincts which are the ultimate source of the actions of human beings are accordingly modified in the course of development under the action of traditional heredity to such a degree that their "impelling force may be barely recognisable; in some cases even the actual instincts seem to have been eradicated, and in the highest types of all have become, to some extent, replaced by other motives of action . . . which were totally unknown to man's primitive ancestors."[1] A natural disposition may be suppressed by educational influences acting positively or negatively, by not affording it the opportunity to develop, or by utterly repressing it; it may be reduced; it may be cultivated; or it may be stimulated to abnormal and excessive development. It may, and in the vast majority of cases is, transformed by being deflected into quite different channels. Several psychologists, in noting the manifestations of instinct in man, have been struck with the fact that those instincts are clearly exhibited during the first years of life and then seem altogether to disappear.[2] It would seem that instinctive tendencies may often fail to become manifested owing to lack of opportunity. For example, it is generally held that the sportsman's keen interest in fishing is the manifestation of an hereditary instinct. But Dr. Starch mentions the instance of a man who never showed the slightest interest in the sport until he was thirty years old; after that age angling became one of the most absorbing interests of his life.[3] Dr. Drever, however, thinks that "it is very questionable if the result of non-satisfaction of an instinct at the proper time is ever mere atrophy of that instinct."[4] Every instinctive tendency in man, probably without an exception, becomes transformed, and that transformation is generally so profound that the original character of the instinct is hard to detect. There is doubtless in every male what may be called the "fighting instinct," and some have even asserted that when a man is in love there is a disposition to attack every other male.[5] But, needless to say, those instinctive

[1] A. F. Tredgold, *Mental Deficiency*, p. 370. The remark refers to racial development, but it applies equally to individual development.

[2] W. James, *Principles of Psychology*, vol. ii, pp. 398, 400 sq.; D. Starch, *Educational Psychology*, pp. 17 sqq.

[3] D. Starch, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

[4] J. Drever, *Instinct in Man*, p. 183.

[5] E. L. Thorndike, *Educational Psychology. Briefer Course*, p. 25.

dispositions do not give rise to direct manifestations; the fighting instinct "finds numerous outlets in civilised life, far removed from the crude instinctive behaviour in which it originally issues." [1] "With regard to tendencies," observes one writer, "it is mainly the education that determines whether they shall develop into vices or virtues." [2] It is recognised, for example, that asceticism and the mystic temperament are transformed manifestations of repressed sexual instincts; the character of the influence which the social environment and traditional heredity exercise will determine whether a potential rake shall become a saint. Many human mental characters are derived from natural heredity much in the same manner as the human organism derives its lungs from fishes, which have no lungs, but whose swimming-bladder has become adapted to the purpose of breathing. But whether the modifications that take place under the influence of the human environment be great or small, whether they operate in one direction or in the opposite, they can never be absent, for no specifically human character can develop independently of that influence. None is the unmodified product of natural heredity.

It can scarcely be doubted that in the course of that portion of the evolutionary process which is represented by the history of the human race, new characters and powers have been developed, and that these have become fixed in natural heredity and are transmitted as inborn dispositions. But it is surprisingly difficult to demonstrate the existence of such innate racial acquirements, and they are not at all such as one might be led to expect. Although language and everything which is transmitted by means of language is not congenitally inherited, the capacity for acquiring such traditional heredity must needs be an innate character: and it might naturally be assumed that it has been gradually improved in the course of human evolution. It is very commonly supposed that the superior hereditary endowments of members of the more highly cultivated races manifest themselves in a greater aptitude for education, which enables them to acquire with greater ease and rapidity than more backward races, the cultural inheritance of their own society. "It may be laid down in an absolute manner," says the French publicist and traveller Mismer, "that the child of an uncultivated race is obliged to learn everything, whereas the child of a civilised race has merely to recollect. The latter has inherited in a latent form, as fire is latent in wood, a mass of knowledge and ideas; it needs but the slightest stimulus to enable them to burst forth. How much that is now obscure will become clear when greater account is taken of these remarks!" [3]

[1] J. Drever, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

[2] A. T. Scholfield, *The Springs of Character*, p. 64.

[3] Ch. Mismer, *Souvenirs de la Martinique et du Mexique pendant l'intervention française*, pp. 56 sq.

There is little cause to complain of any indisposition on the part of most people to accept the view. That the aptitude of Europeans to learn is greater than that of savages is usually regarded as so self-evident as scarcely to require the prosaic support of evidence. When, however, facts come to be examined, they tell, strangely enough, an exactly opposite tale. "It is somewhat startling," remarks Mr. Benjamin Kidd, "to read that in the Australian colonies it has been observed that aboriginal children—who by the common consent of the civilised world are placed intellectually almost at the bottom of the list of existing races—learn quite as easily and rapidly as children of European parents, and, lately, that for three consecutive years the aboriginal school of Remahyuck, in Victoria, stood highest of all State schools of the colony in examination results, obtaining 100 per cent. of marks." [1] Mr. Mathew, from whom Mr. Kidd derives the information, adds further that "it is astonishing how easily and completely young blacks, not cut off from intercourse with their relatives but living and working constantly among whites, fall into European modes of thought." [2] In South Africa, "in mission-schools, children of an early age are found to keep pace with those of white parents. In some respects, indeed, they are the higher of the two." [3] In West Africa, "the black children make much more rapid progress than do the European." [4] Of the negro children of the coast of Guinea, Captain Binger says that "they have an extraordinary memory and a capacity for learning anything that one may teach them. They are quite as highly gifted as are European children of the same age." [5] A missionary in East Central Africa writes: "It has been the general experience in other parts of Africa that negro children have no greater difficulty in learning to read and write than European children, but quite the reverse; and that experience is confirmed in our schools." [6] When schools were first established by missionaries in Hawaii the children's progress in all elementary subjects was surprisingly rapid. Young Hawaiians soon learnt to perform mentally multiplications of four figures

[1] B. Kidd, *Social Evolution*, p. 295.

[2] J. Mathew, "The Australian Aborigines," *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales*, xxiii, p. 387. Dr. A. C. Thomson confirms the statements of Mr. Mathew. He cites a pupil of eight who, two years after he had been 'caught,' not knowing a word of English, read and wrote quite well, and had made fair progress in all branches of elementary education. The arrowroot cultivated by the native children secured prizes at the Melbourne and at the Vienna Exhibitions (A. C. Thompson, *Moravian Missions*, pp. 415 sqq.).

[3] G. McCall Theal, *The Beginning of South African History*, p. 99.

[4] Abbé Borghéro, in *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi*, xxxvii, p. 97.

[5] L. G. Binger, *Du Niger au golfe de Guinée*, vol. ii, p. 246.

[6] J. Raum, in *Evangelisch-Lutheranisches Missionsblatt*, 1909, p. 454.

by four with such rapidity and accuracy that the teachers themselves were frequently placed in an embarrassing situation by being unable to equal the mental alertness and precision of their pupils.[1] In Samoa, when elementary schools were first established, the natives developed an absolute craze for arithmetical calculations. They laid aside their weapons, and were to be seen going about armed with slate and pencil, setting sums and problems to one another and to European visitors. The Honourable Frederick Walpole declares that his visit to that beautiful island was positively embittered by ceaseless multiplication and division. In order to curb the arithmetical importunity of his native friends he set them a problem in algebra. But after long meditation and consultation over it, and after declaring that "it couldn't be done," the Samoans would not rest until they had been initiated into the mysteries of the new science.[2] The rapidity with which American Indian children acquire education has often been reported. Thus Cherokee children learn to read and write English in two and a half months, and Cree children "in a few weeks."[3] "The question has often been considered," says Dr. Brinton, "whether the mental powers of the savage are distinctly inferior. This has been answered by taking the children of savages when quite young and bringing them up in civilised surroundings. The verdict is unanimous that they display as much aptitude for the acquisition of knowledge, and as much respect for the precepts of morality, as the average English or German boy or girl."[4]

Several methods of estimating those mental capacities by definite quantitative tests have been devised, and although none is perhaps entirely free from objection, they afford a more concrete criterion than general impressions and reports. Such psychophysiological tests were applied to Papuans by members of the Cambridge anthropological expedition to Torres Straits.[5] More recently Professor Woodworth made an elaborate investigation by means of such tests on individuals of a large number of different

[1] F. Walpole, *Four Years in the Pacific*, vol. ii, p. 264.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 340. It was customary with most of the older writers to estimate the intelligence of savages by their nomenclature for numbers, and to instance the circumstance that they did not count above four, or ten, as a proof of their low development. But numerical nomenclature is very little called for in the life of most savage societies. Dr. Donath writes: "However low the mental condition of primitive man may be, that is after all the result of external circumstances, especially lack of exercise. His brain organisation allows him, I believe, a capacity for mental development which is hardly less than that of the European of average endowment" (J. Donath, *Die Anfange des menschlichen Kultur*, p. 46).

[3] C. Pilins, in *The American Anthropologist*, vi, p. 184.

[4] D. G. Brinton, *Religions of Primitive Peoples*, p. 15.

[5] *Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits*, vol. ii, pp. 189 sq.

savage races who were gathered together on the occasion of the St. Louis exhibition.[1] The result in each case was to show that there exists no appreciable differences in natural mental capacity between uncultured savage races and modern Europeans. "The elementary brain activities," says Professor Woodworth, "though differing in degree from one individual to another, are about the same from one race to another." [2]

It has, indeed, now become a matter of familiar knowledge to anthropologists that, in direct contradiction with the Platonic theories expressed with such charming confidence by M. Mismer, precocity, rapidity, and ease in acquiring education are a universal characteristic of young savages, while children of the 'higher races' are by comparison slow in learning. The inferiority of the former is not manifested in any lesser aptitude to acquire knowledge, but, as we shall see, in the very precocity of that aptitude, which comes to an end at an early age, whereas the European continues to learn slowly, his tortoise intellect thus eventually outdistancing the hare-like precocity of the savage. His superiority of endowment is not displayed in any reminiscent facility for acquiring traditional heredity, but quite on the contrary, in the greater power he possesses of departing from that heredity and modifying it, of showing mental variability, that is, originality and initiative. M. Guyau asserts that "the civilised child, instead of being, like the savage, without law or control, is ready to accept the yoke of law. Education finds in him a kind of preestablished law-abidingness, a natural legality." [3] But this again, like the observation which M. Mismer bequeathed for the enlightenment of posterity, is one of those confident assertions evolved from the depths of foregone convictions, which happen to be the exact reverse of what is testified by facts. The savage, child or man, is on the contrary an absolute slave to law, custom, and authority; he accepts their yoke with unquestioning submission, and bows to the creeds, prejudices, and moral traditions of the European with even more submissiveness than the latter. It is the civilised child who is by nature a rebel, and it is on that racial seditiousness and his power to shake off the dead hand of traditional heredity in his own society that his superiority really depends.

The retarded development of the European, which is the effect

[1] R. S. Woodworth, "Racial Differences in Mental Traits," *Science*, N.S., xxi, pp. 171 sqq.; Id., *Proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science*, Boston, 1909. Address of the Vice-president and Chairman of Section H—Anthropology and Psychology.

[2] Id., *loc. cit.*, p. 179. The only signs of considerable mental inferiority were found in the Congo Pygmies, and in the Igorots and negritos from the Philippines.

[3] M. Guyau, *Éducation et hérédité*, p. 79.

of causes to which we shall have to refer later, and the consequent prolonged power of acquisition and modification, are, of course, physiological and physiologically heritable characters. So is the capacity for making mental acquirements, for nothing, naturally, can be acquired by the mind without an inborn capacity for acquiring it. Many elaborate investigations have been undertaken of late years with a view to establishing that very reasonable assumption. Statistical enquiries, such as those of Dr. Karl Pearson already mentioned, have been carried out on a large scale on school-children and students ; [1] and ingenious methods have been perfected of testing abilities in a manner sufficiently definite to permit of quantitative comparisons being made. Although the margin of error in such enquiries must necessarily be considerable, and most of the methods adopted are open to serious criticism,[2] so that it must be admitted that " scarcely a fact, and not a single principle, is placed beyond the need for corroboration," [3] yet certain general conclusions appear to have been clearly brought out by those researches. The capacity for acquiring ordinary school education varies in different children, and bears a relation to family heredity ; and those initial differences in capacity between intelligent and dull children are generally maintained and cannot be completely obliterated by any educative process. But those differences, it has also incidentally been shown, are nevertheless diminished by the educational process. Thus Dr. Thorndike confirmed the fact, already hinted at by Sir William Gilbert, that " all twins are very much alike," not only in body, but also in mind. But he further found that the likeness, as regards mental characters, is considerably greater the younger the twins, and that this early similarity is followed by a progressive divergence, the resemblance originally due to birth being diminished by the post-natal influences operating on the mind.[4] Again, it has been noted that family resemblances in mental capacity are more

[1] K. Pearson, " On the Inheritance of Mental and Moral Characters in Man," *Biometrika*, iii, pp. 131 sqq. ; Id., " Inheritance of Psychical Characters," *ibid.* xii, pp. 367 sqq. ; E. Schuster and E. M. Elderton, " Inherited Psychical Characters," *ibid.*, v, pp. 460 sqq. ; E. L. Thorndike, *Educational Psychology*, vol. iii, pp. 303 sqq. ; G. Heymans and E. Wiersma, " Beiträge zur speziellen Psychologie auf Grund einer Massenuntersuchung," *Zeitschrift für Psychologie*, xlii, pp. 321 sqq. ; C. Burt, " The Experimental Investigation of General Intelligence," *British Journal of Psychology*, iii, pp. 94 sqq. ; D. Starch, *Educational Psychology*, pp. 33 sqq.

[2] E.g. C. Spearman, " The Proof and Measurement-of Association between Two Things," *American Journal of Psychology*, xv, pp. 72 sqq. ; Id., " General Intelligence, Measured and Defined," *ibid.*, pp. 222 sqq.

[3] C. Burt, " The Inheritance of Mental Characters," *The Eugenics Review*, iv, p. 200.

[4] E. L. Thorndike, " Measurements of Twins," *Archives of Philosophy, Psychology, and Scientific Methods*, i, pp. 5 sqq. ; Id., *Educational Psychology* vol. iii, pp. 247 sqq.

pronounced as regards very simple mental functions and processes, which form the object of the majority of the tests applied, but that this similarity diminishes the higher, and more specifically human, the faculties investigated. "The lower and simpler processes appear to be more dependent upon heredity than the higher and more complex, the emotional more than the intellectual and the intellectual more than the moral." [1]

General mental capacity for development is, however, a very broad character which, as we have seen, does not differ in a marked degree in the most uncultured and the most cultured races. Mental ability is but an empty vessel the value of which depends upon the contents that happen to be poured into it. "One individual differs from another," remarks Professor Woodworth "not so much in powers of memory, or of reasoning, or of attention, or of will, as in the sort of material to which he successfully applies those powers." [2] What it was hoped by some investigators to demonstrate is that particular aptitudes and capacities for special forms of knowledge or mental development are naturally inherited. The results obtained give no support to that assumption. Children, and even older students, constantly manifest profound distaste for particular subjects and a predilection for others, and it is commonly thought that such tastes are manifestations of special dispositions. But those likes and dislikes appear to be connected with the methods of approach to those various studies rather than with any natural aptitude or inclination. "To a large extent," says Dr. Starch, "they are illusory, because when the actual facts are obtained or when more careful measurements of the abilities in various directions are made, the abilities correlate much more closely than the students' statements would lead one to believe." [3] Such special inherited dispositions, it is currently supposed, are particularly pronounced as regards artistic talents. Special efforts have been made to exhibit the existence of an innate specific aptitude for music; it has frequently been asserted that some individuals show instinctive musical appreciation, while others are innately incapable of distinguishing 'God save the King' from 'The Red Flag.' [4] More accurate and extensive investigations have tended to show that this is an illusion. It has been supposed that, in particular, 'positive pitch,' that is, the ability

[1] C. Burt, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

[2] R. S. Woodworth, "Racial Differences in Mental Traits," *Science*, N.S., xxxi, p. 174.

[3] D. Starch, *Educational Psychology*, p. 57.

[4] The literature purporting to show the inheritance of musical abilities is quite extensive. I need only mention C. C. Hurst, "Mendelian Heredity in Man," *The Eugenics Review*, iv, pp. 20 sqq.; C. B. Davenport, *Heredity in Relation to Eugenics*, p. 48; H. Rupp, "Ueber die Prüfung musikalischen Fähigkeiten," *Zeitschrift für die angewandte Psychologie*, ix, pp. 1 sqq.

to recognise a musical note when sounded, is a very rare inborn capacity. But it has been shown that almost every child is capable of acquiring it quite easily. The conclusion of such investigations is that "music, like poetry, may be a primal talent; that, as all children are born poets, they may also be born musicians, and also, very similarly, that as 99 per cent. of humanity lose all poetic faculty during the years of early childhood because of the artificial conditions of modern child-life, so the very large majority of children lose their native musical ability through lack of training of the ear and mind during the most susceptible period." [1]

After an exhaustive and careful examination of all previous investigations, as well as extensive researches of his own, Dr. Starch concludes that "abilities in special subjects are inherited apparently to no greater extent in one subject than in another," and that "there is no evidence, at least from those figures, for the notion that special abilities run in families. The children of any given family are, on the average, equally good or equally poor in all studies." [2]

It is generally recognised that in his well-known collection of instances of 'Hereditary Genius,' Sir Francis Galton left, after all, his thesis quite unproved, for anything that is set down to hereditary talent may be equally ascribed to good nutrition and a traditional heredity of cultural interests and tastes.[3] The most striking fact presented by a genealogical survey of the families of men of genius is the exasperatingly uniform mediocrity of their offspring—a fact that might be perplexing did we not reflect that the bold and independent variability which constitutes the genius is almost inevitably converted in his descendants into a smug conformity to the parental tradition in whose reflected glory they bask. The power to depart, by individual initiative, from the rut of traditional heredity, which, as we noted, constitutes the most definite mental advantage of the more advanced races, and which, as we shall see, is the direct effect of conditions of growth supplied

[1] E. F. Copp, "Musical Ability," *The Journal of Heredity*, vii, pp. 297 sqq. Cf. S. Bernfeld, "Zur Psychologie der Unmusikalischen," *Archiv für die gesamte Psychologie*, xxxiv, pp. 235 sqq.

[2] D. Starch, *Educational Psychology*, pp. 83 sq.

[3] A writer in the *Biographie Universelle*, speaking of my own ancestors, is kind enough to say that talent appears to have been hereditary amongst them. Yet I quite fail to perceive that I have inherited any specific talent from them. One of my ancestors was a famous mathematician; but, although I have at times taken pleasure in the analytical processes of mathematics, the most unsurmountable repugnance has prevented me from ever undertaking the labour of mathematical manipulation except from necessity. Several were noted as prolific writers of plays; I am absolutely deficient in dramatic faculty, and envy in that respect the talent of the merest writer of shockers. Others have been diplomatists and zealous defenders of causes and opinions which I abhor.

by the environment, is determined in its direction and results by the nature of the traditional heredity and not by natural heredity. The former does not, any more than does the latter, make leaps; its continuity is unbroken. It cannot operate otherwise than by a gradual modification of the products which are handed down by social tradition. Absolute originality is not possible. Every new conception, idea, discovery, whether in the field of intellect, ethics, or religion, is the direct product of what, in the course of traditional heredity, has gone before, and is determined by it. The human mind can enter into new fields by a slight modification only of ideas that have been gradually transmitted to it by traditional heredity and have prepared the way for the new and 'original' point of view. We have seen that the conceptions of Plato, of the mystics of Gnosticism, of the founders of Christian theology were but adaptations and restatements of conceptions which were handed down a long line of tradition traceable by an unbroken filiation to the most primitive forms of human thought. It would be easy to show that the most daring and revolutionary notions put forward in revolt against the tyranny of tradition are themselves derived, and gradually evolved, from pre-existing ideas and sentiments by a filiation no less direct than the most conservative manifestations of hide-bound orthodoxy. The startling originality of a Nietzsche derives from a multitude of precursors.[1] Darwin's name figures in most collections of instances illustrating the hereditary transmission of intellectual talents in families. But in whatever manner those inherited aptitudes might in different circumstances have been manifested, nothing is more certain than that the simultaneous enunciation of the theory of natural selection by Darwin and by Wallace was the somewhat overdue result of traditionally transmitted ideas. In his great achievement Darwin's filiation was to Malthus, Lyell, Lamarck, Buffon, and innumerable other spiritual ancestors, and not to his natural ascendants. If his grandfather, Erasmus Darwin, contributed to the genesis of 'The Origin of Species,' it was through his 'Zoonomia' and not through his germ-plasm. The entire course of development of the human race, from whatever point of view it may be regarded, whether intellectual, economic, industrial, religious, social, or ethical, is as a whole and in detail coincident with the course of transmitted social heredity. "The

[1] Hostile critics of Nietzsche have had no difficulty in representing every one of his leading ideas as bare-faced plagiarisms. (See, e.g., A. Fouillée, *Nietzsche et l'immoralisme*.)

Dr. Brandes questions the title to permanent fame of our most brilliant exponent of the art of "épater les bourgeois," Mr. G. Bernard Shaw, on the ground that if what he owes to Nietzsche, to Ibsen, and a few others be deducted there is very little left.

social phenomenon of civilisation," observes Professor Fiamingo, "is almost completely independent of the anthropological phenomenon of race. At least up to the present date no serious relation scientifically tenable has been established between the two phenomena."[1]

It may seem self-evident to many that with the progress of the human race is correlated a continuous development of innate and hereditary capacities. "When we analyse the assumption," says Professor Boas, "it will soon be found that the superiority of the civilisation of the white races alone is not a sufficient basis for the inference. As the civilisation is higher we assume that the aptitude for civilisation is also higher; and as the aptitude for civilisation presumably depends upon the perfection of the mechanism of body and mind, the inference is drawn that the white race represents the highest type of perfection. In that conclusion which is reached through a comparison of the racial status of civilised and of primitive man, the achievement and the aptitude for an achievement have been confounded. . . . There is no satisfactory evidence that the effects of civilisation are inherited."[2] "The civilisation possessed by a generation," remarks Dr. Woodworth, "cannot be used as a measure of the intelligence of that generation any more than an individual's property can be taken as a measure of his business ability."[3] "There is a striking consensus of opinion," says Mr. Burt, "to the effect that in the main the human race has in its innate qualities remained practically stationary. In inborn mental constitution the civilised inhabitant of Paris or London to-day is, if anything, inferior rather than superior to the Athenian of the time of Pericles or the Englishman of the time of Shakespeare; and, indeed, if anything inferior rather than superior to his prehistoric ancestors. The evidence from the size and conformation of their skulls, from the tools and weapons they invented and manufactured, from the rude sculptures and paintings upon their implements and caves suggests that in native ability the primitive peoples inhabiting Europe before the dawn of history were not a whit behind their descendants. Civilisation, therefore, has been an advance in mental content, stored in the environment and reacquired with each succeeding generation, rather than an improvement in hereditary capacities or an inheritance of the improvements acquired. . . . The superiority of the modern civilised man is due not to hereditary powers and capacities, but to mental

[1] G. Fiamingo, "The Conflict of Races, Classes, and Societies," *The Monist*, vii, p. 391.

[2] F. Boas, "Human Faculty as Determined by Race," *Proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Forty-third Meeting*, pp. 302, 327.

[3] R. S. Woodworth, "Racial Differences in Mental Traits," *Science*, N.S., xxxi, p. 182.

contents and achievements transmitted and accumulated, not by inheritance, but by tradition." [1]

When those conclusions are taken in conjunction with the results of investigations into the relation of mental abilities and their development to natural heredity, it would appear that Professor Lloyd Morgan is right in considering that in the evolution of the human mind "the developmental process has been transferred from the individuals to their environment," that is, from physiological to traditional heredity.[2] It is in the latter, not in the former that the distinctive characters of the human, as opposed to the animal, mind reside.

It is a current view, the expression of ancient pride of race incorporated in traditional heredity, that the acquirements, or contents, of the mind are of secondary importance. The Gothic barbarians despised the culture of ancient Europe, and refused to have their children educated, because, they said, "education enfeebles the mind." [3] Acquired ideas, it is popularly considered, are of small moment compared with the native qualities of character, and that popular faith is translated into psychological terms by assuming the 'contents' of the mind to be distinct from the mind itself. But it is wholly in those contents that the humanity of the mind resides; in its native and unmodified characters, the mere beast. Although emotional dispositions are hereditarily transmissible and ideas are not, the sentiments, the estimates, the emotions that inevitably attach to those estimates and ideas, the moral evaluations, and therefore the behaviour, the conduct, and the whole of the activities of social man, are determined by the traditionally acquired contents of his mind, and not by physiological heredity, which can furnish only the mind of an animal. To suppose vaguely that the more fundamental principles of conduct and the qualities of character are unaffected by the conceptual inheritance of social tradition would be to set aside as functionless the powers of control and modification which conscious mind has developed and exercises every moment of life upon instinct and impulse.

"Faith comes by hearing"; a man will be a Buddhist in China and a Quaker in Pennsylvania, by virtue of traditional, and not of racial, heredity. He will, on principle, be a polygamist in Persia, a monogamist in modern Europe. In the Congo he will "think cannibal thoughts." As it was not the individual who made society in the first instance, but society which created the individual, so the mind of every human being is the product of the society in

[1] C. Burt, "The Inheritance of Mental Characters," *The Eugenics Review*, iv, pp. 186, 193.

[2] C. Lloyd Morgan, *Habit and Instinct*, pp. 345 sq.

[3] Procopius, *De bello Gothico*, i. 2.

the midst of which he is born and of the age in which he lives. "Men," says the Arab proverb, "resemble the times they live in more than they resemble their fathers." [1]

What is true of systems of opinion, principles, and valuations in general is no less true in detail. "Idiosyncrasies of action, peculiarities, sympathies, likes and dislikes, prejudices, preformed judgments, aggressiveness, passivity, marked artistic ability and tendencies, temperament, these and many more traits have been explained on the basis of acquired complexes. And as far as the evidence and explanation are concerned they both seem quite valid." [2] There are, of course, important mental differences between individuals which are due to what is called temperament, and it is such differences which, for the most part, people have in mind when they refer to mental heredity; it is also chiefly these temperamental or constitutional differences which appear in the statistical investigations or measurements of mental resemblances. Constitutional temperament belongs to a different order of facts from specific impulses, instinctive feelings, capacities, abilities; for it does not depend upon the presence or absence of particular dispositions in the nervous organs, but upon general biochemical characters common to the whole organism. It does not refer to any given tendency or capacity, but colours and conditions the activity of all dispositions and capacities. Constitution and its psychical correlative, temperament, are, of course, heritable. Their effects are, however, subject to modifying influences in the same manner as particular mental characters, and the degree of that modification may, as with the latter, vary within wide limits according to the respective force of the temperamental tendency and of the modifying factors in any given case. As we have seen in the instances of Laura Bridgman and Helen Keller, the action of traditional heredity can apparently change the general character of the temperament from wild impulsiveness and choleric wilfulness to the utmost placidity of submissive gentleness. There is no reason to think that the modifications brought about by that action are less important in normal circumstances. The congenital character of the temperament may be greatly accentuated by a particular social environment, and it may be modified in an opposite direction. A shock or injury to nervous structures may apparently, by affecting acquired powers of inhibition, completely transform the general temperament. Such transformations have been noted as a consequence of injuries during the late war. "Young men who had previously been steady, honest, industrious, sober, and in every way perfectly well conducted, became exactly

[1] L. Burckhardt, *Arabic Proverbs*, p. 245.

[2] S. C. Kohls, "New Light on Eugenics," *The Journal of Heredity*, vi, p. 450.

the reverse. They became careless and indifferent to customary routine, disrespectful and defiant to those in authority, lazy, drunken, addicted to lying, theft, and other offences. There was in fact such a complete alteration in their whole disposition and behaviour as to call forth remark from all those who had known them before the injury." [1] Very similar changes have, I think, been noticed as a consequence of the profound disturbance in the environment caused by the war, even in the absence of any definite injury.

Some statistical statements have purported to exhibit quantitatively the respective importance of natural heredity and of traditional heredity, or 'environment,' in the subjects investigated. Thus Dr. Karl Pearson has made the announcement that "the influence of the environment is not one fifth of that of heredity, and quite possibly not one tenth." [2] But, again, such a statement is not only liable to convey a spurious impression of exactitude, but an even more profoundly misleading impression as to its meaning, unless great care is taken to ascertain what it means. Most people would gather the impression that it is meant to signify that the human mind is made up of 90 per cent. of the effects of natural heredity and 10 per cent. of the effects of traditional heredity. It means, of course, nothing of the sort, although even the authors of such statements appear at times to become persuaded that they intend something of the kind. What they actually mean is merely that the differences between the achievements—the scholastic achievements—of various individuals are thought to be referable in the proportion of 10 per cent. to the social conditions of their homes and of 90 per cent. to their native ability or stupidity. Even such an estimate is extremely disputable and disputed. Dr. Starch, from figures at least as accurate as those used by Dr. Pearson, estimates the factors as nearer to 40 and 60 per cent. in their respective proportions.[3] The estimates, whatever their doubtful worth, are in either case irrelevant as regards the respective contributions of natural and of traditional heredity to the constitution of human mentality, for they refer to individuals who have all been moulded by the same common traditional heredity, social, cultural, political, ethical, conceptual, religious, appertaining to the same society and the same age, and varying only, not as the intelligence or stupidity of the individuals, but as the common tradition is represented in slum, shop, or mansion; and of that common or variable traditional

[1] A. F. Tredgold, *Mental Deficiency*, p. 376, after R. Eager, "Head Injuries in Relation to Psychoses," *The Journal of Mental Science* (1920).

[2] K. Pearson, *Nature and Nurture*, p. 27. Cf. D. Heron, *The Influence of Unfavourable Home Environment on the Intelligence of School Children.*

[3] D. Starch, *Educational Psychology*, p. 95.

heredity no account is taken in such estimates. If account were taken of it, these statements would have to mean that Sir Thomas Browne's egg of honest parents, hatched in a den of thieves, would produce 60 to 90 per cent. of "modesty, honesty, and veracity"; that a Newton or a Darwin born and bred in Central Australia would produce 60 to 90 per cent. of the 'Principia' or the 'Origin of Species'; that a Wilberforce or a Lincoln born and bred in Dahomey would have striven to emancipate 60 to 90 per cent. of the slaves. They would have to mean that when we see that the best and the wisest have in the past committed crimes and follies, burnt witches, sacrificed the lives of thousands and their own, swayed by what appear to us the most grotesque and absurdest of notions, the fate of humanity and the course of its career have been determined by one-tenth or one-fortieth of its total inheritance. Since they do not mean that, such misleadingly worded statements to the effect that "the modifications which may be produced by the environment or education are small" have no bearing on the conclusion that "in fact, in the absolute sense, nurture predominates enormously over nature";[1] and Dr. Pearson's assertion that "the physical and the psychical characters in man are inherited in the same manner" has no bearing on the conclusion of Mr. Archdall Reid that "the evidence is overwhelming that mental and moral qualities are not inherited in the same sense as physical qualities."[2]

Summing up the results of such enquiries, Mr. Burt concludes that the differences in hereditary dispositions are shown to be considerable and pronounced as regards individuals, small and doubtful as regards nations and races.[3] In other words, the development of those mental characters which are distinctive of humanity, and on which the course of human achievement and of human history depend, are affected little or not at all by variations in natural heredity.

The faith in the congenital nature of all traits of character has its natural stronghold in that facile branch of popular psychology which is the expression of national and racial prejudice. But it is not, I think, too much to say that there is not an item in that most superficial of all aspects of psychology, or in the various attempts that have been made to clothe it in scientific terminology, which will bear examination as evidence of the fixation of mental characters in racial heredity. Even the most pronounced physical characteristics of strongly marked races, such as the Jews, have been shown to be due in a large measure to the influence of the

[1] D. Starch, *Educational Psychology*, p. 96.

[2] G. Archdall Reid, in *Sociological Papers*, vol. iii, p. 93.

[3] C. Burt, "The Inheritance of Mental Characters," *The Eugenics Review*, iv, p. 200.

environment and circumstances of their lives.[1] "Much has been said about the hereditary characters of the Jews, or the Gypsies, of the French, and Irish, but I do not see," observes Professor Boas, "that the social causes which have moulded the character of members of these peoples have ever been eliminated satisfactorily."[2] There can be no doubt that where those social causes are most pronounced, as with the Jews and the Gypsies, and where the force of heredity is intensified by segregation and intermarriage, the effects of the prolonged action of those causes on constitution and temperament are fixed in heredity. But what are termed national characteristics in mixed races so closely similar as, for instance, the French and the English belong to an order of characters which lie almost entirely within the sphere of traditional heredity. The French are credited, for example, with a 'logical mind' and with a love of novelties, whereas the English demurely plead guilty to blundering through by 'horse-sense,' and to being temperamentally distrustful of untried ideas. But those traits, like most other national traits, are directly deducible from their respective social histories. Under an absolute monarchy established by the necessity for strong national defence, the French aristocracy—and it is always the aristocracy which sets the national pattern of culture—were dwellers in courts and in cities enriched with all that culture and intellectual elegance could lend to them of enhanced prestige. The French language developed its lucidity and logical qualities in such 'salons' as that of the Hôtel Rambouillet; it had previously been quite as Gothic in its uncouthness as the English. Frenchmen of culture were educated by Jesuits, and whether the education resulted in passionate assent or revolt, their wits were sharpened in perpetual defence or attack of a thousand diverse opinions, and in contests for brilliancy on the issue of which their fortunes often depended. The English aristocracy, under a monarchy limited by the geographical absence of any pretext for the maintenance of a standing army, remained a rural aristocracy, and their pastimes and amusements were those of country gentlemen—hunting and sport. They have been educated by a class Church which eschewed theological dispute and propaganda, inculcated class respect for the intellectual establishment, and gave the intellect moderate exercise within the safe limits of well-worn furrows, preferring to ignore heretical ideas rather than confute and rout them with the militant zeal of a priesthood owing no allegiance but to its Church. The system succeeded perfectly in creating what it was its professed aim to create—English gentlemen; and the magnificent type was imitated with more than the customary

[1] M. Fishberg, *The Jews: a Study of Race and Environment*, passim.

[2] F. Boas, "Human Faculty as Determined by Race," *Proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science*, 1895, p. 323.

snobbishness by the whole nation. Dr. McDougall considers human history to be determined solely by traditional, and not by natural, heredity; and that, although "there is widely current a vague belief that the national characteristics of the people of any country are in the main innate characters, there can be no serious question that the popular assumption is erroneous and that national characteristics, at any rate all those that distinguish the peoples of the European countries, are in the main the expression of different traditions."[1] He suggests that if by a magical operation all the babies born in France had at some time been exchanged at birth for all the babies born in England, so that the latter country had become secretly peopled by pure Frenchmen, and France by Englishmen by birth, the exchange would produce practically no effect, and that the course of each country's history would have proceeded in much the same way as if no such legerdemain trick had been played with the two races.[2] Mr. Burt exclaims: "Would the most ardent advocate of the omnipotence of the environment (the old misleading word again!) dare to maintain that the nation would nevertheless have continued its original career, or that its subsequent history would not have to be rewritten?"[3] In the course of his able and restrained essay, Mr. Burt has some judicious remark to the effect that the test of truth is not credibility, that is, accordance with our preconceived notions, but evidence. The answer to his explosive question is that no evidence has been produced that the magical operation suggested by Dr. McDougall would in any way affect the course of national development and history, and that all the evidence we possess points to the conclusion that it would not. "I have never set much importance on race,"

[1] W. McDougall, *Introduction to Social Psychology*, p. 329.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 330 sq.

[3] C. Burt, "The Inheritance of Mental Characters," *The Eugenics Review*, iv, pp. 199 sq. In order to reinforce his point Mr. Burt asks us to suppose further that the occasion chosen was the generation immediately preceding some crisis in the national history—the Protestant Reformation or the French Revolution. The causes of those events belong preeminently to the history of traditional and social heredity, not to that of physiological heredity. They have been pretty abundantly discussed from every possible point of view, and we seem to know something about them; but I do not recollect coming upon any account of them in terms of genetics. By the logical rule of Occam's razor there would appear to be no urgent need for such a novel re-writing of those histories, seeing that the social, economic, political, and cultural histories appear, on the whole, to furnish a fairly intelligible account. Of course, in the magical operation suggested by Dr. McDougall care would have to be taken to allot the individual parts, such as that of Henry VIII, Wolsey, Louis XVI, Mirabeau, to individuals of similar temperamental dispositions. But that is part of the imaginary character of the hypothetical operation, and has nothing to do with the fact it is intended to illustrate, and which refers to averages, not to individuals.

says Mosso; "if anyone should ask me what there is in the white races, as regards physical or intellectual characters, which is not possessed by any other race, I answer, Nothing!" [1]

Inborn differences are much more definite as regards social classes than as regards nations. The aristocrat is stamped with qualities of body and mind which may not be exactly matched, even in a generation or two, by individuals of plebeian stock. The circumstance is readily intelligible when we reflect on the enormous importance, as regards both physical and mental constitution, of nutrition, a factor which has not received all the attention it deserves, and which, I have no doubt, is responsible for by far the greater proportion of those general differences in capacity or faculty which are vaguely set down to hereditary disposition or temperament. The very bones of prehistoric man and of primitive savage races invariably bear unmistakable evidence of irregular and uncertain nutrition.[2] It has been noted that children in Queensland are mentally dull and backward owing to anæmia caused by the hookworm.[3] Conditions favourable and unfavourable to nutrition count for much more in childhood than in adult age, in the first months of life than at any subsequent time, and in intra-uterine life very much more than at any time during the post-natal life of the individual. Early conditions which have operated during the development of the organism can never be completely counteracted, however much they may be changed for better or for worse in later years. It has been observed that milking cows, the feeding of which has not been specially attended to during the first months of calfhood, can never by any amount of luxurious feeding attain to the same standard of milk-producing power as those which have been fattened from the first.[4] Aristocratic classes, even among savages, are generally taller and of a finer type physically and mentally, than the common people. It is usually assumed that they are socially privileged because they are of a finer type, but the reverse is far more probable.

As might naturally be expected, those mental characters which have reference to social behaviour, including among many others those which impart moral values to such behaviour, are more completely dependent than any other mental characters upon social

[1] A. Mosso, *Escursioni nel Mediterraneo e gli scavi di Creta*, p. 265.

[2] F. Boas, "Human Faculty as Determined by Race," *Proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science*, 1895, p. 309, referring to Fritsch.

[3] A. F. Tredgold, *Mental Deficiency*, p. 63, referring to J. H. Waite, in *Medical Journal of Australia*, January 4, 1919.

[4] A. C. McCandish, "Environment and Breeding as Factors influencing Milk Production," *The Journal of Heredity*, xi, p. 214.

education and traditional heredity. We have seen that experimental investigations appear to indicate, as one would anticipate, that emotional characters are more closely connected with heredity than are intellectual characters, and the latter more closely than moral characters.[1] But even those emotional qualities upon which social conduct most directly depends, namely, sympathy and affection, are conspicuous by their absence where, as in the feeble-minded and the deaf, social education and traditional heredity have not had an opportunity of acting. "However disposed we may be to allow the innate or hereditary character of moral faculties," remarks Compayré, "yet nowhere perhaps is the part played by education and social environment more clearly shown."[2] The moral standards and the consequent moral practice of different peoples and different ages are not linked with their physiological, but with their traditional heredity.

Yet the immemorial doctrine of intuition has clung to the notion that the social virtues are contained 'in the egg' with more persistent tenacity than in regard to any other order of mental characters. The belief that language is inborn has been gradually and reluctantly abandoned. The view that general concepts, or ideas, which are dependent for their formation and use upon language, are 'innate' persisted much longer. Locke, who was the first to shake the time-honoured and universal opinion, was rewarded for his contribution to human intelligence by a payment of thirty pounds from his publisher, unlimited abuse, and an evil name which still adheres to his memory. The old doctrine of intuition reappears at the present day under various disguises and in modified forms in the elaborate endeavour of some writers on social history and anthropology, who consequently enjoy great influence and authority, to represent not only moral values, but current approved sentiments, standards, and even institutions as innate in the constitution of human nature. The majority of people have the feeling that to suppose that notions or sentiments to which great intrinsic value is attached are not an integral constituent of the nature of man, but have arisen by degrees in the course of social evolution and are transmitted by traditional and not by natural heredity, would amount to detracting intolerably from the worth and validity of those notions and sentiments. It is not obvious how such a circumstance can affect the worth of a sentiment or moral judgment any more than the fact that it is not intuitive affects the truth of a scientific conclusion, or than the merits of eloquence or poetry are diminished by the circumstance that language is not innate. Most

[1] See above, p. 56.

[2] G. Compayré, *L'évolution intellectuelle et morale de l'enfant*, p. 280.

people, nevertheless, desire to regard their social customs and institutions as 'natural' facts, and not as racial products or traditions of human origin. Thus religious persons are disposed to look upon religious conceptions and sentiments as naturally implanted in the human mind, and are gratified by the assurance of ethnologists that no people is known who does not entertain some form of religious ideas. The earlier enquiries into the mental condition of deaf-mutes bore almost exclusively on the single question, whether they had any inborn notions of theology.[1] The absolute validity of moral ideas is thought to demand that those sentiments should be regarded as rooted in the very structure of human nature, if not in the constitution of the universe. Even social institutions which are looked upon as of paramount importance, such as the principle of private property, the institution of monogamic marriage, or the dominance of the male in the family and the subordinate position of women, tend to be viewed as founded on the natural and inherited dispositions of human nature, as having existed from the first in substantially the same form as in our own societies, and as being innate, that is, transmitted physiologically and not by social tradition. Able writers have sought to show that such sentiments as the regard for chastity, or the sentiment of modesty, are implanted by nature in the human mind.

In accordance with the high value attached to such established and approved sentiments and institutions, they are by most uncultured peoples, and most civilised peoples also, regarded as having been imparted to the first men by the Deity, or by some tribal founder, or other divine personage. In more advanced intellectual stages they have been simply regarded as innate endowments bestowed upon man at his creation. In both those hypotheses it is recognised that those sentiments or customs are peculiar attributes of social humanity, and that they are lacking in the beasts that perish. But the conception of organic evolution has made the view of such acts of special creation or revelation difficult to entertain. The only way, accordingly, of continuing to regard those characters of human mentality and human society as innate and as having existed from the very outset in the human race is to trace them beyond it, and to exhibit their existence, or at least their rudiments, among animals.

In the days when the theory of evolution was compelling people to recast some of their most fundamental notions, many who freely surrendered to the weight of evidence as to the derivation of the human organism from animal forms found an unsurmountable difficulty in conceiving that the human mind was likewise derived

[1] J. Kerr Love, *Deaf Mutism*, pp. 259 sqq.

by a continuous process of development from the mind of animals. One of the propounders of the theory of natural selection, Wallace, was, it will be remembered, among those who most vehemently opposed the notion. Today it is generally admitted that even if the biological, anatomical, and physiological evidence were inconclusive, we should be compelled to recognise that descent on psychological grounds alone; and indeed scientific psychology has become possible only since the apprehension of that derivation. But manifest as is the continuity between the human mind and the mind of animals, we have perhaps become too ready to rest satisfied with the fact that there is no unbridgeable gap between the two, and to underrate the character of the differences which they present. Not that any of those differences is unbridgeable, but, the transition being once effected, conditions have been set up which are radically different from those amid which the animal mind operates. Language and conceptual thought, and the consequent introduction of a separate hereditary transmission distinct from the physiological, constitute unprecedented conditions of evolution. Those features are bound up with the formation of social groups the members of which are intimately related through that traditional heredity. In spite of misconceptions on the subject, there exists, as I hope to show, nothing properly corresponding to a human society in the animal world. The various groups and assemblages found among animals differ fundamentally from any human social group, however primitive, and the biological conditions which have rendered the latter possible did not make their appearance until the emergence of the human species itself, and were in fact the main condition of that emergence. If that be so it is manifest that those human sentiments which have reference to social relations could not have come into existence where those relations did not exist.

Notwithstanding the close mutual interaction and combination of naturally inherited and traditionally acquired characters which makes it difficult to discriminate between them, the socially developed and the biologically evolved characters of the human mind remain, in some respects, distinct and even sharply contrasted. The difficulty of discriminating between the respective shares of the two heredities arises chiefly in regard to characters which are due to human evolution; it does not arise in the same degree as regards characters of purely animal origin. Human consciousness has, in fact, come to dwell almost exclusively in the sphere of socially inherited concepts, sentiments, and values. Not only has conceptual thought, owing to its far greater efficiency and distinctness, superseded more primitive, instinctive, impulsive modes of reaction, but it is with social relations and intercourse that human behaviour is chiefly concerned. Life in a human society would

be impossible for any individual whose behaviour did not conform broadly to the traditional standards and established usages of that society. It is not a question of supine and servile conformity in regard to abstract values or opinions; it is not a question of merely law-abiding conduct; the conditions of existence in a social group necessitate an adaptation of behaviour in its smallest details and during every second to the standards and established organisation of the group. A behaviour which, in such an environment, should be left solely to the guidance of the physiologically transmitted mentality would constitute insane behaviour; it would not be the behaviour of a savage, but that of a madman. The naturally inherited mentality is constantly inhibited, held in check, controlled; modified, over-ruled by the social tradition and inheritance. Even in the rudest human societies behaviour is not for a moment free from that controlling and modifying action, exercised to a large extent automatically and unconsciously, of social tradition and education over natural instinct and impulse. Misconception on the latter point is prevalent; it is commonly supposed that this control is more extensive in civilised than in savage man. Dr. Tredgold, for instance, in the course of an excellent summary account of that controlling action, assumes that it is slight in the savage, that it has gradually become developed, that its greater power constitutes civilisation, and that it may ultimately become an innate and inherited inhibition.[1] His psychology is admirable, but his ethnology is at fault. The control exercised over instinct by traditional heredity is no greater in civilised than in savage man; it is merely different. The Iroquois smiling while being scalped, the Dakota subjecting himself to incredible tortures from superstitious motives, exhibit powers of inhibition of which few civilised men would be capable, and the habitual Spartan demeanour of those savages is no less superior in self-control to that of the European. The countless tabus with which the lives of Australian aborigines, or of Polynesians and Melanesians, are pervaded constitute far more irksome restrictions than any to which European man is subject. As Professor Boas justly remarks, the instincts and impulses of primitive man in uncultured society "are just as much controlled as ours, only in different directions."[2] That control is not related to a special power and a special evolutionary process, but to conditions which are inseparable from the human social state, be it rude or civilised, in which a traditional heredity is superadded to natural heredity and its congenital instincts.

[1] A. F. Tredgold, *Mental Deficiency*, p. 370.

[2] F. Boas, *The Human Faculty as Determined by Race*, reprint from *Proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science*, 1894, p. 21.

The physiologically inherited elements of the mind which are of pre-social origin are thrust by that traditional heredity into the obscurity of unconsciousness or subconsciousness. Not only are they eclipsed by the sharper definition of conceptual mentality, but they are in a large measure forcibly suppressed or repressed by it, owing to their actual incompatibility with social conditions and with the character of the mentality that has developed in relation to those conditions. The brute animal which lurks within every socially developed individual is held in leash, and is disowned and unacknowledged by the educated consciousness. The latter does not so much displace and modify the biological inheritance as become superimposed upon it as a mental sphere which is not only different, but sharply contrasted and antagonistic. So real is that opposition between the two mental inheritances, the biological and the social, that they may without exaggeration be spoken of as two distinct minds.

In the child, although social influences make themselves felt as soon as development has proceeded so far as to allow of any elaborate and coordinated behaviour, and the congenital mentality is thus almost from the first disguised to a smaller or greater extent by the traditionally transmitted mentality, the processes of the mind and of behaviour approximate nevertheless to those of the animal and show many of the differences of feeling and of values which distinguish the animal from the human mind. "It is evident," remarks Professor Sully, "that the psychology of the infant borders on animal psychology. Here we may note the points of contact of man's proud reason with the lowly intelligence of the brutes. In the most ordinary child we may see a new dramatic representation of the great cosmic action, the laborious emergence of intelligence out of its shell of animal sense and appetite. The first years of the child answer to the earliest known stages of human history. It is probable, indeed, that enquiries into the beginning of human culture, the origin of language, of primitive ideas and institutions, might derive much more help than they have yet done from a close scrutiny of the events of childhood." [1]

The child is amoral; the dualism presented by the control of congenital instincts and impulses by the socially inherited consciousness is not established. "The guidance of moral behaviour is absent, for it is a manifestation of a fact, which is gradually developing, but is not yet attained—social life." [2] The character of the

[1] J. Sully, introduction to the English translation of B. Perez, *The First Three Years of Childhood*, pp. vi sqq. Cf. P. Lombroso, *Saggi di psicologia del bambino*, pp. ix, 172; H. Havelock Ellis, *The Criminal*, p. 258: "The child is naturally by organisation nearer to the savage, to the criminal, than the adult."

[2] L. Ferriani, *Minderjährige Verbrecher*, p. 401. Cf. G. Compayré,

first manifestations of moral sentiments is illustrated by Darwin's account of their earliest appearance in his child, nicknamed Doddy, at the age of two years and three months. After sharing a piece of gingerbread with his little sister he " cried out with high self-approbation, 'Oh! kind Doddy, kind Doddy!'" [1] The detail will recall many similar traits; the conceptual notion of merit and moral worth precedes any spontaneous manifestation of it. The child, before that conceptual education, knows no other principle of behaviour than the immediate satisfaction of his desires; he seizes anything he wishes without ulterior consideration. Passionate and violent anger at the least thwarting of his desires is the earliest and most constant manifestation of emotion in the child; it is fully developed at four months.[2] The affective mentality of the child is marked by the conspicuous absence of those emotions of sympathy and affection which are the basis of social sentiments, and which are also absent in mental defectives and deaf-mutes before the operation of educative social agencies. " A child," observes Signorina Lombroso, " is fond of a person in so far only as it is aware that the person is useful or necessary to it; but when it loses that person and another takes her place and endeavours to provide for its needs, especially its material needs, she entirely supplants the first." The child does not until very late manifest joy at the mere sight of a person.[3] It is entirely lacking in sentiments of sympathy.[4] Whereas the grown man may be compassionate, benevolent, and kindly, the child out of which he has grown is devoid

L'évolution intellectuelle et morale de l'enfant, p. 303; J. Sully, *Studies of Childhood*, pp. 228 sq.

[1] C. Darwin, " A Biographical Sketch of an Infant," *Mind*, ii, p. 291.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 287. Cf. G. Stanley Hall, " A Study of Anger," *American Journal of Psychology*, x, pp. 511 sqq.

[3] Paola Lombroso, *Saggi di psicologia del bambino*, p. 85; cf. pp. 83 sqq., 88. In fever hospitals, where large numbers of children remain for several weeks separated from their mothers, the younger ones are invariably wholly unconcerned when taken back; the mothers commonly burst into tears at the callous indifference of their children and bitterly accuse the staff of having 'alienated their affections.'

[4] A little boy of four, on being asked if he was enjoying himself, replied: " I am having a very nice time, mamma is ill " (J. Sully, *Studies of Childhood*, p. 236). Misleading manifestations are often interpreted as indications of sympathy, not only by fond parents, but also in psychological writings, which are often composed in a spirit of baby-worship rather than baby-study. " The existence of feelings of pity in children is very questionable," says Signorina Lombroso (*op. cit.*, p. 99). A child is easily affected by the expressions of emotion of those around him; this is what Dr. W. McDougall describes as " primitive passive sympathy " (W. McDougall, *Social Psychology*, pp. 90 sqq., 168 sqq.). That is one reason why the instinctive cruelty of children is unchecked where, as in animals, those expressions are lacking. A child is pained or frightened at the sight of another person being maltreated; but the feeling is an instinctive dread of the danger to which he may himself

of feelings of pity. "Cet âge est sans pitié," wrote La Fontaine. Not only does the child show no compassion, but childhood, more particularly in boys, is marked by an active delight in cruelty. Perez describes the commonplace play of an ordinary child with the cat and the dog. "He is fond of them, but for his own sake, not for theirs, for the pleasure they give him, not for any kindness he can show them. The dog being the gentler of the two animals is the chief victim, and there is no test to which its good nature is not put. He throws himself on the animal with his full weight, pulls its tail, its paws, its ears, bites its tail, shouts in its ears to startle it, stuffs various objects down its throat, flings his toys at it, brings down chairs on the top of the animal, and beats it with his wooden spade. The other day his nurse sat him on the lawn and, in order to amuse him, placed a tortoise near him. He observed the animal with great interest, and the nurse, seeing his attention engaged, left him for a few minutes. When she returned he had nearly torn off one limb of the tortoise and was pulling with all his might at another." [1] Another child is mentioned who in after-life became an artist; his tastes showed themselves in childhood by his squashing flies between the leaves of a book in order to inspect the curious patterns thus produced.[2] Mr. Johnson, cites a letter in which a schoolboy describes with entire callousness, and "in a tone of savage complacency," how he caught a tired bird that had taken refuge in his bedroom, and pulled off one by one its wings and its neck. "Ruthless as Procrustes appears to be," he remarks, "it is highly probable that his barbarous state of mind is not in any great degree exceptional, but may rather be taken as a fair example of the mental and moral condition of the healthy boys of his time of life." [3] Sully, in seeking an extenuating interpretation of children's cruelty, suggested that it is a manifestation of power, and that a child who stamps on kittens is really showing his fondness for them, and emphasising his sense

be exposed, not one of sympathy for another person's suffering. Those manifestations have been termed 'pseudo-sympathy' (N. Norsworthy and M. T. Whitley, *The Psychology of Childhood*, pp. 61 sq.). A child five months old was made to cry bitterly by pinching bottle-corks (J. M. Baldwin, *Mental Development in the Child and in the Race*, p. 333). The same effect may be produced by hitting chairs or any article of furniture (N. Norsworthy and M. T. Whitley, *op. cit.*, p. 62). The serenity with which facts may be exactly inverted is illustrated by the following statement: "Two faculties at least are seen in every child from its earliest years. They are love and the sense of justice; all children love, and all children have an instinctive sense of justice" (A. T. Schofield, *The Springs of Character*, p. 63).

[1] B. Perez, *Les trois premières années de l'enfant*, pp. 86 sq.

[2] Id., *L'art et la poésie chez l'enfant*, p. 60.

[3] J. Johnson, "The Savagery of Boyhood," *The Popular Science Monthly* xxxi, pp. 796 sqq. Cf. H. Ellis, *The Criminal*, p. 130.

of possession.[1] But cruelty is an old-established biological character which has inevitably developed in predatory animals to whom a suffering or wounded creature represents a welcome prey.[2] It is generally said that the callousness and cruelty of children arise from ignorance. This, no doubt, is to some extent true; but over and above what may be set down to ignorance there is active cruelty, that is, the delight in the infliction of pain and in the spectacle of suffering. Where counteracting influences in the home and surroundings are feeble, that callousness and cruelty, instead of giving place to other sentiments as the child grows up, become more pronounced. He takes a more deliberate delight in cat-hunts, in torturing animals, and is almost invariably attracted by the spectacle of accidents, wounds, etc., and by accounts of murders and executions, which he would very much like to witness.

In his state of 'innocence' the child is not only shameless, but keenly appreciative of obscenity.[3] He is commonly attracted by things, such as carcasses, dirt, excreta, which later will cause him disgust.[4] In short, the mentality of children is characterised by the spontaneous manifestation of those very tastes and sentiments which traditional mentality specially condemns and represses. It could scarcely be expected that it would be otherwise. If the disposition towards such sentiments were not congenital and naturally inherited there could be no occasion for repression or condemnation by social tradition; antecedently to that inhibitory action, those sentiments and tastes are unrepressed. "Most children, if not all," observes Dr. Ireland, "are selfish, prone to passion, giving way to anger at the slightest opposition to their wishes, indifferent to the welfare of others, and resenting deprivation and disappointment with an extravagant keenness which rapidly exhausts itself. At a later stage they are apt to indulge in cruelty to animals, delight in delusions and false statements, and gloat over pictures of wholesale cruelty and slaughter. If a child were to

[1] J. Sully, *Studies of Childhood*, p. 240.

[2] See below, p. 118. Cf. N. Norsworthy and M. T. Whitley, *Psychology of Childhood*, p. 51; F. L. Burk, "Teasing and Bullying," *The Pedagogical Seminary*, iv, p. 92. The manifestations are described as "fragmentary rudiments of past combat, capture and killing of prey" (W. James, *Principles of Psychology*, vol. ii, p. 412; G. H. Schneider, *Der menschliche Wille vom Standpunkt der neueren Entwickelungstheorien*, pp. 224 sqq.).

[3] N. Norsworthy and M. T. Whitley, *op. cit.*, p. 75; A. Moll, *The Sexual Life of the Child*, pp. 50 sqq.; S. Freud, *Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex*, pp. 36 sqq.

[4] G. S. Hall, "Some Aspects of the Early Sense of Self," *American Journal of Psychology*, ix, p. 361; J. Thomson, "On Certain So-called 'Bad Habits' in Children," *Archives of Pediatrics*, 1907; H. Havelock Ellis, *Studies in the Pathology of Sex*, vol. v, pp. 53 sqq.; A. Moll, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

grow up in such a state of mind it would grow up insane. The education to which children are ceaselessly subjected by their parents and teachers instils certain ideas and replaces others, leads them to control their self-will, and shows them how their own happiness will be injured by bringing their covetousness into collision with the interest of those around them. Hence it may be said that sanity is the result of education, and that those who cannot be educated to control their passions and subdue their appetites to the limits prescribed by society, really grow up insane, have never had sanity implanted upon their nature."[1] The manifestations of insanity consist, in fact, essentially in the removal of the artificial inhibitory influences that rule ordinary life. Insane behaviour, accordingly, is such only relatively to the standards of the particular social medium. " A man who is unable to count above five, who walks naked 'coram populo,' adorning his person only with feathers and tawdry ornaments, would ordinarily be called insane; but if he has a black skin and lives on the banks of the Congo, he is considered an average specimen of normal humanity."[2]

The writings of Dr. Freud and his school have drawn widespread attention to the contrast between what they term the 'unconscious' and the conscious, or 'directed' minds. The 'unconscious' mind of psycho-analysis is no other than the natural biological mind as physiologically inherited. Everything above its level in consciousness is of social origin. Freudian psychology, the current estimates of which are coloured by the sharp contrasts of extreme controversial appreciations and depreciations, has undoubtedly made contributions of great value to our psychological conceptions; it has emphasised facts which were in need of being emphasised, and raised questions which it was important to raise. But the theories, which did not arise out of general psychological enquiry, but out of the very special question of the diagnosis and treatment of psycho-neuroses, suffer from a serious deficiency in respect of fundamental philosophical and scientific principles, a disability which has led to many superficialities, and greatly helped to discredit those contributions of Freud to psychological science which are of real value and importance. The 'unconscious,' for instance, is described by Dr. Freud as being governed by the 'Lustprinzip,' the 'pleasure principle.'[3] If the old hedonistic conception, which is an untenable, inconsistent, and happily exploded principle, be once adopted as the formula of psychic action, it is quite unintelligible and meaningless that the 'pleasure principle' should be antagonised or 'repressed' by any other.

[1] W. W. Ireland, *The Blot on the Brain*, p. 88.
[2] C. Mercier, *Sanity and Insanity*, p. 122.
[3] S. Freud, *Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psycho-analyse*, p. 411.

Such a conception is an irreconcilable self-contradiction in terms, and is typical of that lack of philosophical discipline which mars the work of the Freudian school. The 'repressing' principle is called by Freud the 'Realitätsprinzip,'[1] or even more quaintly 'die endopsychische Zensur,' the 'endopsychic censorship.'[2] The nature of that entity and the manner of its repressing action are but vaguely defined in Freudian psychology. What in reality thrusts the physiologically inherited mind into the obscurity of unconsciousness and antagonises it is the socially and traditionally acquired mind.

The conflict between the traditionally acquired and the congenital characters of the human mind which are independent of social education constitutes the sharpest distinction between the human and the animal mind; for to that opposition and dualism there exists no parallel in animal psychology. There is, whatever distinguished writers may have said to the contrary, no equivalent in the mental process of animals to an intrinsic and self-imposed prohibition. A conflict between two opposing impulses is an altogether different psychological phenomenon. Such conflicts between impulses are of constant occurrence in the psychological processes of animals. There may be, for example, a conflict between the 'maternal' instincts and instincts of 'self-preservation.' But what determines the outcome of the conflict? It is not any 'value' attached to the one course of behaviour or to the other; it is not any estimate or calculation of consequences; it is not an adventitious association or apperception superadded to the conflicting impulses; the result is solely conditioned by the respective force of the two impulses. The behaviour of the animal is the direct resultant and algebraical summation of the two dispositions, and is determined by the prevalence of the more powerful. There is no repression; there is no conscious inhibition; there is, to use Freud's phrase, no 'endopsychic censorship.' There is no such thing in animal psychology as a veto imposed upon the operation of a natural impulse. Such a veto, such a prohibition, must be imposed from without; it cannot be imposed within the mind of the animal itself. It has been usual in discussing the question to adduce instances of dogs refraining from stealing food in the absence of their master, or otherwise exhibiting an inhibitory control of a strong natural impulse.[3] Such instances are, it is true, exactly equivalent to the inhibitory operation of traditional social mentality, but they are irrelevant; for, apart from the deeply modified nature of the domestic dog,

[1] S. Freud, *Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psycho-analyse*, p. 412.

[2] Id., *Die Traumdeutung*, p. 393.

[3] C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, vol. i, p. 78; J. Sully, *The Human Mind*, vol. ii, p. 161.

the prohibition is in every instance imposed by human agency It has its origin not in the animal, but in the human mind; and it is as much a manifestation of human and not of canine psychology as any social behaviour.[1] The whole training of animals consists in establishing such inhibitions. But that process of training has no more to do with the natural psychology of animals than the wearing of harness or of iron shoes has to do with their natural anatomy.

The inhibitory action of the socially acquired mind constitutes in some of its forms what is termed the moral sense, and it is chiefly in that aspect that it is commonly regarded. But that control is by no means confined to the sphere of moral values; moral inhibition is only one particular aspect, and a relatively limited one, of a control which is never absent in the behaviour of social man, nor in his inner life, thoughts—which are inhibited speech—and sentiments. Without that control not only would social life be impossible, but the human mind, which is a product of that social life, would not exist. That inhibition does not and cannot exist in the mental processes of animals; for although there is, even in animals, a certain amount of acquired education, as in the training of young beasts of prey, there is no body of socially transmitted tradition. Insanity and idiocy do not, properly speaking, exist among animals.[2] And the reason is manifest; mental derangements which render social behaviour impossible in the human being result in suspension of the inhibition exercised over the 'lower,' or naturally inherited, mental dispositions by the 'higher,' or traditionally developed, mental elements. That process of psychic inhibition cannot become deranged in animals because it has no existence.[3]

The naturally inherited characters of the human mind are, then, so completely overlaid by those that are derived from traditional heredity that, on analysis, they are accounted 'unconscious,' and would according to the rules of the older introspective psychological science have to be regarded as not parts of the mind at all; they are repudiated by conceptual consciousness as

[1] Cf. C. Lloyd Morgan, *An Introduction to Comparative Psychology*, pp. 372 sqq.

[2] W. Youatt, *The Dog*, p. 107.

[3] Cf. J. J. Rousseau, "Discours sur l'origine et les fondemens de l'inégalité," *Oeuvres*, vol. i, p. 540: "Pourquoi l'homme seul est-il sujet à devenir imbécile? N'est-ce point qu'il reste ainsi dans son état primitif, et que tandis que les bêtes qui n'ont rien acquis, et qui n'ont rien à perdre," etc. For similar reasons "amongst primitive races insanity is rare, criminality is rare, and it is only with the rapid advance of civilisation that ill-balanced natures become frequent" (R. Hamlyn-Harris, "Some Anthropological Considerations of Queensland and the History of its Ethnology," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Queensland*, xxix, p. 6).

brutish; and where they are allowed to manifest themselves unchecked and unmodified by traditionally acquired mental characters, the condition is regarded as insanity, as amentia, as absence of mind. The extent of the socially developed and socially transmitted constituents of human mentality may hence be estimated. They comprise all those mental characters which are specifically human; they include not only the conceptual forms of consciousness, thought, and ideation, but also those feelings, sentiments, and affective values by which the behaviour of the social individual is for the most part determined and his experience fashioned. The human mind, in all that distinguishes it from the mind of animals, is thus a social product. It does not consist of characters and powers produced by biological evolution and transmitted by physiological heredity. The human mind, in its specific and distinctive characters, has a different origin; it is a product not of organic, but of social evolution.

There is thus a germ of truth in the old objection once so persistently urged against the doctrine of organic evolution, that it may account for the bodily, but not for the mental nature of man, that between the latter and the mind of animals there is a gap not merely in degree but in kind. That this should be so is inevitable; there is no analogue to the human mind in the animal world because there is no analogue to human society. There is therefore no spoken word, no conceptual thought, or, what is the same thing, no traditional heredity.[1] Hence the fallacy of the latter-day form of the doctrine of innate ideas which endeavours to trace back beyond the human and social stage the characters of the socially developed mind. Traditional heredity, the sentiments which it has slowly created, the relations to which it has given rise and which have in turn stamped their values upon the social legacy, the dualism between it and the uncurbed, physiologically inherited impulses of the human animal, the inhibitory action exercised upon the latter, do not and cannot exist in pre-social, pre-human stages.

It is in the social history of the human race itself that the origin and development of the human mind, in so far as it is human at all, are to be sought. The attempt to trace them in the analysis of the individual alone is as vain as the endeavour to discover the human soul in the structure of the brain. The true field of investigation into the psychology of the socially developed and socially transmitted mind is that of social anthropology and social history.

The enquiries which will occupy us in the present volumes deal for the most part with some aspects of the constitution and conceptions of archaic and primitive human societies. To many

[1] Cf. G. Tarde, *La logique sociale*, p. 88.

cultured persons the ' manners and customs ' of savages, who have, it has been said, no manners and whose customs are abominable, are not a congenial object of contemplation ; and I fully sympathise with their taste. But the interest that attaches to any subject of enquiry lies not so much in its intrinsic attractiveness as in the significance of the testimony which it contributes towards the apprehension of wider and, to the thinker, more momentous issues. If the premises which I have sought to establish are correct, if the mind of man is in all its human qualities a social rather than a biological product, the study of the cruder and more primitive forms of its manifestations is not only a branch of the science of the soul, but is in truth the only avenue to an adequate estimate of those values that constitute the socially developed human mind.

The difficulties with which that branch of enquiry is fraught are scarcely less formidable than any which beset other forms of psychological enquiry. No existing society or race is, except in a relative sense, primitive ; all have behind them a past exactly as long as our own. The aborigines of Australia, who are frequently referred to as a representative example of a surviving primitive race, settled in that continent before the geological changes which separate it from New Guinea and Indonesia had taken place. Dr. S. A. Smith found at Talgai, in Queensland, fossilised skulls dating from the Pleistocene Age, identical with those of the present-day blacks ;[1] and similar skulls have been found in the Pleistocene deposits of Java.[2] It is improbable that since the dawn of time Australian native society has not undergone changes that have many times transformed its social organisation and ideas. The remnants of uncivilised races at present existing have survived the untold tribulations of hundreds of thousands of years, and in order to do so must have weathered many of the most important crises that have determined the stability of the race and of social organisation. Even in conditions of isolation and relative stagnation the succession of ages has of necessity deposited in their traditional heredity its accumulating detritus. The disproportion between the length of time over which our records extend and that which measures the development of human society becomes emphasised with the progress of our knowledge. From morphological evidence of human remains it has become clear that we have not got appreciably nearer to human origins by going back ten, twenty, thirty thousand years. The

[1] R. Hamlyn-Harris, " Some Anthropological Considerations of Queensland and the History of its Ethnology," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Queensland*, xxix, pp. 22 sq.

[2] E. Dubois, " The Proto-Australian Fossil Man of Wadjak, Java," *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam ; Proceedings, Section ii* (English edition), xxiii, pp. 1013 sqq.

span of time demanded for the evolution of the human race from the animal races out of which it became differentiated runs probably into something approaching two millions of years.[1] Yet it is in the night of the earliest stages of that development that the characters of all subsequent traditional and social evolution have been determined.

When we consider those facts we may well be overwhelmed with a sense of the futility of attempting to trace the traditional inheritance of the human mind to its remote origins. That endeavour is, however, greatly facilitated by the circumstance that traditional heredity is subject to some of the most fundamental laws which govern natural heredity. As already noted, it does not, any more than does natural heredity, proceed by sudden leaps. Every step in human thought and feeling is strictly determined by what went before. The boldest speculation of the thinker is bound within narrow limits by the thought of his predecessors, and is the direct outcome of an evolution which goes back in unbroken continuity to the first flickerings of the human mind. Here, as elsewhere, evolution is gradual modification, not creation. No human sentiment, no idea, no institution has ever been created and made its appearance suddenly and 'de novo.'

Traditional heredity presents another feature so invariably that we are entitled to regard it in the light of a constant law; it is also a law of natural heredity. No phase of human ideas, sentiments, institutions ever passes without leaving its imprint upon all subsequent phases. However much any institution, custom, or set of ideas found in some uncultured tribe may appear to differ from those to which we are accustomed, however alien, strange, and grotesque it may appear in the light of our own notions, its unequivocal survival and equivalent is invariably to be found in our own customs, institutions, and ideas. No apparently whimsical curiosity of savage social ethnology or folklore is without its counterpart in twentieth-century civilisation. The quaintest cultural peculiarity from cannibal islands or Central Africa can be matched in modern London. The more we delve among the survivals of primitive ideas, and of the social institutions to which those ideas have given rise in uncultured society, the more clearly is it borne in upon us that none of those products of the primitive mind, however ancient, ever completely disappears. That undying persistence of the forms which the primitive social mind has assumed has a wider significance than is generally realised. It has often been illustrated in that branch of anthropological research which deals with folklore and 'superstitions.' But the same law applies to all that is transmitted by traditional heredity, to all the contents of the socially developed

[1] A. Keith, *The Antiquity of Man*, p. 510.

human mind. These are all, it might be said in a literal sense, 'superstitions.' What is illustrated by old wives' tales and the notions of the uncultured is no less true of every sentiment, value, or concept even, which goes to build up the contents of human consciousness. The forms of those sentiments which define and determine our attitude as social beings towards life are, like the remnants of pagan rites in our country-side customs, products of the primitive human mind's reactions. Our conceptual intelligence itself is bound down to the course determined by its starting-point in the dim mentality of the savage. That determining effect of early development is necessarily proportionate to the antiquity and primitiveness of the psychological products which it perpetuates; for, while in the course of growing and divergent complexity any one phase can only affect directly those which are derived from it, the stamp of the earlier phases is impressed upon the whole evolution of the human mind. In the same manner as the reactions of primitive protozoa and primordial marine creatures survive in the modes of activity of our physiological organism, so every idea, every institution, every custom, that has at one time become firmly established in human society, whether its origin dates back ten or ten thousand years, is perpetuated in traditional heredity; no item of that inheritance is ever lost or abolished. The social constitution may be changed, the primitive idea may become adapted to functions the very opposite of those in relation to which it originated; yet in no instance is it wiped away from the human mind. The record of social evolution is hence far more complete than the geological and palaeontological record of the past; its fossils are not odd fragments that owe their preservation to a lucky chance; they survive for ever and ever in the continuity of social and psychological tradition.

Yet when we survey those products of the mind of primitive man which have to a great extent determined the whole subsequent development of human ideas and institutions, we are met with a strange fact; they appear as the fantastic and incoherent products of a mentality utterly different from our own. We have now become familiar with ideas expressed in beliefs, customs, and institutions which in slightly modified forms are common to all primitive humanity from the Poles to the Equator, from Polynesian Islands to American prairies, from the jungles of India to the forests of Africa. These universal notions, these spontaneous reactions of the human mind to environing conditions, far from being obvious in terms of the common sentiments and interests of human nature, appear to us uncouth and strange. To interpret their significance and mode of origin has been the standing puzzle of anthropology. To that task the ingenuity of some of our most acute and expert intellects has been applied, interpretations

have been put forward and discussed in great variety. It must, nevertheless, be confessed, and the most distinguished of our anthropological students are the first to acknowledge it, that the cycle of primitive human ideas and sentiments remains to a large extent a riddle.

It is constantly repeated that 'human nature,' whether in the savage or in civilised man, is essentially the same. Yet we appear to be so incapable of entering into the workings of that invariable 'human nature' in primitive man that we are at a loss to interpret his most fundamental thoughts and feelings. It cannot be supposed that the uniform and universal notions and sentiments of primitive humanity are in reality fantastic; they are, on the contrary, the direct reactions of very simple human minds actuated by the same impulses that actuate us, and working along the line of least resistance.

There is but one conclusion to be drawn: it is that the feelings and impulses which ruled human nature in its first dim developments operated in relation to social conditions profoundly different from those which we are wont to assume. The reactions of that human nature which brought forth the first-fruits of traditional evolution must have differed considerably from those of the 'human nature' to which they appear strange and fantastic.

The axiom concerning the invariability of 'human nature' is in most circumstances where it is loosely adduced little more than a meaningless and misleading shibboleth. The core of truth whence it derives its authority is that if we go deep enough all human behaviour and sentiments spring from the elementary instincts and impulses which are more or less common not only to humanity in every age, but to all life. The complexity and variety of human reactions is thus reducible to those elementary impulses and instincts of which they are manifestations. But even on that fundamental plane there are distinctions to be drawn. Apart from those between the developed social human mind and the inherited animal mind with which it is in constant opposition, there is even on the animal plane a fundamental difference between the impulses and instincts of the two sexes. The male and the female sex have become specialised in relation to different functions, and the forms of the instincts and impulses which determine their reactions are accordingly profoundly unlike. Two separate psychological evolutions have taken place in relation to that differentiation, giving rise to quite different products. In animal evolution those products have often been transmitted from the sex in which they first arose to the opposite sex, thus giving rise to profound modifications in the character of its reactions. When we speak of 'human nature' we generally mean masculine human nature. We are in the habit of regarding the evolution

of humanity and of human ideas and sentiments as, in the main, products of the masculine mind. That assumption appears justified by a survey of human societies during historical times. The older speculations on social origins, such as the acute and learned discussions of Sir Henry Maine, had no other inductive basis than that afforded by classical history and the pictures of patriarchal society in the Old Testament; they assumed not only the invariability of human nature, but that human society itself had from its origin to the present day been constituted in essentially the same manner. It would indeed be difficult to conceive how notions and sentiments originating in the instincts of women could in those conditions have played any important part in the development of traditional heredity. Our knowledge of human origins has, however, undergone a profound transformation within the last fifty years, and whatever the value of our present conclusions, they have been removed from the sphere of abstract speculation to that of inductive inference. That result we owe chiefly to the labours of the founders of modern social anthropology, J. F. McLennan, L. H. Morgan, E. B. Tylor, W. Robertson Smith. It is in consequence of their researches and of the synthetic conclusions to which these led their acute minds that the scattered facts of our reports of savage races have acquired the significance of broad generalisations which, whatever disputes there may be as to their interpretations, form the basis of our growing insight into the origins and development of our race and its mentality. Of those generalisations two have been particularly important in making that growth in our knowledge possible. One has reference to the form of primitive social organisation, in which the most fundamental unit is not the state or the family, but a group of kinsmen having generally an animal or a plant for its badge. The other was the discovery that the part played in primitive society by women and their influence differed markedly from that which their place in civilised societies during historical times has assigned to them.

The latter conclusion is generally spoken of as the theory of matriarchy, a name given to it by McLennan in opposition to the current theory which traced social origins to a patriarchal age such as that represented in the Biblical descriptions of early Hebrew nomads. The term has been loosely employed to denote a status of women in primitive society ranging within wide limits, from the mere reckoning of descent in the female, instead of in the male line, to gynaecocracy, that is, the exercise of supreme authority by women. It may, I think, be legitimately used in a relative sense, and in opposition to the term 'patriarchal,' when referring to a state of society in which the interests and sentiments which are directly connected with the instincts of the women play a more

important part than is the rule in the civilised societies with which we are most familiar.

That character which has been noted in many uncultured societies would seem to be the necessary consequence of their closer approximation to the forms of biological groups among animals. For those groups differ profoundly, as we shall see, from what we usually understand by a family, and there is in fact among animals nothing corresponding to a patriarchal social group. The male has little or no share in the formation or maintenance of the animal family, and as often as not is entirely absent from it. If human society developed out of such animal groups, it had its origin in an association which was a manifestation of the instincts of the female only, and in which all social relations were determined by those instincts and not by those of the male. In the earliest human groups, if similar conditions obtained in them, there can have been none of that predominance of the interests, instincts, and outlooks of the male which is a feature of existing human societies, and which we are prone to assume in interpretations of their origin. That assumption is alone sufficient to stultify those interpretations. The traditional inheritance of the human mind, if these considerations are well founded, has been moulded in the first instance not by the fierce passions of wild hunters battling for the possession of food and of women, but by the instincts of the mothers.

CHAPTER III

THE EVOLUTION OF MOTHERHOOD

Origin and Function of Sexual Reproduction.

THE property which distinguishes living matter, regarded from a physical point of view, from all non-living systems of energy is the power to renew itself. Every reaction entails a breaking down and partial destruction of living substance; but after each such reaction the original configuration is rebuilt. That fundamental property of living matter may be regarded as an act of reproduction. If the reaction is favourable to the particular configuration of energy, the latter will not only be reproduced as it was before the reaction, but will be reinforced, so that when it is repeated the reaction will take place more readily and more vigorously. At the same time the living system will be materially increased by growth, greater assimilation, greater reserves of energy. Thus by the exercise of particular muscles not only do the movements involved become more readily performed, but an increase takes place in the substance of the muscles concerned. If, on the other hand, the reaction is unfavourable to the system of energy, the reverse will take place; the tendency to react in that particular manner will be diminished, and the energy of the organism will be diverted to the production of other reactions. By successive modifications of the reaction, the organism will tend to become better adapted to existing conditions, at the expense, however, of its assimilation and growth.

It must of necessity have been in circumstances particularly favourable that the first living organisms made their appearance; their surroundings offered the most suitable conditions of temperature and light, and the organisms were bathed in their food supply. Their reactions were therefore confined to processes of assimilation and growth. It was the advent of less favourable conditions which brought about the necessity for more varied reactions, for modification, for adaptation, for obtaining food instead of merely absorbing it; the molar activities and the motility involved in the food quest were occasioned by conditions unfavourable to nutrition.

The first organisms were immobile, passive, well fed ; less favourable conditions gave rise to ill-fed, mobile, active organisms more varied in their reactions.

The continued operation of favourable conditions results in continued assimilation and growth. This, however, as it increases becomes itself an unfavourable condition, for the reserves of energy become greater than can be utilised in the reactions of the organism ; and the greater the bulk of the system, the less proportionally will become the surface it presents to the surroundings from which it derives its nutriment, and the possibility of useful reaction and of absorption. Hence the tendency will be to react to those conditions by getting rid of the superfluous accumulation, by subdividing.

Unfavourable conditions threatening the existence of the insufficiently nourished organism also lead it to escape destruction by subdivision. The process in this instance, as observed in the lowest unicellular organisms—protozoa, algae, bacteria—is of a different type from the subdivision which is the outcome of excessive nutrition. It takes place by rapid divisions into the largest possible number of small portions, each of which will require less food to maintain it.[1] The ill-nourished organism may break up at once into a large number of small offspring, instead of doing so by successive divisions.

Reproduction is thus stimulated in two opposite ways—by favourable and by unfavourable conditions, by abundance and by scarcity. In the former conditions the resulting products are well-nourished, passive, immobile organisms ; in the latter small, active, generally motile organisms.

The longer an organism lives the more it is called upon to meet unfavourable conditions, and to adapt itself to them by modifying its reactions and its structure. But the more its reactions and structures are modified in a given direction, the less will they be able to become modified in another, and to adapt themselves to other conditions ; the more highly the organism becomes adapted, specialised, differentiated, the more permanently fixed must its reactions become, and the smaller therefore its power of adaptation. Its powers of growth and of reproduction also become less in proportion as specialised adaptation is greater ; for that specialised activity is supplied out of the total capital of energy, and at the expense therefore of power of assimilation and of reproduction. That necessary result of the constitution of living organisms is a fundamental law which has far-reaching conse-

[1] F. Schaudinn, " Ueber den Zeugungskreis von *Paramoeba Eilhardi*," *Sitzungsberichte der königliche Preussische Akadamie der Wissenschaften*, 1896, vol. i, pp. 31 sqq.

quences. The powers of growth and of reproduction are inversely proportional to the specialised activity, the differentiation, the degree of organisation of the living system. An unspecialised organism that has had no occasion to adapt itself and become modified and differentiated feeds well, grows quickly, and reproduces freely; a highly modified organism, specially adapted to particular conditions and functions, assimilates poorly, grows slowly, and has little or no power of reproduction.

Thus the longer an organism lives and becomes modified in adaptation to the exigencies of life, the less able does it become to cope with changing conditions and to reproduce. The longer it lives the greater becomes the accumulation of deleterious effects, the more unfavourable the conditions of its life and the smaller its power to meet them. The result is the senescence of the organism, the loss of its power of reproduction, and ultimately its death.

The rebuilding of the configuration destroyed in each reaction and its modification result in the fixation of the type of reaction most favourable to the organism in the particular conditions. The disposition of its energy becomes such as to give rise to the same reaction whenever conditions are similar. That disposition is the same throughout every part of the organism, whether it consist of one cell or of an aggregate of many cells; for the variety of special reactions in the different elements of a multicellular organism is conditioned by the differentiation of those elements, which is in turn the result of their internal relations to the whole and of their external relations to the environment. Every specialised local reaction is determined by the uniform disposition to react in a given way to given conditions common to the whole organism.

When two cells come into physiological contact with one another or partly fuse together, an equilibrium is established between their dispositions, so that their reactions will be the resultants of those to which the disposition of each cell would give rise. This can be observed in the reactions of protozoa and of vegetable cells when they are connected by strands of protoplasm; they will react synchronously and in exactly the same manner, provided their structure and their external relations are similar.[1]

By virtue of that equilibrium a method of survival more advantageous than fragmentation into a number of minute cells

[1] C. O. Townsend, "Der Einfluss des Zellkerns auf die Bildung der Zellhauts," *Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Botanik*, xxx (1897), pp. 484 sqq.; A. Gruber, "Beiträge zur Kentniss der Physiologie und Biologie der Protozoen," *Berichte der Naturforschende Gesellschaft zu Freiburg*, 1886, vol. i, pp. 22 sqq.; F. Cohn, "Die Entwicklungsgeschichte der Gattung Volvox," *Beiträge zu Biologie der Pflanzen*, 1875, Part 1, pp. 93 sqq.; R. Briffault, *Psyche's Lamp*, pp. 130 sqq.

is available to those organisms which suffer from the effects of unfavourable conditions of nutrition. The classical investigations of Maupas have shown that unicellular organisms which, if kept isolated, rapidly deteriorate, become smaller, and ultimately cease to multiply, recover their powers of nutrition and reproduction after conjugating with other individuals.[1] By such conjugation an equilibration is brought about between the dispositions of the two organisms; the effects of adaptation in the less nourished individual are counteracted, its nutrition is improved, and the organism becomes rejuvenated. If, however, care is taken that the conditions of nutrition shall remain particularly favourable, no deterioration takes place and no conjugation is required. Woodruff repeated the experiments of Maupas, taking precautions to secure the best possible conditions of nutrition for the organisms, and inbred Paramecium through 3,000 generations without any signs of deterioration manifesting themselves.[2] The conjugation by which protozoa improve their nutrition is manifestly the beginning of a process of sexual reproduction. The most favourable effects of conjugation will naturally result when an organism which has acquired varied activities and adaptations in its struggle against unfavourable conditions conjugates with one which has retained a greater power of nutrition. The latter is typically a female organism and the former a male.[3]

In simple multicellular organisms any detached group of cells will reproduce the whole organism, since each cell inherits the same dispositions which, by their reactions, gave rise to the organic structure. The greater the degree of specialised adaptation or differentiation of the cell or tissue, the less, as in protozoa, will be the

[1] E. F. Maupas, "Sur la conjugaison des infusoires ciliés," *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences*, cii (1886), pp. 1569 sqq.; Id., "Sur la puissance de multiplication des infusoires ciliés," *ibid.*, civ (1887), pp. 1006 sqq.; Id., "Recherches expérimentales sur la multiplication des infusoires ciliés," *Archives de Zoologie expérimentale et générale*, 2e Série, vi (1888), p. 165. Similar experiments have been made by G. N. Calkins, "Studies on the Life-History of Protozoa," *Archiv für Entwickelungsmechanik*, xv, pp. 139 sqq.; Id., *Journal of Experimental Zoology*, i, pp. 423 sqq.; and by R. Hertwig, "Über die Conjugation der Infusorien," *Sitzungsberichte der Gesellschaft für Morphologie und Physiologie*, v, pp. 35 sqq.; Id., "Über Befruchtung und Conjugation," *Verhandlungen der deutschen Zoologische Gesellschaft*, 1892, pp. 95 sqq.

[2] P. Popenoe, "Experimental Inbreeding," *The Journal of Heredity*, vii, p. 70.

[3] Dr. Pearl's investigations appear to show that with Paramecium, the conjugating individuals tend on an average to be alike in length and breadth (R. Pearl, "A Biometrical Study of the Conjugation in Paramecium," *Biometrika*, v, p. 274). At such a rudimentary stage of the process very slight differences in equilibrium are doubtless sufficient to produce the advantages that are sought in the process of conjugation.

power of reproduction. While in hydroid polyps a complete new individual is reproduced from any living fragment, no matter from what portion of the body it may be amputated, the power of reproducing differentiated tissues is limited in the salamander or lizard to regenerating a limb or a tail, or the lens of an eye, after those parts have been excised. In the human body most cells, such as the epithelium of glandular organs or of skin, connective tissue cells, muscle cells, bone and cartilage cells, retain some power of reproduction which is inversely proportional to the degree of their functional specialisation, while nerve cells, being the most highly differentiated and specialised, are entirely devoid of that power, and are incapable of multiplying.[1] In general those cells which are so situated as to be the best nourished, and are accordingly not differentiated in relation to any particular function, not having to earn their living, so to speak, are the best adapted to the reproduction of the whole organism. Thus in hydra and similar coelenterates the cells situated at the bottom of the coelenteric cavity in which food collects, and which are bathed in the body-fluids, receiving, therefore, a large amount of food, become specifically reproductive cells, although reproduction may also be performed by almost any other cells. Such favourably situated and highly nourished cells belong to the female type, and the reproduction of the multicellular organism can take place from them without any conjugation with other cells. Parthenogenesis, or reproduction from undifferentiated cells without any sexual conjunction, which is the ordinary mode of reproduction in simpler organisms, commonly takes place in animals which stand fairly high in the scale of organisation. It is the ordinary mode of reproduction among wheel-animalcules (Rotifers);[2] it has been observed among nematode worms;[3] it is common among many species of crustaceans, such as brine-shrimps,[4] ostracods,[5] water-fleas.[6] Among gall-flies

[1] C. S. Minot, *The Problem of Age, Growth, and Death*, pp. 219 sqq. Cf. H. H. Donaldson, *The Growth of the Brain*, p. 32.

[2] A. Lange, "Unsere gegenwärtige Kenntnis von den Fortpflanzungsverhältnisse der Räderthiere," *Internationale Revue der gesamten Hydrobiologie und Hydrographie*, vi, pp. 257 sqq., 429 sqq.; E. Dobers, "Über die Biologie der Bdelloidea," *ibid.*, vii, Supplement, pp. 104 sqq.

[3] E. F. Maupas, "Modes et formes de reproduction des nématodes," *Archives de Zoologie expérimentale et générale*, 3e. Série, viii, pp. 463 sqq.; F. A. Potts, "Notes on the Free-living Nematodes," *Quarterly Journal of Microscopical Science*, x, pp. 52 sqq.

[4] C. Th. Siebold, *Beiträge zur Parthenogenesis der Arthropoden.*

[5] A. Weismann, "Parthenogenese bei Ostracoden," *Zoologischer Anzeiger*, iii, pp. 82 sqq.; *Amphimixis*, p. 169; R. Wohlgemuth, "Beobachtungen und Untersuchungen uber die Biologie der Süsswasserostracoiden," *Internationale Revue der gesamten Hydrobiologie und Hydrographie*, vi, p. 44.

[6] A. Weismann, "Beiträge zur Naturgeschichte der Daphnoiden," *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Zoologie*, xxxiii, pp. 124 sqq.

" the male is useless ; the continuation of the species being effected by virgin females, although males exist." [1] Exclusively feminine reproduction is the rule among sawflies [2] and caddis flies.[3] Parthenogenesis has been observed among thrips ; [4] it commonly takes place in several species of moths and butterflies, the race being reproduced for whole seasons, or for many years, by unfecundated females.[5] Reproduction by females alone can take place among social wasps [6] and among bees.[7]

Reproduction without any sexual process takes place in all those instances from female reproductive elements alone, never from male reproductive elements.[8] That is as one would expect ; the conditions of high nutrition and undifferentiated activity are those essentially favourable to reproduction ; it is only by a particular adaptation that the active and differentiated male type succeeds in getting itself reproduced at all. This, as has been seen, is effected by one of two methods : by the desperate expedient of reducing, through the complete breaking up of the organism into a large number of small elements, the nutritional requirements of each, or by conjugation with another organism less exhausted by ill-nutrition. By a combination of the two methods the ill-nourished, modifiable, and active males succeed in propagating themselves to the best advantage in the fully developed method of sexual reproduction. Their reproductive cells break up into a large number of active elements, or sperms, and fuse with the well-nourished female cells, or ova. The purpose served by that process is in fact no other than that of facilitating the reproduction of the male type which

[1] D. Sharp, " Insects," in *The Cambridge Natural History*, vol. v, p. 498 ; cf. H. Adler, " Über den Generationswechsel der Eichen-Gallwespen," *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Zoologie*, xxxv, pp. 151 sqq.

[2] P. Cameron, *A Monograph of the British Phytophagous Hymenoptera* (*Ray Society Annual Volume*, 1882), p. 29.

[3] D. Sharp, *op. cit.*, p. 481.

[4] H. Uzel, *Monographie der Ordnung Thysanoptera*, pp. 348 sqq.

[5] K. W. von Dalla Torre, " Die Erforschungsgeschichte der Parthenogenesis bei den Schmetterlinge," *Entomologische Jahrbücher*, xxv (1916), pp. 101 sqq.

[6] P. Marchal, " La reproduction et l'évolution des guêpes sociales," *Archives de Zoologie expérimentale et générale*, 3e Série, iv, pp. 1 sqq.

[7] K. W. von Dalla Torre, " Die Parthenogenesis bei den Honigbiene, *Zoologisches Zentralblatt*, xvii (1910), pp. 485 sqq. For a full review of our present knowledge of parthenogenetic reproduction, see Hans Winkler, *Verbreitung und Ursache der Parthenogenesis in Pflanzen- und Tierreiche* (Jena, 1920). Cf. also P. Geddes and J. A. Thomson, *The Evolution of Sex*, pp. 174 sqq.

[8] It has, however, been suggested that in the artificial chemical fertilisation of enucleated ova as effected by T. Boveri and Y. Delage the male cell, being supplied with nourishment, performs the whole process of reproduction (A. Giard, " A propos de la parthénogénèse artificielle des oeufs d'échinodermes," *Comptes Rendus de la Société de Biologie*, 1900, pp. 761 sqq.).

would otherwise be at a very great disadvantage. So far as regards the process of reproduction no profit results to the female type from conjugation; the race as a whole gains, however, by preserving and acquiring the adaptability of the male type. But it is the male's business to get itself reproduced by seeking conjugation with the female, who, essentially and originally does not require the male in order to reproduce. In those species which habitually reproduce parthenogenetically, males may be entirely absent, as, for example, in *Cypris ovum* and other ostracod crustaceans,[1] and in fresh-water rotifers.[2] In the Solenobia butterfly, males appear only occasionally, sometimes at intervals of years.[3] In some species of rotifers the males are not sexually functional, and in spite of the desperate efforts of the minute male individuals to conjugate with the much larger females they cannot succeed in doing so; but usually perish in the body-cavity of the latter.[4] The necessity for the impregnation of the female has arisen only as a special adaptation to sexual reproduction, and in higher forms that adaptation, which includes the casting off of a portion of the female cell in preparation for the reception of the male cell, precludes the direct reproduction of the unimpregnated female.

Sexual reproduction is, then, essentially a special device or adaptation to meet certain conditions by a physiological differentiation which, instead of taking place within the individual organism, is effected in separate individuals. It has been commonly imagined that sex is a primal fact rooted in the very constitution of life, if not indeed of the universe. Mystic philosophies have been inclined to view all existing things as appertaining either to the male or the female principle. But there is nothing of that fundamental character about the device of sexual reproduction; it is merely an adventitious, one might say an accidental, adaptation, and nature knows no more of a male and a female principle than of a vertebrate and an invertebrate principle.

The differentiation of function between the male and female types, corresponding to the differences in conditions of nutrition that gave rise to them, becomes more manifest in the higher organisms, with which the bearing of bulky ovaries, gestation, the care of offspring constitute a serious handicap in the struggle for existence. But physiological differentiation of function never

[1] A. Weismann, "Parthenogenese bei Ostracoden," *Zoologischer Anzeiger*, iii, pp. 82 sqq.; Id., *The Germ-plasm*, p. 345.

[2] A. Lange and E. Dobers, *ll. cc.*

[3] O. Hofmann, "Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Parthenogenesis," *Entomologische Zeitung*, xxx, pp. 299 sqq.

[4] M. Hartog, "Rotifera," in *The Cambridge Natural History*, vol. ii, p. 218.

means development in a single direction to the complete exclusion of all others. The organisation of the multi-cellular organism depends upon the specialised differentiation of function of its component cells, but while each element develops a particular form of its activity, it continues, whatever its specialisation, to exercise all the fundamental functions of life. The nerve cell not only reacts to stimuli, but also breathes, feeds, excretes; the respiratory and the digestive cells not only breathe and feed, but also react to stimuli. Complete or excessive sexual differentiation in a nutritive direction in the female and in an active direction in the male would soon lead to extinction. The purely female organism that should develop its powers of nutrition alone and become entirely passive would lose all power of adaptation and be at the mercy of all adverse conditions. The male organism that should increase its metabolic expenditure and activity without limit would soon, like Maupas' protozoa, become exhausted, prematurely senile, and perish. In sexual reproduction each of the two opposite tendencies is corrected and supplemented by the other. The resulting organism partakes of the male and of the female disposition. Whether it develops into a male or into a female depends essentially upon conditions of nutrition; abundant food giving rise to an excess of females, scarcity to an excess of males. But each organism, whether male or female, inherits the benefits of maternal nutritive tendencies, and of the active, adaptive paternal qualities.

Limitation of Offspring and Development of Maternal Provisions.

In addition to the equilibrium brought about by sexual reproduction, in which the primary function of the female is to counteract the exhausting activities of the male type of organisation by endowing it with a larger measure of its own quiescent, nutritional disposition, a further distinct function has become thrust upon the female in the course of organic evolution. Her primary function is fulfilled when the composite ovum cell is produced, and that ovum is accordingly discharged and left to develop. In multicellular organisms that development is itself a process of considerable complexity and necessarily extends over a considerable length of time, during which the multiplying cells reproduce the reactions of their ancestry at corresponding phases, thus recapitulating the embryonic evolution of the race. The longer their genealogy, and the more complex the degree of organisation attained, the longer and the more complex will be the development. The process entails a large expenditure of energy and

requires a corresponding supply of nutriment. In some forms the need for nourishment appears to bring about an interruption in the process; it becomes arrested at ancestral stages before reaching the parental phase of organisation, and those larval stages are utilised to obtain nourishment for the resumption of the process of development, which may even be carried out by alternate stages of nutrition and reproduction, giving rise to a life-history presenting a succession of dissimilar forms.

In favourable or compelling conditions another method of meeting the difficulty is employed. During the first stages, or even during the whole of its development, the young remain adherent as commensals to the body of the mother, thus benefiting by the food which she collects. In some starfish the embryos lodge in folds round the mouth of the maternal organism, which they expand, as they grow, into brood-sacks, sometimes starving their mother to death by obstructing the passage.[1] The young of some sea-cucumbers attach themselves in like manner to the dorsal tentacles of their mother until full development is reached.[2] Some leeches (*Clepsine*) adhere to their mother by their suckers, and derive their nourishment directly from her by sucking the fluids of her body.[3]

It is customary to see in that parasitic development of the brood the rudiments of maternal self-sacrifice. But brood-care, in its origin at least, owes probably as much to the self-regarding impulses of the offspring as to maternal protection. The former are certainly in the initial stages of the evolution of the relation more conspicuous than the latter. The egg-cells in such a simple organism as a hydroid polyp not only absorb the best share of nourishment, owing to their favourable situation at the bottom of the food-cavity, but actually feed upon the neighbouring tissue-cells, " which they devour as does an amoeba." They encircle them with pseudopods, capture them, and eat them.[4] When ova, instead of being spawned as soon as developed, adhere, as in some surf-

[1] O. Carlgreen, " Die Brutflege der Actinarien," *Biologisches Centralblatt*, xxi, pp. 468 sqq.; M. Sars, " Mémoire sur le développement des astéries," *Annales des Sciences Naturelles*, 3e Série, *Zoologie*, ii, pp. 190 sq.

[2] W. Salemsky, " Ueber die Thätigkeit der Kalymnoceten (Testazellen) bei der Entwicklung einiger Synasciden," in *Festschrift zum 70 Geburtstage Rudolph Leuckart's*, p. 109; C. Julin, " Recherches sur la phylogénèse des Tuniciers, Archiascidia napolitana." *Mittheilungen aus der zoologischen Station zu Neapel*, xvi, pp. 510 sq.

[3] T. J. Parker and A. W. Haswell, *A Text-Book of Zoology*, vol. i, p. 480, after Whitman and Bourne.

[4] Y. Delage and E. Hérouard, *Traité de Zoologie concrète*, vol. ii, 2e Partie: *Les Coelentérés*, p. 27. Cf. W. Goetsch, " Neue Beobachtungen und Versuchen an Hydra," *Biologisches Centralblatt*, xxxix, p. 545.

perches (*Cymatogaster aggregatus*), to the tissues of the ovaries, and the embryos suck nourishment from the walls of the oviduct,[1] who shall say that we are dealing with physiological maternal care and not with filial voracity and self-protection? Not seldom the mother-organism is sacrificed to the greed of the progeny; in some gall-flies (*Cecidomyiidae*), for instance, the young actually eat their mother, and creep out of her empty skin only after the matricidal feast is over.[2]

The relation of mother and offspring is, like all life-processes, a mutual adjustment and a coordination of actions and reactions. The maternal reaction to her parasitic offspring has probably developed as a response to the situation created by the latter. The maternal organism is deprived of a certain amount of nourishment which would have gone towards the production of more ova, and her food-questing activities are impeded; the surplus reproductive activity becomes applied to assisting the maturation of her less numerous brood. It is sometimes assumed that the wasteful ovulation of fishes, which spawn their eggs by the million, has become limited as a maternal device to lessen the reckless slaughter of the offspring and to enhance the quality of the race. But it appears more probable that the effort of the reproductive cells to obtain more nourishment automatically brings about a limitation in their numbers. That limitation has not been the result, but, on the contrary, the occasion, of enhanced maternal provisions. The reduction in number of the ova proved a benefit to the maternal organism, by relieving it from the invalidism resulting from enormous ovarian tumours that threatened its existence.[3] The reality of that handicap is rendered apparent when it is noted that in female fishes reproductive activity, in the very rudimentary form of producing unfertilised eggs, instead of reaching its height during the youth of the animal, goes on increasing with age. Thus, while a haddock weighing 1½ pounds is found to carry 156,000 eggs, one weighing 4 pounds carries 806,000. In salmon the number of eggs is also proportional to the weight of the animal, being about 900 eggs to the pound;

[1] C. H. Eigemann, in *Bulletin of the United States Fish Commission*, 1892, p. 381; Id., in *Archiv für Entwickelungsmechanik*, iv, p. 125.

[2] N. Wagner, "Über die viviparen Gallmückenlarven," *Zeitschrift für wissentschaftliche Zoologie*, xv, pp. 106–117; Wagner, Meinert, Pagenstecher, and Ganine, "Observations sur la reproduction parthénogénésique chez quelques larves d'insectes diptères," *Annales des Sciences Naturelles*, 5ᵉ Série, *Zoologie*, vol. iv, pp. 259 sqq.

[3] A cod may carry some 6,652,000 ova; a turbot nearly 15,000,000; a conger-eel, 15,191,000; a herring, 50,000; a ling, 29,361,000; a crab carries about 2,000,000 eggs (J. T. Cunningham, *The Natural History of the Marketable Marine Fishes of the British Islands*, p. 69; F. Buckland, *Natural History of British Fishes*, p. 387).

the eggs of old females are larger than those of young females, the latter being frequently infertile.[1]

The unfertilised ova which are scattered in such profusion by the primitive vertebrate as soon as they are formed, are not even equipped, as a rule, with a provision of nourishment for use during their development; consequently the embryos which succeed in getting hatched enter an unsympathetic world in an immature larval stage, and have to complete their development as best they can while at the same time struggling for existence.

The advantage of reducing the number of eggs by devoting some of the reproductive energy squandered in producing them to making better provision for their nutrition and by bestowing some care upon them, is scarcely less from the point of view of the mother than from that of the brood and of the race. In the Elasmobranch fishes (sharks) the ova are retained by the mother until they have been fertilised by the male, a supply of food-yolk is provided, which increases fifty to a hundred times the size of the eggs, they are wrapped in a capsule and covered with glutinous material, and a suitable spot is selected for their deposition. The number of eggs is accordingly reduced to reasonable figures, a score or two, or even down to ten or three; they take from eight to fifteen months to hatch.[2] One result, amongst others, of the more efficient way of dealing with them is that the development of the offspring is not hampered by their having to earn their living at the same time; they are consequently hatched in a more mature state of development, the racial type is improved, and thereby the more efficient manifestation of the reproductive instincts in the mother is doubtless promoted.

The ova of reptiles and those of the more primitive birds—such as ostriches, the apteryx, bustards, cranes, rails, grebes, geese, and ducks—are provided with a large supply of yolk sufficient to nourish the developing embryo until it has become self-supporting. When the eggs have been deposited in a suitable place and hatched by the heat of the sun or by brooding, the offspring is able to dispense with further care. The birds give the young the benefit of protection, keeping them from wandering into danger, and direct them in their search for food; but they do not feed them. In the more highly developed birds, such as the petrels, cormorants, hawks, pigeons, owls, swifts, woodpeckers, and all the passerine birds, the amount of food-yolk in the eggs is greatly reduced. The young are consequently born immature, naked or covered with fine down, and helpless. They are thus prevented from wandering, and maternal anxieties and

[1] F. Day, *British and Irish Salmonidae*, pp. 76, 78.
[2] B. Dean, *Fishes, living and fossil*, pp. 193 sqq., 280.

responsibilities are relieved; but, on the other hand, the brood has to be fed by the parents and more prolonged care and attention on their part is required.

In mammals a return is made to the parasitic mode of embryonic development by dispensing with viable eggs and feeding the developing organism directly from the circulation of the mother, a device already adopted by some fishes.

In the table opposite the time occupied by that gestation has been set down for a few representative species of the various orders of mammals, together with the number of offspring usually brought forth at a birth, and the time taken by that offspring to attain sexual maturity and full growth.[1]

It will be seen at a glance that a marked and uniform increase in the duration of gestation takes place as we advance from the lower to the higher types of mammals. The length of that period is also clearly related to the size of the animal and to the number of offspring produced at a birth. If the latter factors be taken into account, the progressive lengthening of gestation becomes more clearly manifest. The elephant carries its calf for nearly two years, and thus holds the record for long gestation among existing mammals. But if we allow for the fact that the adult animal weighs three or four tons—Jumbo weighed six and a half tons—or about as much as fifty men, gestation for an equal weight will be seen to be twice as long in the human species as with the elephant. A cow carries its young more than twice as long as a lion and the same length of time as a human being; but reducing the figures to a common weight the gestation of the cow is only one-fifth of that of man and about one-fourth less than that of the lion.

Effects of the Prolongation of Immaturity.

The prolongation of gestation is, then, related to the advance in the qualities of the organism, in its degree of organisation. Growth takes place by the multiplication of cells, for these are of the same size in different organisms with the single exception of the cells of the cortex of the brain, which are larger in larger animals than in small ones.[2] But it has been seen that the powers of nutrition

[1] The data have been compiled from various sources, chiefly from Brehm-Strassen, *Tierleben*; J. G. Millais, *The Mammals of Great Britain and Ireland*, 1904, and E. T. Seton, *Life Histories of Northern Animals*. Where slight variations occur in the period of gestation the most commonly observed period is given. The weights represent, of course, only rough averages, as the weights of animals of the same species vary within very wide limits; the figures are merely intended to give a basis for comparison.

[2] G. Levi, "Studi sulla grandezza delle cellule," *Archivio Italiano di Anatomia e Embriologia*, v, pp. 291 sqq.; Irving Mardesty, "Observations on

	Gestation.	Weight.	Number of Offspring.	Sexual Maturity.	Full Growth.
MARSUPIALS—	Days.				
Opossum (American) ..	13				
Kangaroo (smaller spec.)	38		1–2	6 months	1 year
Kangaroo (larger spec.)	40		1	6 ,,	1–2 years
INSECTIVORA—					
Mole	30	10 oz.	3–5	1 year	1 year
Hedgehog	49	6 ,,	3–5	1 ,,	1 ,,
CHIROPTERA—					
Common Bat	36	1 ,,	1–2	6–8 weeks	3 months
RODENTS—					
Mouse	25	½ ,,	5–12	6 ,,	2½ ,,
Rat	35	12 ,,	4–10	6 ,,	6 ,,
Rabbit	30	3 lb.	4–12	5–8 months	1 year
Hare	30	8 ,,	1–4	1 year	1 yr. 3 m.
Squirrel	30	12 oz.	3–6	7–8 weeks	6 months
Beaver	42	30 lb.	2–3	2 years	3 years
EVEN-TOED UNGULATES—					
Sheep	150	65 ,,	1	2 ,,	3 ,,
Chamois	140	80 ,,	1–2	2 ,,	3 ,,
Gazelle	150	80 ,,	1	3 ,,	3–4 ,,
Red deer	245	170 ,,	1–2		2 ,,
Gnu Antelope	238	500 ,,	1	8 months	
Reindeer	210	280 ,,	1		
Elk	260	600 ,,	1	2 years	3 ,,
Llama	300	250 ,,	1		3 ,,
Camel	300	400 ,,	1	2 ,,	3 ,,
Giraffe	431	550 ,,	1	6 ,,	6–7 ,,
Ox	300	1,300 ,,	1	2 ,,	3–4 ,,
Bison	280	1,800 ,,	1		
ODD-TOED UNGULATES—					
Horse	350	1,500 ,,	1	3–4 ,,	5 ,,
Ass	365	800 ,,	1	3–4 ,,	5 ,,
Pig	100	180 ,,	5–12	2–3 ,,	3 ,,
Hippopotamus	235	6,000 ,,	1	5–6 ,,	8–9 ,,
Rhinoceros	576	4,000 ,,	1	7–8 ,,	13 ,,
Elephant	600	8,000 ,,	1	21 ,,	21–30 ,,
CARNIVORA—					
Weasel	35		3–7	9 months	1½ ,,
Otter	63	18 ,,	2–4	10 ,,	2 ,,
Polecat	62	2¾ ,,	3–7	9 ,,	2 ,,
Marten	90	3 ,,	3–5	9 ,,	1½ ,,
Dog	63	50 ,,	4–6	1 year	1½ ,,
Wolf	63	90 ,,	4–6	1 ,,	1½ ,,
Fox	63	15 ,,	4–6	1 ,,	1½ ,,
Bear	120	300 ,,	1–4	5–6 years	6 ,,
Cat	56	12 ,,	5–6	1 year	1½ ,,
Lynx	70		3–4	2 years	3–4 ,,
Panther	63	280 ,,	3–5	2 ,,	3–4 ,,
Jaguar	100	250 ,,	2–3	2 ,,	3–4 ,,
Lion	110	350 ,,	2–4	3 ,,	3–4 ,,
Tiger	110	350 ,,	2–4	3 ,,	3–4 ,,
PRIMATES—					
Baboon	210	50 ,,	1	3 ,,	5 ,,
Gorilla	280 ?	300 ,,	1	10–12 ,,	12–15 ,,
Man	280	140 ,,	1	13 ,,	25 ,,

and of reproduction decrease in the cell in proportion to the degree of fixation of its reactions, that is, in proportion to its differentiation and specialisation. And, in fact, during the development of an embryo, cell-multiplication and growth take place very rapidly in the first stages, and the rate decreases as differentiation proceeds. Thus a human embryo in the fourth month of gestation multiplies its own weight by 600 per cent.; in the fifth month by over 200 per cent.; in the sixth month by 100 per cent.; in the last month by only 20 per cent.[1] During the first month of extrauterine life the rate of growth continues to decrease slowly; in the fourth month the child adds only 14 per cent. to its weight; in the eighth month only 6 per cent. When a year old a baby gains about 2 per cent. of its weight each month, when two years old only 1 per cent. Between the eighteenth and twenty-first years the human body only grows at the rate of about 0·14 per cent. of its own weight per month.[2] That power of growth, which is great to begin with and rapidly diminishes, measures the power of cell-multiplication. The further differentiation proceeds, the less are cells capable of multiplying. If in a rabbit embryo the cells are counted at various phases it is found that at seven days and a half 17 to 18 cells out of a thousand are in the act of subdividing; on the tenth day only 14 to 15 out of a thousand are observed to be reproducing; on the thirteenth day the multiplication of the cells differs in the several parts, but the rate shows a further marked diminution, varying from 6 to 11 per thousand in different tissues.[3] The rate of growth of various animals immediately after birth may also serve to show the relation between their power of growth and the degree of organisation: a rabbit doubles its weight in 7 days, a dog in 8, a cat in 9½, a sheep in 10, a pig in 18, a cow in 47 days, a horse in 60, and a baby takes 180 days to effect the same growth.[4] Or, to put it in another way, the power of growth of a human being is half that of a horse, 18 times less than a sheep's, 30 times less than a rabbit's. The higher the degree of specialised organisation and differentiation which the cells of the developing being have to attain, the slower the rate of growth. Hence it is that the higher we proceed in the scale of mammalian evolution, the longer is the time devoted to gestation.

Even more important is the fact that, although the time of

the Medulla Spinalis of the Elephant, with some Comparative Studies of the Intumescentia Cervicalis and the Neurones of the Columna Anterior," *Journal of Comparative Neurology*, iii, pp. 125 sqq.

[1] H. Fehling, "Beiträge zur Physiologie des placentaren Stoffverkehr," *Archiv für Gynaekologie*, xi, p. 528.

[2] My figures are taken or calculated from the data given by Minot.

[3] C. S. Minot, *The Problem of Age, Growth, and Death*, pp. 221 sqq.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 107.

gestation is thus lengthened, the rate of individual development becomes slower as we rise in the scale of organisation, and the young are brought into the world in a condition of greater immaturity.

Rodents, although born blind and pulpy, grow so rapidly that the tutelage of infancy does not extend beyond a few weeks. Rats are turned out to shift for themselves when thirty-nine days old, and they have reached their maturity in six months; mice are capable of breeding in six weeks and are full grown in four months; rabbits breed when five months old. The most intelligent of the rodents, the beaver, is suckled for one month and is sexually mature in two years.

The greatest contrast is presented by the herbivorous gregarious ungulates as compared with the carnivora. The former are able to stand a few minutes after birth and in a few hours can follow their mother. A hartebest antelope one week old can outrun the fastest man.[1] A young elephant is capable of following its mother when two days old.[2] Carnivorous animals, on the other hand, are born helpless; they are unable to stand for several days, and they are entirely dependent upon their mother for a period of many months. With the exception of lion cubs, their eyes remain closed for several days after birth. Young lions are unable to stalk for themselves until they are about a year and a half old.[3]

The young of monkeys cling closely to the body of their mother with arms and tail, hardly changing their position for about a month. There is, in respect of infantile helplessness, an even more pronounced contrast between young anthropoids and the lower orders of monkeys than between these and other mammals. A baby gibbon is said to remain clinging to the body of its mother for seven months, when it gradually begins to shift for itself.[4] A young orang-utan learns laboriously to walk by holding on to objects for support when it is a month old. Up to that time it lies on its back tossing its hands and feet about and inspecting them.[5] The higher anthropoids are said to be capable of independent existence when about three years old; they are full grown between eight and fifteen. Among most savages the human baby at the former age is still being suckled by its mother, at the latter age most puberty ceremonies take place. A baby can scarcely use its eyes and coordinate their movements before it is a month old; it is unable to coordinate the movements of its limbs before five months; it is still tumbling

[1] P. L. Sclater and O. Thomas, *The Book of Antelopes*, vol. i, p. 42.

[2] G. P. Sanderson, *Thirteen Years among the Wild Beasts of India*, p. 51.

[3] P. Chalmers Mitchell, *The Childhood of Animals*, p. 169.

[4] S. R. Tickell, "Notes on the Gibbon of Tenasserim, Hylobates lar," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, xxxiii, p. 198.

[5] A. R. Wallace, *The Malay Archipelago*, vol. ii, pp. 68 sqq.; O. Mohnike, "Die Affen auf den indischen Inseln," *Das Ausland*, xlv, p. 850.

about at eight months, and can seldom walk before the end of the first year.[1] Thus the orang-utan at the end of one month is as advanced as the human baby when a year old; a lamb a day old has proceeded further in its development than either.

That protraction of immature infancy is the most far-reaching and momentous factor in the evolution of the higher animals. Upon it has depended the possibility of the crowning phases of organic evolution, to it is due the origin of humanity.

The period of immaturity is not employed in promoting the general growth of the body; for, as we have seen, the power of growth is in fact less where infancy is most prolonged. It is not employed in carrying out any gross changes in organisation, for the new-born mammal, however immature, is not, like the young of many lower forms, an undeveloped larva, but possesses all its organs according to the pattern of its parents. Those organs, apart from those of reproduction, are functionally active and do not undergo after birth any important structural transformation. In one organ alone, the brain, are the structural arrangements left in fundamental respects incomplete at birth; they are developed during the period of infancy.

The cells which compose the brain cease to multiply before those of any other organ or tissue in the body. While the cells of connective tissue, muscles, bone, skin, glands go on multiplying long after birth—the general growth of the body and its perpetual renewal being brought about mainly by that multiplication—the number of the cells in the brain is not added to after about the sixth month of intrauterine development, and remains stationary throughout life, except for the occasional disappearance of cells from degeneration and decay. Yet the brain, although it is relatively to the rest of the body much larger and heavier at birth than in the adult, goes on growing after birth more rapidly than any other portion of the body. In the first three months of life the body as a whole adds about 20 per cent. to its weight; the brain adds nearly 90 per cent. In less than nine months the weight of the brain is doubled, in three years it is trebled. While the rate of growth of the body diminishes rapidly after the first few months—it falls from 209 per cent. at birth to 29 per cent. in the second year [2]—the growth of the brain, though it falls off rapidly after the first month, is steadily maintained until the seventh year, and continues until the twenty-fifth, or even the thirty-fifth, year.[3]

[1] M. W. Shinn, *The Biography of a Baby*, pp. 61 sqq.; W. Preyer, *Die Seele des Kindes*, pp. 25 sq., 152 sq.

[2] H. H. Donaldson, *The Growth of the Brain*, pp. 51, 63.

[3] R. Boyd, "Tables of the Weight of the Human Body and Internal Organs in the Sane and Insane of Both Sexes at Various Ages, arranged from 2,614 Post-mortem Examinations," *Philosophical Transactions of the*

Since there is no increase in the number of cells, the whole of that growth is due to functional development.

And in fact the cells which constitute the grey substance of the cerebral hemispheres, and which at first are smooth and egg- or pear-shaped bodies, put forth an outgrowth of branching filaments which spread in a meshwork in all directions. That meshwork of fibres constitutes the white substance of the brain; and it is to this tree-like growth that the increase in weight is due. Some of the outgrowths of the brain-cells form nerve-fibres; others are association-fibres which establish countless connections between the various elements of the brain itself, and give off numerous collateral branches. It is upon this complex network of intercommunicating connections that the functional efficiency of the brain depends. Its structure does not present any striking difference as regards the number of cells in the higher and in the lower mammals; but in the latter, such as rodents and ruminants, only a few branching processes are given off, while, as we rise in the scale, the number and complexity of those branches is greatly increased.[1] The same difference is presented by the structure of brain-cells in young and immature animals as compared with older ones. In the mouse just before birth, for instance, there are no downward outgrowths from the pyramidal ganglion-cells of the cortex and no collateral branches in the main, or axis-cylinder, process. They are present at birth, and at the end of the first week are fully developed.[2] The development of nerve-cells in the nervous system of the foetus takes place in all mammals in the order of their evolutionary development in the organic scale, that is to say, the 'lower' centres in the medulla and hind-brain develop first, the cells of the mid-brain next, and those of the fore-brain last. There is, further, a striking difference in the development of those cellular elements between those species whose young are born immature and those in which the young are born precocious. "I have found," says Dr. Below, "that among animals that bring forth their young in a condition of helplessness, such as man, the dog, cat, rat, mouse, rabbit, the development of ganglion-

Royal Society, 1861; T. B. Peacock, "Tables of the Weight of the Brain and some other Organs of the Human Body," *Monthly Journal of Medical Science*, vii; P. Broca, "Sur le poids relatif des hemisphères cérébraux et de leur lobes frontaux," *Bulletin de la Société d'Anthropologie*, vol. x, pp. 534 sqq. Th. L. W. von Bischoff, *Das Hirngewicht des Menschen*, pp. 46 sqq., 50 sq.

[1] S. Ramon y Cajal, *Textura del sistema nervioso del hombre y de los vertebrados*; Id., "Estructura de la corteza occipital inferior de los pequeños mamiferos," *Anales de la Sociedad Española de Historia Natural*, xxii (1893); F. Boll, "Die Histologie und Histogenese der nervösen Centralorgane," *Archiv für Psychiatrie und Nervenkrankheiten*, iv, pp. 5 sqq.

[2] S. Ramon y Cajal, "Sur la structure de l'écorce cérébrale de quelques mammifères," *La Cellule*, vii, pp. 169 sq.

cells is incomplete at the time of birth and even soon after; whereas the horse, calf, sheep, guinea-pig show completely developed ganglion-cells in every part of the brain almost always in the earlier periods of foetal life, invariably before birth."[1] That incomplete development is much more pronounced in the human baby than in any other young; the processes of the pyramidal cells in the frontal cortex have only one quarter of their full development at the sixth month of intrauterine life, and only one half at birth.[2] The development of the fibres that grow out of the brain-cells can be demonstrated without special preparation, owing to the fact that, when the main branches become functionally active, they are enclosed, or insulated, in a sheath of a substance known as myelin, which stains brightly with haematoxylin, thus affording an easy way of observing the development of cerebral elements. Of the paths connected with the sense-organs, only the olfactory tracts, the most primitive path of sensation with the lower animals, begin to develop soon after birth in the human baby; the visual paths develop later, and the auditory paths last.[3] In a premature infant born at eight months the optic-nerve becomes enclosed in its sheath of myelin much earlier than in one which remains in the womb until full term.[4]

If the eyes of new-born puppies or kittens be destroyed and the visual area of the cortex of the brain be examined some months later, it is found that the cells of that part of the brain have remained undeveloped, retaining the appearance of embryonic cells, and form a striking contrast to those of the same area in animals who have had the opportunity of using their eyes.[5] Analogous appearances are presented by the brains of blind deaf-mutes, such as Laura Bridgman, whose grey matter in the visual and auditory areas was "abnormally thin," the cells being much smaller than normal.[6]

[1] E. Below, "Die Ganglienzellen des Gehirnes bei verschiedenen neugeborenen Thieren," *Archiv für Anatomie und Physiologie* (*Physiologische Abtheilung*), 1888, p. 188.

[2] H. Obersteiner, *Anleitung beim Studium des Baues der nervöse Centralorgane in gesunde und kranke Zustande*, p. 367; J. S. Bolton, "The Histological Basis of Amentia and Dementia," *Archives of Neurology from the Pathological Laboratory of the London County Asylums*, iii, p. 611.

[3] P. Flechsig, *Gehirn und Seele*, p. 20.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 52 sq.

[5] H. Berger, "Beiträge zur feineren Anatomie der Gehirnrinde," *Monatschrift für Psychiatrie und Neurologie*, xviii, pp. 371 sqq.; Id., "Experimentell-anatomische Studien über die durch den Mangel optischer Reize veranlasten Entwicklungshemmungen in Occipitallappen der Hundes und Katzen," *Archiv für Psychiatrie und Nervenkrankheiten*, xxxiii, pp. 521 sqq. The same results have also been obtained by Tanzi and by von Monakow, (C. von Monakow, *Die Lokalisation in Grosshirn und Abbau der Funktionen durch kortikale Herde*, p. 351).

[6] H. H. Donaldson, "Anatomical Observations on the Brain and several Sense-organs of the blind deaf-mute Laura Dewey Bridgman," *American Journal of Psychology*, iv, p. 265.

The increase in weight of the brain after birth in the human infant takes place chiefly in the parietal and frontal portions, the growth of which is much greater than that of the occipital and temporal regions.[1] It is in the former regions that are situated the association centres which appear to be connected with the highest functions of the cerebrum. Those centres are absent in rodents and in ruminants; they are very small in carnivorous mammals; in the monkeys they are equal in development to the sensory centres; in man they are considerably larger than those centres.[2]

The retarding of the rate of growth, the bringing into the world of the young mammal as a helpless being before its full development, makes, then, so far as regards its anatomical structure, but the trifling difference represented by those microscopic filaments in the substance of its brain. But upon those almost impalpable cobwebs a new world of being depends. Let the connections which they effect be completely established in the darkness and seclusion of embryonic development within the womb; the new-born creature is almost as well fitted for life as the parent; it can look after itself, feed, outdistance a man in the race. But that precocious proficiency owes everything to heredity. It has been developed by the animal's ancestry, it is transmitted as a ready-assembled apparatus. In proportion to its perfection, in proportion to the specialisation of its nervous interconnections, it is fixed, rigid, unalterable. That fixity is not absolute, but it is so to a degree that makes the whole difference in the possibilities of the creature's behaviour. Experience can teach it little; it is unamenable to education, to new development; it is a creature of instinct.

Where, on the other hand, the connecting paths along which the inherited impulses of the living organism meet those that reach it from without remain open and unformed after birth, they are not laid down by heredity alone, but by education and experience also. The brain-structure is, to be sure, determined to a large extent by dispositions inherited from a long line of ancestry; but those inherited impulses cannot have it all their own way. Their action is counteracted, deflected, modified by that of the experience which comes pouring in at every second. By that individual tuition the racial determinism of instinct is checked and superseded.

[1] Th. L. W. von Bischoff, *Das Hirngewicht des Menschen*, pp. 104 sqq.

[2] P. Flechsig, *op. cit.*, p. 84; F. W. Mott, "The Progressive Evolution of the structure and functions of the visual cortex in Mammalia," *Archives of Neurology from the Pathological Laboratory of the London County Asylums*, vol. iii, pp. 14 sqq.

Hence it is that in exact proportion as the immaturity of the offspring is prolonged the mammalian animal is superior in intelligence, in power of learning from experience, and of adapting itself by modifications in its behaviour. Our traditional estimate of the comparative intelligence of animals, derived as it is mostly from domesticated forms greatly modified by artificial selection, requires considerable correction.[1] Broadly speaking, the fighting, solitary carnivora stand immeasurably above the herding herbivores in intelligence. The fact shows incidentally how little the so-called gregarious instincts are related to social instincts as a basis for the development of mind. Monkeys and anthropoids stand in intelligence and affective mental development as high above carnivora as the latter are above the ruminants. Among animals the power of imitation exists, according to Dr. Chalmers Mitchell, in the monkeys only. "Notwithstanding the innumerable anecdotes about the intelligence of other animals," he says, "and the great difficulty there is in describing or even thinking over one's personal experience in taming and training animals without slipping into language that implies conscious imitation, I do not think there is any real evidence of it outside the group of monkeys." [2]

If that be so, there is no stronger evidence of the monkey's approximation in mental development to the human faculty than that capacity which even popular observation associates with 'monkey tricks' of imitativeness. For that capacity to imitate, which is in reality a manifestation of a very complex diversity of high mental faculties, constitutes the most important psychical foundation of human development.[3] "In the development of individual human beings," writes Dr. McDougall, "imitation is the great agency through which the child is led on from the life of a mere animal impulse to the life of self-control, deliberation, and true volition. And it has played a similar part in the development of the human race and of human society. Imitation is the prime condition of all collective mental life."[4] That capacity is, in turn, the direct effect of prolonged immaturity and maternal care.

That progressive increase in natal immaturity, in aptitude

[1] See P. Chalmers Mitchell, *op. cit.*, chap. xv. The horse which has fondly been credited with great intelligence is, from a comparative point of view, an exceedingly stupid animal. The 'sagacious' elephant likewise is, compared to any carnivorous animal, decidedly dull.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 253. Dr. Mitchell's admirable discussion of the subject is enhanced by the authority of his unrivalled knowledge and experience.

[3] G. Tarde, *Les lois de l'imitation*; Id., *La logique sociale*, pp. ix. sqq.; W. McDougall, *Introduction to Social Psychology*, pp. 325 sqq.

[4] W. McDougall, *Introduction to Social Psychology*, pp. 326, 327.

to modify natural heredity by imitation and receptiveness to experience and education, marks the evolution that has led up to human conditions and human mentality; prolonged infancy, slow development, reduction of the determinism of natural heredity, are most pronounced in the human race.

A fact that might at first appear paradoxical becomes readily intelligible when the effects of those conditions are apprehended. The similarity to man of his nearest animal congeners, the anthropoid apes, is much more pronounced in the young than in the adult. "The resemblance of the young apes to human children," says Virchow, "is very much greater than that of old apes to full-grown men. Nowhere does this analogy manifest itself more strongly than in the construction of the skull. But with every month and year of life the skull of even the most man-like apes becomes more unlike that of man." [2] "In every respect the young ape stands nearer to the human child than the adult ape does to the adult man," says Vogt.[3] The resemblance between the orang or gorilla and the lower human races assumes a quite different character when a new-born young of one of those apes, or still better a foetus just before birth, is seen. The likeness is so uncanny that one might for a moment be in doubt whether it is the young of an ape or of an Australian native. The shape of the head, the relative size of face and skull, the distribution of the hair, which is confined to the top of the head, the smooth and light-coloured skin, all contribute to the illusion. It might seem strange that the immature ape should be nearer to man, and therefore of a higher type, than the fully developed animal. The subsequent divergence of ape and man corresponds to the differences in the process of maturation. The animal matures much more rapidly amid conditions of animal life, and reproduces more infallibly the ancestral type developed under those conditions;

[1] The paramount effect and importance of the prolongation of infancy was first clearly perceived and enunciated by John Fiske (*Excursions of an Evolutionist*, pp. 306, 319; *Cosmic Philosophy*, vol. ii, pp. 343 sqq.). He appears, however, to have been anticipated in the sixteenth century B.C. by Anaximander. Plutarch gives the following account of the views of the Milesian philosopher on the subject: "Further, he says that in the beginning man was born from animals of some different species. His reason is that, while other animals quickly find food for themselves, man alone requires a prolonged period of suckling. Hence had man been originally such as he is now, he could not have survived" (Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica* i. 82). Cf. Nicholas Murray Butler, "Anaximander on the Prolongation of Infancy," in *Classical Studies in honour of Henry Drisler*, pp. 8 sqq.; E. G. Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophy*, p. 74.

[2] R. Virchow, *Menschen- und Affenschädel*, p. 22.

[3] Cited by H. Hartmann, *The Anthropoid Apes*, p. 301.

the human infant matures much more slowly amid human conditions and under the influence of a social and human heredity. In the latter the opportunities of modifying the determining power of natural heredity before its results become fixed are much greater than in the former.

The same relative differences in the rapidity of maturation which obtain between man and the apes are also manifested in the higher as compared with the lower races of man. Savage children develop much more quickly and are far more precocious than the children of European races; and, on the other hand, their development being completed earlier, they are less capable of further modification and progress. The phenomenon is well known. "The children of savage races," writes Dr. Schurtz, "mature much more rapidly and lose their childish character much earlier than do European children."[1] And Dr. Havelock Ellis remarks: "It is an interesting fact, and perhaps of some significance, that among primitive races in all parts of the world, the children, at an early age, are very precocious in intelligence. . . . It seems that, the lower the race, the more marked is the precocity and its arrest at puberty."[2] For example, children among the Baholoholo of the Congo know how to paddle a canoe and how to catch a fox "at an age when civilised children are still in the arms of their nurses."[3] In Nigeria, among the Habbe, children of six or eight leave their parental home, build a hut, and provide for themselves by fishing and hunting.[4] In East Africa children four years old "show an independence which is astounding."[5] Among the Aleuts, children of ten have already become hunters and not infrequently keep a wife.[6] At the same age a child among the Omahas has already learnt all that his father knows as a hunter and warrior;[7] Chiriguano children of seven or ten go to war and on hunting expeditions with their fathers.[8] Among all aboriginal American races "the native instincts are exhibited in their young at a wonderfully tender

[1] H. Schurtz, *Urgeschichte der Kultur*, pp. 65 sq.

[2] H. H. Ellis, *Man and Woman*, p. 177.

[3] R. Schmitz, *Les Baholoholo*, p. 151.

[4] A. M. L. Desplagnes, *Le plateau central nigérien*, p. 235.

[5] K. Weule, "Aus dem ostafrikanischen Kinderleben," *Westermanns illustrierte deutsche Monats-Hefte*, lxxxv, p. 648. Cf. P. Reichard, "Die Wanjamuesi," *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin*, xxiv, p. 258; D. Macdonald, *Africana*, vol. i, pp. 119 sq.; S. Watt, *In the Heart of Savagedom*, p. 237.

[6] I. Petroff, "Report on the Population, etc., of Alaska," *Tenth Census of the United States*, vol. viii, p. 158.

[7] E. James, *Account of an Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains*, vol. i, p. 220.

[8] A. Thouar, *Explorations dans l'Amérique du Sud*, p. 48.

age, and in this particular they differ vastly from our own children at a corresponding time of life, and, reared as they have been for ages, in a civilised environment," says Dr. Shufeldt. He describes the antics of a Navaho child "not over ten months old" who objected to have his photograph taken. The brat hid behind bushes, crouched down, ran from cover to cover, "taking advantage of everything that lay in the short intervening distance," and "looked for all the world the young Indian cub at bay, with all the native instincts of his ancestors on the alert and making use of every stratagem."[1] Among the Kirghis a child of three can already ride a horse, and at six he takes charge of a herd of camels.[2] Among the Chevsurs young children behave like grown men and join quite naturally in the conversation of their elders.[3] The like precocity is reported of the Malays,[4] the Polynesians,[5] the Australians.[6]

We have already had occasion to note that savage precocity in reference to the acquisition of school-education; young children of savage races are not only equal, but actually superior to European children of the same age in their capacity for learning. There is, however, another aspect to that aptitude; it lasts only until the age of puberty; after the age of about twelve it rapidly diminishes, or rather stops suddenly, and while the European child develops then his best powers and goes on improving, the savage becomes, by comparison, dull and shows no desire or no capacity to learn more. The Abbé Borghéro, whom I quoted as bearing witness to the more rapid progress shown by young negroes than by European children, goes on to say: "The black children, however, soon come to a standstill in this ardent precociousness; and while the European children continue to learn and add each day something to their store of knowledge, our negroes remain stationary."[7] So likewise Captain Binger, who speaks of the astonishing intelligence and aptitude of the young children of the Coast of Guinea, adds: "Unfortunately all mental development ceases as soon as sexual maturity is reached. This complete standstill is most pronounced; not only does the intellect of the child cease to develop, but it might be said that it retrogresses;

[1] R. W. Shufeldt, "Notes on Certain Traits of Infant Navajos," *Nature*, xxxv, pp. 346 sq.

[2] H. Vámbéry, *Das Türkenvolk*, pp. 218, 224.

[3] G. Radde, *Die Chewsúren und ihr Land*, p. 85.

[4] A. L. van Hasselt, *Volksbeschrijving van Midden-Sumatra*, p. 276.

[5] W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, vol. ii, p. 262; vol. iii, p. 205.

[6] W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 36 sqq.; K. L. Parker, *The Euahlayi Tribe*, pp. 61 sq.

[7] Abbé Borghéro, in *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi*, xxxvii, p. 97.

the memory becomes impaired. He becomes as stupid, mistrustful, vain, deceitful as he was formerly intelligent."[1] Of the Fanti, Lord Wolseley says: "The boy is far brighter, quicker, and cleverer than the man. You can apparently teach the boy anything until he reaches puberty; then he becomes duller and more stupid, more lazy and more useless every day."[2] Among the Gallas, according to Father Martial, children are remarkable for their bright intelligence, but after the age of about fifteen they become complacently self-conceited and learn nothing.[3] "In the European the higher faculties go on developing throughout life, whereas in the case of the Kaffirs the development of the higher nature is arrested soon after puberty as a rule."[4] The same arrest of mental and intellectual development after puberty has been observed among American races, as, for instance, by Spencer among the Pueblo Indians.[5] It has been noted that among the Cambodians children are extremely intelligent, but "after the age of about fifteen their mind becomes, if not stationary, at least much duller. A shadow seems to settle over their intellect, and at the same time their features from being pure become coarse and deformed."[6] In Java "it is remarkable," says Herr Metzger, "what good and attentive pupils the natives make, especially in their younger years; but, on the other hand, it is no less evident that they deteriorate and become dull in later youth."[7] In Melanesia "a boy of fourteen or fifteen is already a fully-grown man in his manner and behaviour. At that age his whole training and education, as far as they go, are completed; what he has not already learnt he will never learn later, when his whole attention and activity have become engaged in providing for the daily needs of life. It is not an unusual experience that boys who in their younger years were remarkable for the brightness of their intelligence, appear dull by comparison in later years. It is often observed in the schools established by missionaries that children from twelve to fourteen learn easily and rapidly; but with the appearance of puberty they suddenly fall off and no longer maintain their progress."[8] So likewise among the Papuans of New Guinea,

[1] L. G. Binger, *Du Niger au golfe de Guinée*, vol. ii, p. 246.

[2] R. P. Martial de Salviac, *Un peuple antique, ou une colonie gauloise au pays de Ménélik; Les Galla*, p. 254.

[3] Quoted by H. H. Ellis, *Man and Woman*, p. 178.

[4] D. Kidd, *Savage Childhood*, p. 119.

[5] F. C. Spencer, "The Education of Pueblo Children," *Columbia University Contributions*, vii, Part 1 (1899), p. 97.

[6] A. Leclére, "Moeurs et coutumes des Cambodgiens," *Revue Scientifique*, li, p. 67.

[7] E. Metzger, "Herrscher und Beherrschte auf Java," *Globus*, lvi, p. 9.

[8] R. Parkinson, *Dreissig Jahre in der Südsee*, p. 73.

"the rapid progress of the children in knowledge and education decreases rapidly at puberty, and something like an ossification of the mind sets in."[1]

With the precocious mental development and early arrest at puberty in savage races are associated anatomical characters, in particular the early closing of the sutures of the skull, and the consequent arrest in its development. In the same manner as the skulls of young anthropoids are more man-like than those of adults, so also the skulls of children of the lower races do not show the same contrast and the same racial differences when compared with those of Europeans at a corresponding age, as do the skulls of full-grown individuals.[2]

It would appear that the congenital superiority of what are regarded as the higher races of man consists essentially in a slower rate of development, owing to which the fixative force of natural heredity is counteracted by a more prolonged modifying operation of the social environment and of traditional heredity, the powers of variation, of initiative and progress being in consequence greatly increased. The physical characters of those races would themselves seem to show the persistence of a more infantile type. The lack of pigmentation which is characteristic of them, and is exceptional in the animal kingdom, is an embryonic character; the light skin, the fair hair and blue eyes of the northern peoples whose restless energy and initiative have disturbed the world, are abnormalities in adult animals and men, but are the rule in the undeveloped foetus of darker races.

That slower development is rendered possible, and is perhaps directly caused, by prolonged relief from the necessity of providing for subsistence and self-protection. The immature lower mammal, the immature ape, the immature human infant, savage or civilised, are each in varying degrees, increasing in the order of evolutionary advance, enabled to develop under the influence of actual experience, and not of fixed and unmodified natural heredity, while at the same time they are not, like the larvae of primitive vertebrates, called upon to face the world and the struggle for existence while not as yet fully developed. They are shielded

[1] R. Neuhauss, *Deutsch Neu-Guinea*, vol. i, p. 112. Similar remarks have been made in reference to the Polynesians (F. Walpole, *Four Years in the Pacific*, vol. ii, p. 264) and the Australian aborigines (J. Mathew, "The Australian Aborigines," *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales*, xxiii, p. 386). Cf. A. L. Chamberlain, "Entwicklungshemmung des Kindes," *Zeitschrift für pädagogische Psychologie*, ii (1900), pp. 303 sqq.; E. Franke, *Die geistige Entwicklung der Negerkinder*, pp. 131 sqq.

[2] C. Vogt, *Vorlesungen über den Menschen*, pp. 239 sq.; A. B. Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, pp. 9 sq.; A. H. Keane, *Ethnology*, pp. 44 sq.; F. Manetta, *La razza negra nel suo stato selvaggio*, p. 20; E. Franke, *Die geistige Entwicklung der Negerkinder*, pp. 116 sqq.

during that process of leisurely growth and education, first by the physiological provisions of the maternal organism, later by the protecting instincts that brood over them, by mother-care.

The Maternal Instinct.

The maternal provisions for the successful growth of the offspring which take the form of physiological adaptations, manifest themselves likewise in more or less elaborate instincts and as a feeling, an emotion which will develop into love. Not only is the line of demarcation between structure and function arbitrary, but so also is that which we draw between 'physiological' and 'psychological' phenomena. An impulse, a disposition tending towards its satisfaction, may produce a modification of physiological action involving corresponding structural changes, or manifest itself as an emotion, an affective value with which the objects appropriate to the satisfaction of that impulse are invested. The mother's protection of her offspring may take place while the latter is lying in a nest or gambolling about her, or while it is developing within her body.

In its rudimentary forms, and indeed throughout the larger portion of the animal kingdom, the mode of operation of the maternal instinct is conspicuously physiological. Rabaud has shown that with female mice interest in young of the species does not make its appearance until the end of gestation; unimpregnated females take no notice whatever of young mice, and it is not until the later days of pregnancy that they will sniff at young which are presented to them, lick them, and endeavour to carry them away. The manifestations of the instinct, which are strongly marked, cease altogether about six weeks after the birth of the young.[1] Loisel has reported interesting observations on a virgin bitch in which periodical menstruation was pronounced, and which developed a secretion of milk at the time. During those periods she was extremely restless, and searched everywhere as if seeking something. When presented with a litter of young rabbits, she was entirely satisfied, licked and fondled them, and lavished maternal solicitude on the brood. The phenomena passed off with the period of ovulation.[2] Among the lower vertebrates the primitive maternal devices, such as brood-sacks or superficial recesses, for the protection of the brood, are fre-

[1] E. Rabaud, "L'instinct maternel chez les mammifères," *Bulletin de la Société de Zoologie*, xlvi, p. 74.

[2] G. Loisel, "Relations entre les phénomènes du rut, de la lactation, de la mue et de l'amour maternel chez une chienne hybride," *Comptes rendus de la Société de Biologie*, 1906, pp. 255 sqq.

quently appropriated by parasites which avail themselves of the provisions intended for the offspring of the animal. But the behaviour of the mother-organism towards the intruder that has turned out the brood or cheated it of maternal care is the same as towards its offspring. A female crab, if the maturing larvae which are attached to its appendages are touched, will bristle with anger and prepare for attack. The behaviour, Dr. Giard remarks, would afford excellent scope for an eloquent tirade on maternal anxiety and devotion; but the mother-crab behaves in precisely the same manner if the brood-stalks are appropriated by noxious parasites.[1] The reactions of the maternal instinct in most animals take place, it has been pointed out, in response to gross physical stimuli. Suckling is sought by the female as a relief to uncomfortable tension in the mammary glands, and maternal care ceases when the glands become depleted. Brooding by birds takes place in relation to the exhaustion and pyrexia resulting from laying and to irritative congestion of the abdominal wall. In birds that are not good sitters the defect may be remedied by rubbing their abdominal skin with nettles.[2]

When we speak of maternal 'love,' maternal 'care' and 'devotion' in the lower animals, we are translating the phenomena of behaviour in terms of the conceptual sentiments known to us. "All animal behaviour," observes a distinguished poet, "must, to be understood, be divested of the sentimental qualifications with which it has been clothed by an ignorant humanity corrupted by providential fatalism."[3] There is, however, nothing singular in the fact that the maternal instinct has purely physiological foundations, and is ultimately dependent upon certain chemical conditions of given organs. The same is true of all feelings and sentiments. Our most exalted and refined conceptual emotions have developed out of 'physical' feelings of pleasantness and unpleasantness. Their operation as moulders of behaviour is independent of any perception of their tendency, or 'purpose.' That the maternal feelings of animals cannot be accurately compared to the exalted conceptual associations comprised in the human emotion of love is, after all, irrelevant. We say that the responses of the hen, of the ewe to certain physiological conditions are manifestations of maternal love because they are manifestations of the impulses which, in their continued operation and development, will become human feelings and conceptual sentiments of maternal love.

[1] A. Giard, "Les origines de l'amour maternel," *Oeuvres diverses*, vol. i, pp. 215 sq.

[2] A. Giard, *op. cit.*, pp. 226 sq., 230.

[3] R. de Gourmont, *Physique de l'amour; essai sur l'instinct sexuel*, p. 160.

The maternal instinct develops in strict relation to conditions in which it can operate usefully. That it is a product of evolution, and not a primary impulse of life, is pointedly indicated by the fact, among many others, that it requires an appreciable time to develop fully in the individual mother. The same female animals that will offer their lives in defence of their young will quite commonly eat them when they are new-born. Mammalian females usually dispose of the after-birth by eating it, which is said to promote the secretion of milk; and it is not unusual for them to eat their way up the umbilical cord, and to proceed to eat the young which is attached to it.[1] It has been observed that carnivorous mothers are prone to eat their young whenever they are disturbed or frightened. Sows commonly devour their young "because their owners have handled them too freely, or removed them from place to place," and "the more gentle race of dogs and cats are guilty of this horrid and preposterous murder."[2] The reindeer is said to kill invariably its second fawn.[3] In the human mother herself maternal affection requires to be elicited by experience. Apart from the influences of traditional and cultivated sentiment, the first instinctive and spontaneous reaction of the young mother at the sight of her newly born infant, which does not present a particularly attractive appearance, is one of revulsion. It is not an uncommon experience of obstetricians to see the mother in those circumstances turn from her offspring with a shudder and refuse to look at it. "It is not strange," writes an acute observer, "that if the mother has not followed Froebel's exhortations and come to love her child before birth, there is a brief interval occasionally dangerous to the child before the maternal instinct is fully aroused."[4] At that moment infanticide is common among both savage and civilised mothers, whereas a little later it would be difficult or impossible. The death of an infant at birth generally leaves the mother, except for the disappointment of the generalised desire for offspring, comparatively indifferent. It is a psychological necessity that love, which consists of affective associations, should require to form those associations before it can exist. Although desire and sexual attraction may prelude affection, there can in reality be no such thing as 'love at first sight.'

[1] J. Tur, "Observations sur la perversion de l'instinct maternel," *Bulletin Scientifique de la France et de la Belgique*, xliii, pp. 477 sqq.; E. Rabaud, 'L'instinct maternel chez les mammifères," *Bulletin de la Société de Zoologie*, xlvi, p. 77; C. Féré, "Sur la psychologie de l'infanticide chez les animaux," *Comptes Rendus de la Société de Biologie*, 1897, pp. 669 sqq.

[2] G. White, *The Natural History of Selborne*, Letter lii.

[3] E. T. Seton, *Life Histories of Northern Animals*, p. 205.

[4] M. W. Shinn, *The Biography of a Baby*, p. 20.

How slowly, precariously, adventitiously the maternal instincts have developed in the long course of organic evolution, how gradually the operation of reproductive impulses has been transformed and transferred from purely organic provisions to care and concern for the eggs and the brood, from physiological to psychological manifestations, may be gauged by the fact that out of some 2,600 existing species of reptiles not half a dozen—one or two crocodiles and a couple of snakes—devote any attention to their young, either before or after hatching. Yet reptiles are the immediate ancestors of the birds who are traditional types of parental care.

The maternal care of birds varies, as already noted, according to the requirements arising from the precocious or immature condition of the offspring; it reaches its highest development in birds of prey, which have not only to make greater provision for the feeding of their young, but must needs also bestow upon them a more prolonged and elaborate education. Maternal care and affection is in birds very ephemeral. As soon as the young have attained a stage of independence the attitude of the parents towards their offspring, from one "of unceasing solicitude suddenly changes to one of open hostility. As on a foe they turn on the children they have so long and faithfully nurtured, and drive them forth from the neighbourhood for ever." [1] In migratory birds the instinct which impels them to migrate is more powerful than the maternal instinct. Swallows and house-martins, urged in the autumn by the migratory instinct, frequently abandon their nestlings and leave them to perish.[2]

Among mammals maternal care is likewise strictly limited in duration, though more prolonged in some species than in birds. "No animal regards previous offspring after the birth of fresh young ones." [3] The young, especially among the herbivores, is repulsed by the mother when lactation is no longer necessary, and is henceforth treated as a stranger. It does not appear to be even recognised. Broadly speaking the maternal instincts among herbivorous animals are limited to pre-natal care and, especially among browsing species, to the first few days, during which the young is hidden in a suitable place and the mother visits it at regular intervals for the purpose of suckling. Defence of the offspring has been observed in the ox tribe only. Among carnivores, on the contrary, passionate solicitude and fierce

[1] W. P. Pycraft, *The Infancy of Animals*, p. 72.

[2] C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, vol. i, p. 84.

[3] J. Stevenson-Hamilton, *Animal Life in Africa*, p. 167. The rule does not appear to apply to the higher apes, among which females have several times been noted to be accompanied by young of widely different ages.

defence of the brood is the rule. Great variations are, however, observed. Among seals, for instance, "the apathy with which the young are treated by the old on the breeding-grounds is somewhat strange. I have never," says Mr. J. A. Allen, "seen a cow caress or fondle her offspring, and should it stray but a short distance from the harem, it can be picked up and killed before the mother's eyes without causing her to show the slightest concern."[1] When returning from a fishing expedition to the breeding-ground, the cow-seal will call her pups by bleating after the manner of a ewe, and will recognise her calf at once by its answering voice among scores of others; but if no answer comes, the young being asleep or having strayed, she quietly curls herself up to sleep and shows no concern.[2] The walrus mother, on the contrary, will fight to the death in defence of her young.[3] Among whales maternal solicitude is invariably intense and heroic. "The female Right Whale exhibits extraordinary maternal affection when her young one is attacked, and in every work on whale-fishery there are numerous instances of the parent sacrificing her life while protecting her young."[4] "The cub, being insensible to danger, is easily harpooned, when the attachment of the mother is so manifested as to bring it almost certainly within reach of the whaler. Hence, though the cub is of little value, it is often struck as a snare for the mother."'[5] Although rodents, which rapidly reach maturity, are driven away by their parents very soon after they are born, the maternal instinct appears to be quite lively during the short period that it lasts. It is related that a nest of young mice together with their mother having been laid bare during the demolition of a house, and the whole family being picked up with a shovel, the mother did not stir, thus showing a heroism equal to any produced by the maternal instinct.[6] Of elephants, on the other hand, among which the association between mother and young lasts a year and more, it is said that "the female elephant evinces no peculiar attachment to her offspring."[7]

Among the monkeys and apes the intense and consistently uniform manifestations of maternal instinct are such as to constitute a contrast between them and all other mammals greater almost than any difference in form or structure. 'Monkey-

[1] J. A. Allen, *History of North-American Pinnipeds*, p. 360.

[2] H. W. Elliot, "Report on the Seal Islands of Alaska," *Tenth United States Census*, 1884, vol. viii, p. 39.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 97 n.

[4] J. G. Millais, *Mammals of Great Britain and Ireland*, vol. iii, p. 230.

[5] A. W. Scott, *Seals, Dugongs, Whales*, pp. 133 sq.

[6] L. Büchner, *Liebe und Liebesleben in der Thierwelt*, p. 151.

[7] G. P. Sanderson, *Thirteen Years among the Wild Beasts of India*, p. 61.

love,' 'Affenliebe,' is a common expression in German for doting maternal fondness, and pages could be filled with descriptions of its manifestations. The tense and watchful anxiety of the mother monkey, and the pathetic gravity with which she will sit for hours contemplating her offspring, have often been noted. Baboon mothers take their young to a stream to wash them, and Rengger watched a Cebus carefully driving away the flies which plagued its infant.[1] "So intense is the grief of female monkeys for the loss of their young that it invariably caused the death of certain kinds kept under confinement by Brehm in North Africa."[2] "The affection of the mother monkey for her baby," says Mr. Fitzsimons, "is so great that it dominates her completely. When danger threatens she quite forgets herself in her anxiety for the safety of her helpless offspring. I was with a Dutch farmer in Natal one day when we happened to surprise some monkeys in the orchard. They sprang in haste to the ground, and made off to the adjacent thorny thicket. The dogs gave chase, and a female with a rather heavy youngster in her arms, could not keep pace with the rest, and, realising that it was impossible to reach the safety of the thicket in time, sprang up an isolated tree, and in a moment the dogs were howling at her from below. I tried to dissuade my friend from shooting her, but he was so exasperated by the damage wrought by these monkeys from time to time that he raised his gun and fired. Seeing him in the act of firing, the mother monkey swung round, placing her body between the gun and her child. She received the charge of shot in her back, and came tumbling down through the branches, clutching vainly at them as she fell. We drove off the dogs, and turning to observe her we noticed that she was cowering over her young one, still seeking to protect it with her body. Hugging her baby tight to her breast, she regarded us with a world of sadness in her eyes. . . . We forgot for the moment that she was but a monkey, for her actions and expressions were so human that we felt we had committed a crime."[3] There are a number of almost exactly similar accounts of the manner in which the female monkeys of various species invariably sacrifice their life for their offspring, and endeavour till the last moment to protect it.[4] A Cebus monkey, after all the troop had taken flight, returned at the call of her young, and succumbed after

[1] J. R. Rengger, *Naturgeschichte der Saügethiere von Paraguay*, pp. 41, 57.

[2] C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, vol. i, p. 40.

[3] F. W. Fitzsimons, *The Natural History of South Africa*, vol. i, p. 16 sq. Cf. pp. 7 sq.

[4] E.g.: A. E. Brehm, *Thierleben*, vol. i, p. 106; E. Pöppig, *Reise in Chili, Peru und auf dem Amazonenstrome*, vol. ii, p. 236; J. R. Rengger, *Naturgeschichte der Saügethiere von Paraguay*, p. 42.

three attempts to rescue it.[1] The females of carnivores, such as lionesses and tigresses, fierce as they can be in the defence of their young, will occasionally abandon them, and once the cubs are abandoned they are seldom sought by the mother.[2] When starving, tigresses have even been known to kill and eat their young.[3] No instance of any similar behaviour is known among monkeys. The development of maternal love is with them, beyond all comparison, greater.

Both the physiological provisions, then, by which gestation is prolonged, maturity delayed, the operation of individual experience and social education substituted in a large measure for that of inherited instinct, and the psychological transformation of the maternal functions into maternal love, attain in the primates a higher development than in any other animal forms. The momentous effects of those factors are not confined to the powers of the psychological apparatus, to the means of cognition, to intelligence. Not those instruments only, but the very springs of action and behaviour, are transformed by the new relations that are established by the protracted tutelage of mother-care. That prolonged individual education is not only the supreme factor of mental development, but, owing to the nature of the means by which it is effected, the sentiment of maternal affection, it constitutes a new psychological development by which the individual mind is linked up with others to form a new organism, the group bound by social ties. It is, in fact, through that process that the social products of evolution have become superimposed upon the biologically inherited animal mind, and that mind has become human.

[1] L. Büchner, *Liebe und Liebesleben in der Thierwelt*, p. 161, after Schomburgk. Cf. D. Wilson, *Anecdotes of Big Cats and other Beasts*, p. 196.

[2] A. F. Pease, *The Book of the Lion*, pp. 142 sq.

[3] R. Lyddeker, *A Hand-book to the Carnivora*, Part i, p. 52.

CHAPTER IV

THE ORIGIN OF LOVE

Sexual Hunger and Cruelty.

IT has been almost universally assumed that feelings of tenderness and affection are part and parcel of the attraction between the sexes. That attraction is commonly spoken of as 'love,' and the sentiment is identified with the sexual impulse. Sexual attraction throughout the animal kingdom, and even in the vegetable kingdom, is loosely spoken of as a manifestation of love; and love comes hence to be regarded as almost a 'primordial quality of protoplasm.' We say, quoting Schiller, that life is ruled by Hunger and Love. Scientific writers vie with the poets in describing Nature as pervaded with a hymn of love.[1] The term is even extended to include molecular attractions. The apostle of materialism, Büchner, adopts the language of Empedocles, who described atoms as actuated in their attractions and repulsions by love and hate. "Just as man and woman attract one another," says the German philosophical writer, "so oxygen attracts hydrogen, and in loving union with it forms water. Potassium and phosphorus entertain such a violent passion for oxygen that even under water they burn, that is, unite themselves with the beloved object." "It is love," he says again, "in the form of attraction which chains stone to stone, earth to earth, star to star, and which holds together the mighty edifice on which we stand."[2] Robert Burton, inspiring himself from Leo the Jew, used similar language. "How comes a lodestone," he says, "to draw iron? the ground to covet showers, but for love? No stock, no stone that has not some feeling of love."[3] The 'primordial quality of protoplasm' is thus extended to the entire Universe, and we speak of it as moved by love, "the most ancient of the gods"[4]—"L'amor che muove il sole e l'altre stelle."[5]

[1] P. Mantegazza, *Fisiologia del'amore*, p. 21.
[2] L. Büchner, *Liebe und Liebesleben in der Thierwelt*, pp. 1, 11.
[3] R. Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, Part iii, sec. i.
[4] Plato, *Symposium*, vi.
[5] Dante, *Paradiso*, xxxiii. 145.

Those widely current modes of speech and of thought are founded on a profound misconception of biological facts. The attraction between the sexes is not primarily or generally associated with the order of feelings which we denote as 'tender feelings,' affection, love. These have developed comparatively late in the course of organic evolution, and have arisen in relation to entirely different functions. The primitive, and by far the most prevalent, association of the sexual impulse is not with love, but with the opposite feelings of callous cruelty and delight in the infliction and the spectacle of pain.

Neither love nor hatred, kindness nor cruelty is connected with the fundamental impulses that move living things any more than with chemical reactions. The pain and suffering of another individual is primordially neither pleasant nor unpleasant, but indifferent. The trend of animal evolution has, however, been to make the spectacle of suffering an object of pleasant and gratifying feeling. Animals are preying beings; the perception of a mangled, bleeding, or of a suffering, weak, and helpless creature means to the universal disposition of animal life a prey, food. That the suffering animal belongs to the same species, or is a close associate, makes no difference. All carnivorous animals and rodents are cannibalistic. Lions and tigers, which furnish favourite examples of mating among carnivora, commonly kill and devour their mates. Andersson describes how a lion, having quarrelled with a lioness over the carcass of a springbok, "after killing his wife, had coolly eaten her also," and the same thing has been reported by other observers.[1] A female leopard which had been wounded, but had got away, was found a few days later with her hind-quarters half eaten by her mate.[2] Half-grown tiger cubs, orphaned by their mother being killed, are attacked and eaten by their father.[3] A jaguar in the Zoological Gardens at New York, to whom it was desired to give a female companion, showed every sign of delight and of extreme fondness for her while she was safely kept in an adjacent cage in order to habituate the animals to one another's company; the male jaguar purred, licked the female's paws, and behaved like the most love-sick admirer. When at last the partition between the cages was removed and the male was united with the object of his affection, his first act was to seize her by the throat and kill her.[4] The same thing happened when a female

[1] C. J. Andersson, *Lake Ngami*, p. 311; F. W. Fitzsimons, *The Natural History of South Africa*, vol. i, p. 113.

[2] R. Lyddeker, *A Hand-book to the Carnivora*, Part i, p. 85.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 53.

[4] W. T. Hornaday, *The Mind and Manners of Wild Animals*, p. 290.

was introduced to a grizzly bear.[1] The danger of allowing the sexes to associate is a commonplace in menageries. Wolves commonly kill and eat their mates.[2] Male mice have been observed to kill their females and eat them for no apparent reason.[3] It is a rule with herding animals that any sick or wounded individual is driven from the herd, or gored and worried to death.[4]

Sexual attraction, sexual 'hunger,' as it has been aptly called, is a form of voracity. The object of the male cell in seeking conjunction with the female cell is primarily to improve its nutrition, in the same manner, and by virtue of the same fundamental impulse, as it seeks food. The female does not in the primitive forms of life seek or desire the male; but with the establishment of sexual reproduction she also requires the male as a substance necessary to her reproductive growth and nutrition, as an object of assimilation. And in the same manner as the ovum cell assimilates the sperm-cell, so in some forms of life, such as the rotifers and spiders, the female devours and assimilates the male.

With both the male and the female, 'love,' or sexual attraction, is originally and preeminently 'sadic'; it is positively gratified by the infliction of pain; it is as cruel as hunger. That is the direct, fundamental, and longest established sentiment connected with the sexual impulse. The male animal captures, mauls and bites the female, who in turn uses her teeth and claws freely, and the 'lovers' issue from the sexual combat bleeding and mangled. Crustaceans usually loose a limb or two in the encounter.[5] All mammals without exception use their teeth on these occasions.[6] Pallas describes the mating of camels: as soon as impregnation has taken place, the female, with a vicious snarl, turns round and attacks the male with her teeth, and the latter is driven away in terror.[7] Rengger remarks that the sexual union of a pair of jaguars must be a formidable conflict, for he found the forest devastated and strewn with broken branches over an area of a hundred feet where the fierce 'love-making' had taken place.[8] The congress of the sexes is assimilated by the impulse to hurt, to shed blood, to kill, to the encounter between a beast of prey and its victim, and all distinction between the two is not infrequently lost. It would be more accurate to speak of the sexual impulse as pervading nature with a yell of cruelty than with a

[1] W. T. Hornaday, *The Mind and Manners of Wild Animals*, pp. 293 sq.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 283.
[3] E. T. Seton, *Life Histories of Northern Animals*, pp. 563 sq.
[4] C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, vol. i, p. 76.
[5] R. Müller, *Sexual-Biologie*, p. 52. [6] *Ibid.*
[7] P. S. Pallas, *Voyages en différentes provinces de l'Empire de Russie*, vol. i, p. 624.
[8] J. R. Rengger, *Naturgeschichte der Säugethiere von Paraguay*, p. 172.

hymn of love. The circumspection which is exhibited by many animal females in yielding to the male, the haste which is shown by most to separate as soon as impregnation has taken place, would appear to be due in a large measure to the danger attending such relations rather than to 'coyness.'

So fundamental and firmly established is the association between the sexual impulse and cruelty that, as is well known, manifestations of it frequently break out, and are perhaps never wholly absent, in humanity itself.[1] According to M. d'Enjoy, the kiss has developed out of the love-bite.[2] In many parts of Europe women are not convinced of their lover's or husband's affection unless their own bodies bear the visible marks of it in the form of impressions from their teeth. Mr. Savage Landor relates a little love-affair he had with a young Ainu woman. As is the custom with those primitive peoples, the young lady did most of the wooing. "I would not have mentioned the small episode," says Mr. Landor, "if her ways of flirting had not been so extraordinary and funny. Loving and biting went together with her. She could not do the one without doing the other. As we sat on a stone in the semi-darkness she began by gently biting my fingers, without hurting me, as affectionate dogs often do to their masters; she then bit my arm, then my shoulder, and when she had worked herself up into a passion she put her arms round my neck and bit my cheek." The young traveller had to cut the affair short; he was bitten all over.[3] Among the Migrelians of Transcaucasia the betrothal of a girl is sealed by her lover firmly biting her breast.[4] Among the ancient Egyptians the word which is translated by Egyptologists as "to kiss" meant "to eat."[5] The desire expressed by lovers to 'eat' the object of their affection probably contains more sinister biological reminiscences than they are aware.[6]

[1] Cf. H. H. Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, vol. iii, pp. 69 sqq.; I. Bloch, *The Sexual Life of Our Time*, pp. 559 sqq.

[2] P. d'Enjoy, "Le baiser en Europe et en Chine," *Bulletin de la Société d'Anthropologie*, IVe Série, vii, pp. 181 sqq. Cf. H. H. Ellis, *op. cit.*, vol. iii, p. 71.

[3] A. H. Savage Landor, *Alone with the Hairy Ainu*, p. 141.

[4] A. F. Chamberlain, *The Child*, p. 259.

[5] E. Révillout, *L'ancienne Égypte d'après les papyrus et les monuments*, vol. ii, p. 48.

[6] The association between love and eating or injuring is, it seems to me, one of those primal and basic biological associations, of which there are many examples, which persist throughout all transformations and evolutions of the sentiment. Liking, or judging a thing to be 'good,' is throughout the greater part of the biological scale equivalent to regarding it as 'good to eat.' All other forms of attraction, of desire, are derivatives of that primary value. That fundamental value is never entirely obliterated. With the infant any

The Mating Instinct.

Sentiments of tenderness and affection between the sexes are not originally connected with the sexual impulse, but with an entirely different instinct, the mating instinct. The utmost confusion has resulted from failing to draw any distinction between the two. They have different origins and fulfil different functions. The operation of the sexual impulse does not demand anything beyond the performance of the sexual act; mating, or association between the sexes, is a special adaptation to the reproductive functions of the female. With the extension of maternal care the female is placed in a position of disadvantage as regards self-protection, and the procuring of food. When thus handicapped it becomes desirable, and even necessary, that she should obtain the cooperation and assistance of the male. The mating instinct, where the female is thus handicapped, comes into operation in both sexes during the period that maternal care is beneficial. The merely physical, and even cruel, impulse leading to impregnation has received, in exact correlation to the prolongation of care for the eggs and offspring, the superadded element of a transferred maternal tenderness leading to the association of the sexes during a longer or shorter period, to mating, instead of momentary congress ending in impregnation. That is more particularly the case where the eggs are hatched by brooding.

object which attracts, is 'liked,' admired, as for its brilliancy and colour, is grasped, if possible, and at once carried to the mouth. The tendency of children to tear and destroy anything which they particularly cherish and admire is probably connected with the same primary value of the desired thing as a prey. The prominent disposition of animal females to devour their young appears to be also a primitive confusion of the object of maternal solicitude with something good to eat; the maternal instinct is not so fully dissociated from the undifferentiated biological form of love as to exclude an occasional reversion to that older value. The female licks, bites, mauls its young; she may proceed to eat them. Her refraining from doing so is an inhibition of the more primitive forms of the sentiment of attraction. So with sexual love. We need not go beyond the primal undifferentiated assimilation of every desired and beloved object with a prey to be torn, killed, devoured, to account for the association of violence and cruelty with sexual love. The jaguar mentioned above licked and fondled the female which he took the first opportunity of killing and devouring. We need not suppose, as does Dr. Hornaday, that those manifestations of affection were hypocritical. They were, in all probability, normal manifestations of attraction, desire, 'love.' The killing and devouring of their sexual mates by confined animals is but the reversion of pent-up sexual desire to undifferentiated biological 'desire.' It appears probable that the same element enters largely in murders through 'jealousy.' The 'jealousy' affords, as it were, a pretext for the outburst of the primary violence and homicidal tendency of 'love.'

The cooperation of the male while the female is sitting on the eggs is almost a necessity to provide for her sustenance and protection. Among the majority of nidicolous birds the mating instinct has accordingly attained to a degree of development unparalleled in any other class of the animal kingdom. The mating instinct of birds is strictly confined to those species which hatch their eggs by prolonged brooding; where no brooding takes place there is no mating. "There is no necessity for birds to pair, in the usual sense of the word, when they do not tend their young." [1]

Among mammals the conditions are different. Although the pregnant and suckling female is at a certain disadvantage in the material struggle, she is able to fulfil her functions unaided. That cooperation which has led to the marked development of the mating instinct among nidicolous birds is accordingly not conspicuous among mammals.

With a large proportion of mammalian species the association between the male and the female does not extend beyond the primary purpose for which the sexes come together—the fecundation of the female. After that function is fulfilled there appears to be, as a general rule, an actual repulsion between the sexes. "As soon as pairing is over," says Brehm, speaking of mammals generally, "great indifference is shown towards one another by the sexes." [2] Of antelopes Mr. Seton says: "The separation of the sexes seems to be due to an instinctive dislike of each other as the time approaches for the young to be born. It becomes yet stronger as the hour draws near. At that time each female strives to be utterly alone." [3] This applies almost universally to herbivora. Among reindeer "the prospective mother goes entirely alone, avoiding her own kind even as she avoids man." [4] During their migrations the cows and the bulls of the American reindeer keep in separate herds.[5] With the elk, and in fact all the deer and antelope tribe, the same rule obtains.[6] Among buffaloes "as September wanes the males lose interest in their partners, the clan becomes divided, the males in one herd and the females in another. Their lives go on as before, but they meet and pass without mix-

[1] E. Chance, *The Cuckoo's Secret*, p. 236.

[2] A. E. Brehm, *Thierleben*, vol. i, p. 33.

[3] E. T. Seton, *Life Histories of Northern Animals*, p. 238.

[4] A. Radcliffe Dugmore, *The Romance of the Newfoundland Caribou*, p. 18, cf. p. 101.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 27. Except at the breeding season the does "do not keep with the stags, but prefer the company of their own sex or a solitary life" (*ibid.*, p. 101).

[6] E. J. Seton, *op. cit.*, pp. 50, 238; J. J. Audubon and J. Bachman, *Quadrupeds of North America*, vol. ii, p. 226; T. Roosevelt and E. Heller,

ing." [1] Among bats the sexes live entirely separate; the males are driven off after sexual congress, and no male is ever found in a band of females.[2] Elephant cows, after they have been impregnated, likewise form bands from which males are driven off; [3] the cow, which carries for nearly two years, does not receive the male until eight or twelve months after calving.[4] "The male and female elephants," observes Livingstone, "are never seen in one herd. The young males remain with their dams only until they are full-grown, and so constantly is the separation maintained that anyone familiar with them, on seeing a picture with the sexes mixed, would immediately conclude that the artist had made it from his imagination and not from sight." [5] Seals and walruses separate into male and female herds after the breeding season.[6] The moose bull associates with cows during two months of the year.[7] The wild boar consorts with the female at the breeding season only.[8] Among squirrels the sexes often live separate.[9] The same thing has been reported of the monkey, *Presbytis entellus*; "the males live apart from the females." Blyth noticed that in one locality males only were to be found, in another chiefly females.[10] With the orang-utan the sexes never live together.[11] In bands of gorillas the sexes keep separate, the females and young forming one group, the males keeping to themselves.[12]

Among most carnivora cohabitation of the male with the female takes place for a short time only during the rutting season, and in many species there is no cohabitation at all. Weasels "continue together during the mating season for a week or more, then separate completely." [13] Bears do not cohabit after sexual congress; "no one yet has found two adult black bears in one den; mother and half-grown cubs have been taken together

Life Histories of African Game Animals, p. 480; D. Livingstone, *Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa*, p. 547.

[1] E. T. Seton, *op. cit.*, p. 277.

[2] Brehm-Strassen, *Tierleben*, vol. x, p. 387.

[3] F. Roosevelt and E. Heller, *op. cit.*, p. 719; Sir S. Baker, *Wild Beasts and their Ways*, vol. i, p. 98.

[4] G. P. Sanderson, *Thirteen Years among the Wild Beasts of India*, p. 59.

[5] D. Livingstone, *Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa*, p. 547.

[6] H. W. Elliot, "Report on the Seal Islands of Alaska," *Tenth United States Census*, p. 94 and *passim*.

[7] E. T. Seton, *op. cit.*, pp. 166, 169, 175.

[8] C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, vol. i, p. 267.

[9] R. Martin, *Les Mammifères de la France*, p. 11.

[10] R. A. Sterndale, *Natural History of the Mammalia of India and Ceylon*, p. 15; T. C. Jerdon, *The Mammals of India*, p. 5.

[11] See below, p. 174.

[12] See below, p. 177.

[13] E. T. Seton, *op. cit.*, p. 175.

in the same winter quarters, but never two old ones."[1] "I have never seen the two (male and female) together at any time of the year," says an experienced observer of the species; "they meet by chance and again separate."[2] The same is reported of the Indian,[3] and of the polar bear.[4] The jaguar cohabits with the female during one month of the year only;[5] and the cougar during a few weeks.[6] The leopard male and female live entirely separate.[7]

The male takes no share in rearing the young. The parental relation is, amongst mammals, confined to that between the mother and her offspring; fatherhood does not exist, and no mammalian young looks to a male for protection or assistance. Among herbivorous animals the male sees the young for the first time when they have reached a state of independence. Among carnivora the female generally takes great pains to conceal herself and her brood from the male, and drives him off lest he should eat the cubs. "Some fathers are considered models when they refrain from doing bodily harm to their offspring, and are especially admired if they keep away altogether while the young are helpless."[8] The lioness, like all other mammals, withdraws from the male when she is about to give birth.[9] The beaver also is said to "drive away the male from the 'lodge,' who would otherwise destroy the young."[10] Even where a fairly close association exists between the parents, the feeding of the young after they are weaned is attended to entirely by the female.[11] The male lion is not infrequently represented as bringing his 'kill' to the female while she remains with her cubs. But the lion drags his kill, often for long distances, to his lair, whether there are cubs or not. The leopard, which does not cohabit with the female, invariably does the same.[12] The lioness forages for herself and for her young. The male does not exercise any protective function either towards the female or towards the young. Some mem-

[1] E. T. Seton, *Life Histories of Northern Animals*, p. 1066. Cf. J. F. Nott, *Wild Animals Photographed and Described*, p. 149.

[2] W. H. Wright, *The Grizzly Bear*, p. 207.

[3] G. P. Sanderson, *Thirteen Years among the Wild Beasts of India*, p. 365.

[4] J. F. Nott, *Wild Animals*, p. 139.

[5] J. R. Rengger, *Naturgeschichte der Säugethiere von Paraguay*, p. 172.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 188.

[7] J. Stevenson-Hamilton, *Animal Life in Africa*, p. 200.

[8] E. T. Seton, *op. cit.*, p. 472.

[9] W. R. Rainsford, *The Land of the Lion*, p. 101.

[10] M. Lewis and W. Clark, *History of the Expedition to the Sources of the Missouri*, 1905, vol. ii, p. 374.

[11] E. T. Seton, *op. cit.*, p. 762.

[12] J. Stevenson-Hamilton, *Animal Life in Africa*, p. 199; R. Lyddeker, *A Hand-book to the Carnivora*, Part i, p. 85.

bers of the ox tribe are said to take an interest in the young and have been known to defend them ;[1] but this, if correct, is a collective, not an individual act. The almost universal rule among animals, birds and mammals, is that the female alone protects her offspring. In a number of instances she is the protector not only of her offspring, but also of the male. Among deer and antelopes the does watch over the safety of the bucks and interpose themselves between them and any source of danger.[2] This has also been observed of elephants.[3] "Many hunters, when they come across a lion and a lioness together, shoot the lioness first, on the assumption that if you kill the lion the lioness will charge at once, whereas if you shoot the lioness the lion will probably stand by, and, before making off, stop to smell the lioness, and, when he has satisfied himself that there is not much use in staying any longer, he may clear."[4]

Sexual and Maternal Love in Primitive Humanity.

The mating instinct appears to play in primitive humanity a scarcely more important part than among mammals generally. Cohabitation is, as will later be shown, very transient in the lower phases of human culture, and the sexes, as a rule, associate little with one another. The bulk of testimony concerning the sentiments which obtain in those relations among uncultured peoples is decidedly unfavourable. For example, it is said of the Eskimo that, "like all other men in the savage state, they treat their wives with great coolness and neglect."[5] Love, in our sense of the word, is said to be "unknown to the North American Indians."[6] "If you wish to excite laughter," says Father Petitot, "speak to the Déné of conjugal affection. We have been obliged to create the sentiment, and we are now beginning to see it appear little by little."[7] South American Indians are said to have no love for their wives.[8]

[1] E. T. Seton, *Life Histories of Northern Animals*, pp. 276 sqq. The female's defence of her young is, however, much more determined than the male's (Sir S. Baker, *Wild Animals and their Ways*, vol. ii, p. 70).

[2] R. E. Drake Brockman, *The Mammals of Somaliland*, p. 82 ; A. R. Dugmore, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

[3] T. Roosevelt and E. Heller, *op. cit.*, p. 719.

[4] A. E. Pease, *The Book of the Lion*, pp. 102 sq.

[5] G. Heriot, *Travels through the Canadas*, p. 25.

[6] L. H. Morgan, *Systems of Consanguinity*, p. 207, note. Cf. H. R. Schoolcraft, *Indian Tribes*, vol. v, p. 272.

[7] E. Petitot, *Dictionnaire de la langue Déné-Dindjié*, p. xxii.

[8] I. B. de Moura-Para, "Sur le progrès de l'Amazonie et sur les Indiens," *Verhandlungen des XVI internationales Amerikanisten-Kongress*, p. 546.

The Papuans are said to be entirely indifferent to their women's charms.[1] In West Africa, it is reported, "love as understood by the people of Europe, has no existence."[2] "Not even the appearance of affection exists between husband and wife."[3] "I have never witnessed any display of tenderness betwixt man and wife," says Mr. Ward of the Congo tribes.[4] In East Africa the natives show "scant appearance of affection."[5] "In all the long years I have been in Africa," says Monteiro, "I have never seen a negro manifest tenderness to a negress. I have never seen a negro put his arm round a woman's waist, or give or receive any caress whatever that could indicate the slightest loving regard or affection on either side."[6] In New Zealand the Maori "in general appear to care little for their wives. In my own experience," says Mr. Brown, "I have only seen one instance where there was any perceptible attachment between husband and wife. To all appearance they behave as if they were not at all related, and it not infrequently happens that they sleep in different places before the termination of the first week of marriage."[7]

Statements like the above have been the subject of a good deal of somewhat futile controversy, and there are more favourable reports of affection between married people, particularly in reference to societies where the conditions of life are easy and culture somewhat advanced. But the real evidence, which we shall have an opportunity of viewing, that, namely, which is afforded by the whole sexual life of uncultured peoples and the principles which govern their sexual associations, make it clear that sexual love as we conceive it is at best rudimentary in primitive humanity.

While there may be room for ambiguity or misunderstanding in regard to affection between the sexes among savages, there is none in respect of the love of primitive mothers for their offspring. With exceedingly few exceptions the testimonies on the point are uniform and emphatic. In reference to the same peoples who are described as being devoid of love between man and woman, the liveliness of maternal affection is constantly noted. Thus among the Eskimo, the coldness of whose sex relations is conspicuous, maternal love is said to be "lively and tender."[8]

[1] B. A. Hely, in *Annual Report on New Guinea*, 1892–93, p. 65.
[2] A. B. Ellis, *The Tshi-speaking Peoples*, p. 285.
[3] J. Duncan, *Travels in Western Africa*, vol. i, p. 79.
[4] H. Ward, *Five Years among Congo Cannibals*, p. 139.
[5] R. F. Burton, *The Lake Regions of Central Africa*, vol. ii, p. 333.
[6] J. J. Monteiro, *Angola and the River Congo*, vol. i, p. 243.
[7] W. Brown, *New Zealand and its Aborigines*, p. 33.
[8] G. Heriot, *Travels through the Canadas*, p. 25.

"We are inferior to the savages," remarks Father Petitot in speaking of them, "as regards the sentiment of maternity."[1] Reports are very unfavourable as regards affection between the sexes amongst the Déné; but "maternal love is developed among these peoples to the point of obliterating every suggestion of prudence and even every reasoned act of intelligence."[2] Among the Ojibwa, says the Ojibwa Peter Jones, "I have scarcely ever seen anything like social intercourse between husband and wife"; but the same witness bears testimony to the fact that "no mother can be fonder of her children."[3] "They love their children," says Father Théodat, speaking of the North American Indians generally, "more than we do ours."[4] Among the Indians of Guiana the extreme love of the mothers for their children has been noted, while the father is said to take little notice of them.[5] Similar manifestations of maternal tenderness are reported of the wild tribes of Brazil, among whom conjugal affection is not apparent.[6] Among the Patagonians a child "is the object of the whole love of its parents, who, if necessary, will submit themselves to the greatest privations to satisfy its least wants or exactions."[7] Their love for their children "is quite extravagant; they show such extreme compliance with regard to them that whole tribes have been known to leave a district or to remain there longer than was advisable simply to gratify the whim of a child."[8] Among the Fuegians "conjugal affection," we are told, "does not exist";[9] but maternal love is conspicuously tender and lively.[10]

[1] E. Petitot, *Les Grands Esquimaux*, p. 79. Cf. D. Cranz, *The History of Greenland*, vol. i, p. 189; J. Murdoch, "Ethnological Results of the Point Barrow Expedition," *Ninth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 417; C. F. Hall, *Life with the Esquimaux*, vol. i, pp. 102 sqq.; F. Nansen, *Eskimo-Leben*, p. 130; A. E. Nordenskiöld, *The Voyage of the Vega*, vol. i, p. 449.

[2] A. G. Morice, "La femme chez les Dénés," *Congrès international des Américanistes, XVe Session tenue à Québec en* 1906, vol. i, p. 381.

[3] P. Jones, *History of the Ojebway Indians*, pp. 60 sq.

[4] G. Sagard Théodat, *Le grand voyage du pays des Hurons*, p. 116.

[5] R. Schomburgk, *Reisen in Britisch-Guiana*, vol. i, p. 167.

[6] E.g., G. A. Colini, in G. Boggiani, *Viaggi di un artista nell'America Meridionale. I Caduvei (Mboyá e Guaycuru)*, p. 322; M. Dobrizhoffer, *Historia de Abiponibus*, vol. ii, p. 226; Yves d'Evreux, *Voyage dans le nord du Brésil*, p. 79; P. Ehrenreich, *Beiträge zur Volkenkunde Brasiliens*, p. 28.

[7] A. Guinnard, *Trois ans d'esclavage chez les Patagons*, pp. 130 sqq. Cf. Lady Florence Dixie, *Across Patagonia*, p. 69.

[8] F. Lacroix, *Patagonie, Terre de Feu et Îles Malouines*, p. 20.

[9] D. Lovisato, "Appunti etnografici con accenni geologici sulla Terra del Fuoco," *Cosmos di Guido Cora*, viii, p. 146. Cf. C. R. Gallardo, *Los Onas*, p. 212; G. Bove, *Patagonia. Terra del Fuoco. Mari Australi*, p. 134.

[10] C. Spegazzini, "Costumbres de los habitantes de la Tierra de Fuego," *Anales de la Sociedad científica Argentina*, xiv, p. 166; P. P. King and R. Fitzroy, *Narrative of the Surveying Voyages of the 'Adventure' and 'Beagle,'*

The women of the Orinoco, when their children are ailing, perforate their own tongue with a skewer and cover the child's body with their blood, believing that this will promote its recovery. They repeat the process daily until the child has recovered or is dead.[1] Similarly among the aborigines of New South Wales the mothers give their blood to bring about the recovery of their children when they are sick.[2] Among the Omahas it was the practice in war-time, when they were overtaken by foes, for the women to dig a hole in the ground, and to conceal themselves there with their children, covering up the opening. It is related that a mother was overtaken by the enemy after she had placed her children in the 'cache,' but before she had had time to cover the opening; this she did with her body, pretending to be dead, and allowed herself to be scalped without stirring.[3] During a tribal war in Samoa "a woman allowed herself to be hacked from head to foot, bending over her son to save his life. It is considered cowardly to kill a woman, or they would have despatched her at once. It was the head of her little boy they wanted, but they did not get it."[4] Among the Wagogo of East Africa, mothers besought the slave-raiders to allow them to take the place of their sons.[5] Bushmen women gave themselves up in like manner to redeem their children.[6] The lack of affection between men and women among the Hottentots has frequently been referred to; but it is related that during a famine, when food was brought to them, the women would not touch it until their children had been fed.[7] The same thing has been reported of the Aleuts,[8] of the Indians of the Red River Colony,[9] of the Tasmanians.[10] With the natives of Madagascar "the idea of love between husband and wife is hardly thought of";[11] accounts agree in representing the relations between men and

vol. i, pp. 76, 186; P. Hyades and J. Deniker, in *Mission scientifique du Cap Horn*, vol. vii, p. 238.

[1] J. Gumilla, *El Orinoco ilustrado*, vol. i, pp. 184 sq.

[2] F. Bonney, "On some Customs of the Aborigines of the River Darling, New South Wales," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xiii, p. 132.

[3] W. Kobelt, "Das Volk der Omaha," *Globus*, i, p. 350.

[4] G. Turner, *Samoa, a Hundred Years Ago and Long Before*, pp. 195 sq.

[5] Hermann, "Ugogo, das Land und seine Bewohner," *Mitteilungen aus den Deutschen Schutzgebieten*, v, p. 198.

[6] H. Schinz, *Deutsch-Süd-West-Afrika*, p. 392.

[7] R. Moffat, *Missionary Labours and Scenes in Southern Africa*, pp. 57 sq.

[8] J. Weniaminoff, "Charakter-Züge der Aleuten von den Fuchs-Inseln," in F. Wrangell, *Statistische und ethnographische Nachrichten über die Russischen Besitzungen an der Nordküste von Amerika*, pp. 188, 206.

[9] J. West, *Journal during a Residence at Red River Colony*, p. 125.

[10] J. West, *The History of Tasmania*, vol. ii, p. 80.

[11] J. Sibree, *The Great African Island*, p. 250.

women as utterly destitute of sentiment or affection.[1] But we are told at the same time that "the love of the parents for their children is intense";[2] that "nothing can exceed the affection with which the infant is treated; the indulgence is more frequently carried to excess than otherwise."[3] So again among the Dayaks of Borneo the children are spoilt; their slightest whim is indulged in.[4] The intensity of maternal affection in the savage is noted of the lowest races which we know, such as the Bushmen, Fuegians, the Seri Indians,[5] the Andaman negritos,[6] the Veddahs of Ceylon,[7] the Sakai of the Malaccan forests,[8] the Ainu,[9] the New Hebrides Islanders.[10] To an Australian woman her child is the object of the most devoted affection; "there is no bounds to the fondness and indulgence with which it is treated."[11]

The practice of infanticide, which is very widespread among uncultured races,[12] appears to us irreconcilable with the manifestations of maternal instincts in primitive women. The apparent inconsistency applies equally to the maternal instincts of most animals; and from what has been already noted[13] it has little, if any, significance as an index of the power and reality of maternal affection. Infanticide takes place, as a rule, with the human as with the animal mother, directly after the birth of the child. Thus in the Society Islands infanticide, "if not committed at the time the infant enters the world, was not perpetrated at any subsequent period. If the little stranger was, from irresolution, the mingled emotions that struggled for mastery in the mother's bosom, or any other cause, suffered to live ten minutes or half an hour, it was safe; instead of a monster's

[1] J. Sibree, "The Manners and Customs, Superstitions and Dialect of the Betsimisaraka," *Antananarivo Annual and Madagascar Magazine*, No. xxi, pp. 70 sq.; G. A. Shaw, "The Betsileo; Religious and Social Customs," *ibid.*, No. iv, p. 8.

[2] Id., "The Betsileo: Country and People," *ibid.*, No. iii, p. 82.

[3] W. Ellis, *History of Madagascar*, vol. i, p. 161; J. Sibree, *The Great African Island*, p. 250.

[4] S. St. John, *Life in the Forest of the Far East*, vol. i, p. 49.

[5] W. J. McGee, "The Seri Indians," *Seventeenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, Part i, p. 11.

[6] A. R. Brown, *The Andaman Islanders*, p. 77.

[7] J. Bailey, "An Account of the Wild Tribes of the Veddahs of Ceylon," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society*, N.S., ii, p. 291.

[8] G. Cerruti, *Nel paese dei veleni. Fra i Sakai*, pp. 149, 150, 159.

[9] I. L. Bird, *Unbeaten Tracks in Japan*, vol. ii, pp. 61, 79.

[10] H. A. Robertson, *Erromanga, the Martyr Isle*, p. 395.

[11] G. Taplin, in J. D. Woods, *The Native Tribes of South Australia*, p. 15. Cf. R. Hill and G. Thornton, *Notes on the Aborigines of New South Wales*, p. 2.

[12] See below, vol. ii, pp. 27–29.

[13] See above, p. 112.

grasp it received a mother's caress and a mother's smile, and was nursed with solicitude and tenderness." [1] The missionary's language imports, as usual, the notions and sentiments of European tradition into primitive psychology. Infanticide is committed by primitive women without any compunction or 'struggle' of feelings; but with them, as with animal mothers, it is the adoption of the offspring and not the relationship, intellectually viewed, which constitutes maternity.[2] Death and the sacredness of life are not conceived in the same manner in primitive as in civilised societies. The killing of children, like the killing of aged people, may often be done with the most tender feelings and sentiments towards them. It is certain, in any case, that the practice of infanticide is no indication of deficient maternal tenderness. Among the Patagonians, whose extravagant affection for their children has attracted the attention of every traveller, infanticide is habitual. Directly after its birth, the fate of each child is considered and decided; if allowed to live, it becomes at once the object of its parents' unbounded solicitude.[3] American squaws are said to destroy their female children in order to spare them the arduous life which their mothers have to lead.[4] The Arabs represent the extensive practice of female infanticide which obtained amongst them as arising from their love for their daughters, "the flesh of their flesh and blood of their blood," in order to shield them from poverty or dishonour.[5] In the Cameroons, during the German invasion, the natives, who are noted as devoted parents, killed most of the new-born, "in pity for their sufferings and in the firm belief that their spirits would return to earth as soon as all was peaceful once more." [6] Australian mothers, if one of their children is weak and sickly, sometimes kill its infant brother or sister and feed the survivor with its flesh in order to make it strong.[7]

[1] W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, vol. i, p. 255. Cf. H. Ploss, *Das Kind im Brauch und Sitte der Völker*, vol. ii, p. 255; A. Sutherland, *The Origin and Growth of the Moral Instinct*, vol. i, p. 113 sqq.

[2] See below, pp. 597 sqq.

[3] A. Guinnard, *Trois ans d'esclavage chez les Patagons*, p. 130.

[4] A. Mackenzie, *Voyages from Montreal on the River St. Laurence*, p. xcviii; H. R. Schoolcraft, *Indian Tribes*, vol. v, p. 167; W. J. Hardisty, "The Loucheux Indians," *Smithsonian Report*, 1866, p. 312.

[5] A. P. Caussin de Perceval, *Essai sur l'histoire des Arabes avant l'Islamisme*, vol. i, p. 351.

[6] P. A. Talbot, *In the Shadow of the Bush*, p. 159.

[7] W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 52, 475; A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, pp. 749 sq.; W. E. Stanbridge, "Some Particulars of the General Characteristics, Astronomy, and Mythology of the Tribes in the Central Part of Victoria, Southern Australia," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society*, N.S., i, p. 289.

The maternal love of primitive women is much fiercer and more unreasoning than that of civilised mothers. "Their affection is not rational," observes Dr. Todd.[1] Corporal punishment of children is unthought of in primitive society. "All the savage tribes of these parts, and those of Brazil, as we are assured," remarks Father Le Jeune, "cannot chastise a child or bear to see one chastised. What trouble this will cause us in carrying out our intention of instructing their young!"[2] The Eskimo do not consider that white people deserve to have children, since they are so heartless as to strike them.[3] Missionaries are constantly in trouble on that score. "It would be well," says one of them, "if the parents did not grow so angry when their children are now and then slightly chastised for gross misdemeanour by order of the missionary; but instead of bearing with patience such wholesome correction of their sons and daughters, they take great offence and become enraged, especially the mothers, who will scream like furies, tear out their hair, beat their naked breasts with a stone, and lacerate their heads with a piece of wood or bone till the blood flows, as I have frequently witnessed on such occasions."[4]

The maternal sentiment is, then, very much more primitive, fundamental and stronger than the mating instinct, the love, as we term it, in the relations between the sexes. The latter is primarily an extension of the maternal instinct. The feelings of tenderness and affection of which the offspring is the direct object have become extended to the male associate for the biological utilitarian purpose of enlisting his cooperation in the discharge of maternal functions. Maternal affection and not sexual attraction is the original source of love.

In mammals that extension of the maternal sentiment generally consists rather in a tolerance which overcomes the primary self-protective distrust and hostility of the female towards the male than in active affection. After the birth of the offspring that solicitude for a vicarious object reverts to its natural channel, and the male tends to become an object of repulsion. In primitive woman the mating instinct does not differ greatly from that observed in mammals. The primitive mother is, apart from her fierce maternal tenderness, a wild enough creature with little about

[1] A. J. Todd, *The Primitive Family as an Educational Agency*, p. 98.

[2] *Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, vol. v, p. 220.

[3] H. E. Saabye, *Bruckstücke eines Tagebuches gehalten in Grönland*, p. 158.

[4] F. J. Baegert, "An Account of the Aboriginal Inhabitants of the Californian Peninsula," *Smithsonian Reports*, 1863–64, p. 369. "I have seen a Paumotuan native turn from me in embarrassment and disaffection," says R. L. Stevenson, "because I suggested that a brat would be the better for a beating" (R. L. Stevenson, *In the South Seas*, p. 38).

her of what we reckon as feminine gentleness. Primitive women commonly exceed the men in cruelty.[1] Their attitude towards their mate, which at its worst is what we should term cynical, is at its best a loyalty such as binds the members of all primitive groups. It is invariably utilitarian, and has in view those functions of assistance, protection, economic cooperation which are expected of him in regard to herself and her offspring. The qualities which she looks for are those which will render him efficient in the discharge of those functions: strength, courage, endurance, ability, in short the qualities that command success. A contemporary authoress, in emphasising that character of the mating instinct in modern woman, goes so far as to defend the primitive practice of leaving the choice of a husband entirely to parents, on the ground that their experience and judgment will enable them to estimate the required qualities far better than a young woman could do for herself.[2] The view is that taken by primitive women in general, who are, as we shall see, quite content to leave the choice of their mate to relatives. These, brothers, uncles, fathers, and mothers, apply the severest tests to prove the qualities of the aspirants; the woman sets the highest store on those tests of the intended mate's economic value. That mercenary attitude is not, as is commonly supposed, a corruption of civilisation, a profanation of love; it is, on the contrary, the primal form, the source of the mating instinct in the female. The loyalty and devotion of primitive woman is no less real because her choice has been determined by deliberate utilitarian motives. It is subservient to the maternal instinct, and eventually uses in its interest the most powerful attraction, by transferring to the male associate some of the mothering tenderness which becomes the tender constituent of her relation to him. In certain conditions where the pressure of life's necessities is less acute, and the female's need for protection less pressing, that mothering character of feminine tenderness may go so far as to respond to the appeal of the weak, the suffering, the vanquished, of the gentle and effeminate. But the male's appeal to the female lies normally and overwhelmingly in his utilitarian worth, a value which has reference not to the sexual relation, but to economic cooperation, and grows therefore with the closeness and stability of that relation.

The gradual admixture of tenderness with the mating instinct, its transformation into love, is a process which has taken place in the psychological evolution of the female, and it appears

[1] See below, pp. 453 sq.
[2] Gina Lombroso, *L'anima della donna*, p. 221.

probable that in the human species love was at first confined to woman. What sexual selection exists among the lower races is predominantly exercised by the women.[1] In those races where the attitude of the men towards the women is one of indifference and even brutality, manifestations of strong and genuine attachment are shown by the women towards their tyrannous mates. North American squaws, notwithstanding the coldness with which they are treated, "are remarkable for their care and attachment to the men, continually watching over them with utmost solicitude and anxiety."[2] Chippeway widows are truly inconsolable and pine with grief over the loss of their husbands.[3] Aleut women often commit suicide on that account.[4] Fijian women, who are among the most brutally treated, insist upon being killed on the graves of their husbands. It is highly probable that the widespread custom of 'suttee' was originally voluntary.[5] The numerous wives of an African chief, whom he uses as pillows and footstools, vie for the honour of being so employed, and genuinely worship their lord.[6] The unmistakable gleam of devotion is seen in their eyes as they watch their master and seek to forestall his wishes.[7]

Transference of Characters from one Sex to the other.

Tender feelings are one and all derivatives of the maternal instincts and products of feminine evolution; they have developed, that is, in relation to the reactions of the female organism, and are feminine secondary characters. But characters developed in relation to the functions of one sex are, nevertheless, transmitted in some form to both. The cell produced by the fusion of a male and of a female cell inherits the characters and dispositions of both parents. This does not necessarily mean that those characters are blended in the corresponding character of the offspring, or even that they are reproduced at all; for a given hereditary disposition may result in a variety of structural reactions, any

[1] See below, vol. ii, pp. 168 sqq.

[2] H. R. Schoolcraft, *Indian Tribes*, vol. v, p. 272.

[3] H. C. Yarrow, "A Further Contribution to the Study of the Mortuary Customs of the North American Indians," *First Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, pp. 184 sq.

[4] I. Petroff, "Report on Alaska," *Tenth Census of the United States*, vol. viii, p. 158.

[5] See below, pp. 329 sq.

[6] A. Delegorgue, *Voyage dans l'Afrique australe*, vol. i, p. 176.

[7] C. Letourneau, *La condition de la femme dans les diverses races et civilisations*, p. 80.

one of which may be incompatible with others. Where characters are mutually incompatible, or the disposition towards the one is more firmly fixed in heredity than the disposition towards the other, either the character of the male parent or that of the female parent will result, the one being prepotent over the other; thus will be produced the appearance of 'unit characters' which has been interpreted in terms of the speculations of Weissmann on the basis of the conception of a complex structure of 'determinants.' Similarly one character may manifest itself at one period of life, and another, derived from the other parent, at another period. But the organism, whether male or female, inherits equally dispositions corresponding to all the characters, physical and psychical, of both parents and of their ancestry. Every disposition developed in the race by the males is thus transmitted to the females, and every disposition developed by the females is transmitted to the males. Even the primary reproductive organs of each sex are in all their parts represented in the opposite sex; a rudimentary uterus and vagina in the male, a rudimentary penis in the female. The males of mammalian species possess mammary glands, which may even be functional; the pouches in which marsupial females carry their young after birth are found, in a rudimentary condition, in the males also.[1] By merely transplanting some ovarian tissue into young castrated rats Steinach caused them to develop all the characters, psychical as well as physical, of the females. They developed mammae and nipples, their bones assumed the lighter structure characteristic of the females, and their hair the finer and softer quality of the opposite sex. They developed "the tail up reflex" peculiar to the females, and warded off the males by kicking. "These feminised rats were followed by males as if they were females."[2]

Thus it is that in every race, although the two sexes may lead different lives and both their environments and their reactions to those environments may differ widely, different structures and reactions resulting in each sex, yet the race will combine the results of evolutions which have taken place in the males and in the females. "In vast numbers of species the individuals of opposite sex are so much alike that it is difficult to distinguish them without examination of their genital organs."[3] The two sexes differ in so far only as the common racial characters are held in abeyance or modified by the functional characters of

[1] C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, vol. i, p. 208.

[2] D. N. Paton, *The Nervous and Chemical Regulations of Metabolism*, p. 153.

[3] J. T. Cunningham, *Sexual Dimorphism in the Animal Kingdom*, p. 36.

each sex. "The secondary characters of each sex," as Darwin says, "lie dormant or latent in the opposite sex, ready to be evolved under peculiar circumstances."[1] When females cease to be reproductive male characters usually make their appearance. Thus hens that have ceased laying crow like a cock, develop a comb, hackles, spurs, and tail-feathers;[2] pheasants, patridges, pea-hens, and many other female birds assume the secondary male plumage of the species, and a duck ten years old has been known to put on the perfect winter and summer plumage of the drake.[3] Old ewes and does grow horns and antlers, old lionesses manes. Mares that are old or sterile frequently develop canine teeth, which normally are rudimentary in the female. Cow giraffes, when old, assume the darker coat which is characteristic of the bulls.[4] Female salmon develop the peculiar hook or knob on the lower jaw which is distinctive of males at the breeding season.[5] Women who have passed the climacteric, or suffer from ovarian atrophies, assume male characters, such as changes in the larynx giving rise to a deeper voice, hair on the upper lip and chin. Similar symptoms, and often the growth of a dense beard, are produced by disease of the adrenal glands in women, and the development of male characters is arrested by administration of the glandular substance.[6]

Many characters which in some species are sexual secondary characters are in other species normal specific characters common to both sexes. Thus many of the markings and bright colours distinctive of male birds appear in the female, usually in a somewhat duller form, but sometimes, as in the guinea-fowl, in identical form.[7] The larynx has probably developed as a male sexual character, but it is common to both sexes, and has become used by the female for the purpose of calling the young. Horns are grown by the females of goats, some breeds of sheep, and

[1] C. Darwin, *The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication*, vol. ii, p. 27. The qualities of a good milking-cow are transmitted through her male offspring, and the disposition of game-cocks through the hens.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 26.

[3] W. Yarrell, "On the Change in the Plumage of some Hen-pheasants," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, 1827, pp. 270 sqq.; A. Brandt, "Anatomisches und Allgemeines über die sogenante Hahnenfedrigkeit und über Gschlectsanomalien bei Vögeln," *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Zoologie*, xlviii, pp. 101 sqq.

[4] A. Brandt, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

[5] F. Day, *British and Irish Salmonidae*, p. 50.

[6] C. de M. Sajous, *The Internal Secretions and the Principles of Medicine*, pp. 474 sqq.; I. Geikie Cobb, *The Organs of Internal Secretion*, p. 155. Cf. Blair Bell, "The Internal Secretions and Female Characteristics," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine*, vi, p. 74.

[7] C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, vol. i, p. 212.

cattle, and by the female of the reindeer, though not usually by deer and antelopes.[1]

So likewise many purely female characters manifest themselves in the males of animals. Darwin states that "with the bees, the pollen-collecting apparatus is used by the female for gathering pollen for the larvae, yet in most species it is partially developed in the males to whom it is quite useless, and it is perfectly developed in the males of Bombus, the humble-bee."[2] The most conspicuous example is the appearance of mammary glands and nipples in the male, which in early mammalia are thought to have been functional, and which are functional at birth even in the human infant, and are sometimes developed in the adult to the extent of being used for suckling. Steers, and even bulls, sometimes secrete milk.[3] In pigeons a peculiar secretion developed from fatty degeneration of the lining of the crop a few weeks after the hatching of the young is used by both sexes to feed them.

The like holds true of psychical as of physical characters, the distinction between the two being but a concession to our forms of thought. Psychical reactions necessarily differ in the two sexes. The relations of life present themselves in the form of entirely different values, and their effect upon the complex of existing impulses and instincts varies according as they act upon the dispositions of the male or upon those of the female. The former is primarily concerned with activities directed to obtaining for the individual greater control over the conditions of active life and with securing the best advantages in the competition for food and favourable conditions. The female's organism is specialised for the production of offspring, and the impulses which are related to those racial interests predominate in her over those which have regard to the securing of the most advantageous present conditions. The forms which the reproductive impulse itself takes in the two sexes are dissimilar, and reactions and feelings are differentiated according to the divergent functions and dispositions of the two sexes.

The psychical development of the race thus takes place along two separate lines. Two psychical evolutions proceed side by side, a masculine and a feminine evolution, each giving rise to different products, modifications of impulses, general and specialised instincts, affective values, and powers of cognition, control, and action. Some of those psychical products have come into existence as a result of the reactions of masculine impulses and instincts, others as a result of the reactions of the instincts and

[1] C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, vol. i, p. 263.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 352.
[3] A. Brandt, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

impulses of the female. But here also, as in the development and transmission of visible organic characters, the results of evolution in the one sex are transmitted to the other.

Darwin mentions the instance of a hen which had ceased laying and had assumed the plumage, voice, and warlike disposition of the cock. When opposed to an enemy she would erect her hackles and show fight. "Thus every character, even to the instinct and manner of fighting, must have lain dormant in the hen as long as her ovaria continued to act."[1] Capons take up the brooding and nursing functions of the female. A cock by being kept for a time in enforced solitude and darkness could be taught to take charge of chickens. He uttered the peculiar cry and retained during his whole life the newly acquired (or rather, elicited) maternal instinct. The sterile male hybrids from pheasants and fowl take delight in sitting on eggs, and watch for the hens to leave their nests that they may have an opportunity of taking their place.[2]

The development in the male of instincts and psychical modifications of female origin is widespread in the animal kingdom. Examples of maternal instincts in the male are found among reptiles and fishes whose parental instincts are not in general highly developed. It is, indeed, a somewhat startling fact that the earliest manifestations of parental instincts and care, as distinguished from purely physiological provisions, appear in the lowest vertebrates, the fishes, not in the female but in the male. "As a rule it is the male who acts as guardian nurse, the female troubling herself but little about the fate of her eggs or her offspring."[3] Several male fishes carry the eggs in their mouth or pharynx until they hatch.[4] In a species of sea-horse, *Hippocampus guttulatus*, the male develops a regular marsupial pouch in which it carries the eggs.[5] In a number of species the male fish builds a more or less elaborate nest in which the female deposits her ova.[6] The

[1] C. Darwin, *The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication*, vol. i, p. 26.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

[3] T. W. Bridge, "Fishes," in *The Cambridge Natural History*, vol. vii, pp. 414 sq.

[4] G. A. Boulenger, "Teleostei," *ibid.*, p. 593; Th. Gill, "Parental Care among Fresh-Water Fishes," *Smithsonian Reports*, for 1905, p. 405; H. von Ihering, "Ueber Brutpflege und Entwicklung der Bagie (*Arius commetronii*. Lac.)," *Biologisches Centralblatt*, viii, pp. 268 sqq.; J. Pellegrin, "Contributions à l'étude anatomique, etc., des Cichlides," *Mémoires de la Société Zoologique*, xvi, pp. 72 sqq.

[5] T. W. Bridge, *op. cit.*, p. 416.

[6] G. A. Boulenger, *op. cit.*, p. 592; Th. Gill, *op. cit*, pp. 494 sqq.; C. F. Holder, "The nest-builders of the sea," *Harper's New Monthly Magazine*, lxviii, pp. 104 sqq.

male stickleback uses for the purpose a mucous secretion which is specially produced by the kidneys at the rutting season.[1] The Butter-fish, or Gunnel, rolls the mass of eggs into a ball and coils himself round them, the female, in this instance, also taking a share in the process of brooding.[2] The male Lump-sucker (*Cyclopterus lumpus*) sedulously guards the eggs, which are affixed to rocks or piles, and the young fry, when hatched, attach themselves by their suckers to the body of their paternal nurse.[3] The North American Catfish (*Ameiurus nebulosus*) also mounts guard with great solicitude over the eggs, and when they are hatched "leads the young in great schools near the shore, seemingly caring for them as the hen for her chicks."[4] It might thus be said that maternal instincts have, in the first instance, originated in the male! The paradox is readily intelligible when it is borne in mind that with fishes, except the elasmobranchs and a few teleosteans, there is no copulation, spawn and milt being shed in the water without sexual congress. The sexual instincts of the male are accordingly directed not so much towards the female as towards the eggs; these, and not the female, are the excitant to their operation. It follows that the male is even more disposed than the female to take an interest in the eggs, to segregate them in his own person, parental care being here indistinguishable from the sexual impulse.[5]

It appears not improbable that those dispositions in primitive vertebrate males have largely contributed to the development of

[1] Th. Gill, *op. cit.*, pp. 497 sqq. The fullest account of the curious parental activities of the stickleback is that of A. Hancock. ("Observations on the Nidification of *Gasterosteus aculeatus* and *Gasterosteus spinachia*," *Transactions of the Tyneside Naturalists' Field Club*, ii, pp. 312 sqq.)

[2] J. T. Cunningham, *The Natural History of the Marketable Marine Fishes of the British Islands*, p. 91.

[3] T. W. Bridge, *op. cit.*, p. 415.

[4] A. C. Eycleshymer, "Observations on the Breeding Habits of *Ameiurus nebulosus*," *The American Naturalist*, xxxv, p. 911. An instance of male brooding among fishes was known to Aristotle, who thus speaks of the *Glanis*: "The male glanis takes great care of the young. For the female, having brought forth, departs; but the male, where the greatest deposits of eggs have been formed, remains by them watching, rendering no other service except keeping off other fishes from destroying the young. He does this for forty or fifty days" (Aristotle, *Hist. Animal.*, ix. 25. 6).

[5] Parental care among fishes does not, as a general rule, involve any form of 'mating.' In the bowfin, for example, "a nest is made without any selected mate and sometimes in advance of finding or selection of one by its maker. Meanwhile, the male stays beside it more or less persistently. If the female does not appear, the waiting male ceases after a time to guard the empty nest, and leaves." Several females may successively spawn in the same nest, and the same female may visit several different nests

parental instincts, interest in the care of eggs, and consequently in the development of the mating instinct in the immediate successors of the fishes in the vertebrate scale. And, in fact, the males of some reptiles and batrachians show the same solicitude directed towards the eggs rather than towards the females. Thus the male obstetric frog (*Alytes obstetricans*) helps the female to discharge her eggs, pushes its hind-limbs in the convoluted mass, thus winding it round its legs, and, after tending them carefully for three weeks, betakes itself to the water to hatch the eggs.[1] In *Rhinoderma Darwinii*, a small Chilian frog, a purely male organ, the croaking-ratchet, is temporarily converted into a brood-pouch in which the eggs are carried till hatched.[2]

In the class of birds which presents the most conspicuous development of the mating instinct in the male, those instincts are connected with the eggs almost as much as with the female. The male, as with fishes, is interested in the protection of the eggs and in their hatching, and the reproductive impulse continues to operate in relation to that function, apart from the purely sexual impulse that leads to congress; while, on the other hand, that mating instinct ceases, in general, to operate as soon as the brood has left the nest. The male bird often relieves the female in brooding. This is the rule among all Rasores, such as the emu, cassowary, rhea, and it has also been observed in several other birds, such as godwits, the dotterel, and phalaropes.[3] The psychology of mating birds has in all probability

(Th. Gill, *op. cit.*, p. 432, after J. Reighard). Much the same promiscuity has been observed as regards the stickleback, and the sun-fish (*ibid.*, pp. 500, 513 sq.). The relations between the sexes in both those fishes have been described in edifying terms. They have been pronounced to be 'monogamous.' Thus of the sunfish Dr. Abbott says: "They are not merely paired for the season, but remain a faithful and loving couple all the year and for several years" (C. C. Abbott, *A Naturalist's Rambles about Home*, p. 375). There is no excuse for such statements; the female never associates with the male after spawning; male and female are never found together in one nest; the male endeavours to get as many females as possible to spawn in his nest; "the relation between the sexes may be described as promiscuous polygamy" (Th. Gill, *op. cit.*, pp. 513 sq., and authorities there cited). With the majority of nidicolous fishes the female departs as soon as she has spawned; sometimes she is then actually driven off by the male and is in danger of her life (*ibid.*, p. 467).

[1] A. de l'Isle, "Mémoire sur les moeurs et l'accouchement de l'*Alytes obstetricans*," *Annales des Sciences naturelles*, 6e Série, *Zoologie*, iii, art. No. 7, pp. 1 sqq.

[2] J. W. Spengel, "Die Fortpflanzung des *Rhinoderma Darwinii*" (after Jimenez de la Espada), *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Zoologie*, xxix, pp. 495 sqq.

[3] A. Newton, *A Dictionary of Birds*, p. 634.

been entirely misconceived by interpreting it in terms of our own sentiments; it is not so much the female which is the object of interest to the male as the eggs. It is noteworthy that in those species in which the male assumes female functions, the female is considerably larger than the male and has a brighter and handsomer plumage.[1] The most curious instance is presented by an Indian gallinaceous species, *Turnix taigoor*. In this bird the usual respective characters of male and female are almost completely reversed; "the males and the males only sit on eggs, the females meanwhile calling and fighting, without any care for their obedient mates. The males and the males only tend the brood." While the males are of a tame and mild disposition, the females are most pugnacious, and it is indeed those females and not the males which are kept by the natives as "fighting cocks."[2] The famous habit of the cuckoo which, as Gilbert White remarked, "is such a monstrous outrage on maternal affection, one of the first dictates of nature, and such violence on instinct that, had it only been related of a bird in the Brazils, or Peru, it would never have merited belief,"[3] illustrates the manner in which the correlated instincts of each sex are dependent upon combined inheritance from both sexes. For "the species consists predominantly of males. The preponderance is probably as five to one, though one observer makes it five times greater."[4] So entirely identical are the males and the females that they are not to be distinguished by external appearance. With such a preponderatingly male heredity it is not surprising to find the maternal instincts atrophied in the female. There is no mating; sexual relations are "promiscuous, that is, both polyandrous and polygynous."[5]

As with physical characters, the dispositions inherited by one sex from the other can become manifested and active only when not conflicting with the functional characteristics of the sex which inherits them, and when they perform a useful function in regard to the reproductive interests of the race.

Not only does each sex benefit by the products of the evolution which has taken place in the opposite sex—a uniform level of development being maintained in the race—but a further

[1] J. T. Cunningham, *Sexual Dimorphism in the Animal Kingdom*, p. 118.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 119.
[3] Gilbert White, *The Natural History of Selborne*, letter xxx.
[4] J. A. Thomson, in *Proceedings of the Royal Physical Society of Edinburgh*, vol. x, p. 64; Geddes and Thomson, *The Evolution of Sex*, p. 276. Mr. E. Chance criticises the evidence of the numerical preponderance, but does not deny that it may exist (E. Chance, *The Cuckoo's Secret*, p. 235).
[5] E. Chance, *loc. cit.*

important consequence follows. Since in each sex the characters of the opposite sex are only held in abeyance by the functions peculiar to the sex of the individual, a mutual adjustment takes place between the sexual characters of the two sexes. These characters, both physical and psychological, are balanced within every organism of either sex—organisation, functions, and instincts being adjusted and adapted in each to the corresponding characters of the other sex. The development of special impulses and instincts in the one sex, being transmitted by heredity to the other, calls forth a corresponding and complementary adaptation, in the same manner as correlation of physiological functions takes place in the individual. Mutual adjustment between the sexes in respect of the common racial interests is thus automatically established.

Antagonism between the Mating and the Sexual Instinct.

No greater inducement could be offered to the male to modify his sexual instincts in adaptation to the mating instinct of the female than the latter's transferred affection, for it is the equivalent of the maternal tenderness and devotion under the aegis of which his development has taken place. The mating instinct leading to prolonged association is nevertheless entirely foreign to his sexual instincts. The sole function of the male in regard to reproduction is primarily the impregnation of the ova, and his instincts are limited to fulfilling that function. In most teleostean fishes, impregnation does not even necessitate the coming together of the sexes. In the majority of animals the contribution of the male to the reproductive process does not extend beyond the sexual act. The further functions of providing physiologically and psychologically for the development of the offspring devolve upon the female alone. Not only is the mating instinct, leading to prolonged association with the female and manifesting itself in tender sentiments and affection, unrelated to any function and instinct of the male, but that sentiment is in direct contrast and antagonism with the character of his sexual impulse. So much so that the two orders of impulses remain even in the higher forms of their development essentially distinct. The sadic hunger of the masculine impulse can never become entirely blended with mating affection. Love and lust must remain antagonistic. "Il n'y a rien de si loin de la volupté que l'attendrissement," observes Lamartine.[1] Although they may be directed towards the same

[1] Cited by L. G. Sera, *Sulle tracce della vita*, p. 3.

object, the two forms of sexual attraction in the male, distinct as they are in function and origin, are not only opposed, but essentially incompatible; they may alternate, but can never completely blend. Love, tender feeling, is a common cause of 'psychical' impotence. The high developments of the transferred maternal instinct in the male, the 'sublimations' of the sexual impulse, tend to obliterate the impulse itself. It has been suggested that such transformations of the male instincts are in reality a manifestation, or an index of diminished reproductive power, and that the high development of romantic love would tend ultimately towards the extinction of the race.[1] The two instincts, the sexual and the mating instinct, may exist in the male quite independently of one another; and this, as we shall have occasion to note, is commonly the case in primitive humanity. The sexual impulse may have no trace of affection, while, on the other hand, genuine and strong attachment, which quite commonly results from prolonged association, may be unattended with any manifestation of sexual instincts, such, for instance, as jealousy. It is not uncommon among savages for an old and decrepit wife to be tenderly loved and treated with gentle affection, whilst her place is taken, sexually, by younger wives. Throughout primitive societies the distinction between the two functions and instincts is, indeed, much more definitely and consciously recognised than in our own, where sentiments and institutions have deliberately tended to obliterate and ignore the distinction. Sexual relations do not, in primitive society, imply sexual association, and sexual association is not primarily regarded as a sexual relation.

Those utilitarian considerations which are paramount with the female have no place in the functional purpose of the male's sexual instincts. It is, of course, the interest of the male to obtain a capable mate; and in primitive marriage, as we shall see, that capacity and ability of the woman as a worker is even the chief, and often the sole, consideration in determining the economic association. But that order of considerations is, with the male, distinct from the sexual instinct, and not, as with the female, an intrinsic part of it. The economic motives of the male have regard to his individual interests, not to those of the offspring; they are conscious, not instinctive and subconscious; they are unconnected with the sexual impulse, and they do not imply, or even lead up to, tenderness and affection towards the woman. In the latter those economic values are the cause and standard of attraction; in man they are even antagonistic to that sexual

[1] L. G. Sera, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

attraction. In the sexual relations of man the sexual instinct itself is supreme; and when that instinct becomes discriminating, the discrimination has reference chiefly or solely to sexual values. These are the physical qualities of youth and beauty, which are, ultimately, expressions of the suitability of the female for rearing offspring of the best type. Those moral qualities, such as courage, ability, character, which are supreme in the woman's sexual choice, have no place in the man's in so far as that choice is purely sexual. Hence the feminine taunt that a man may be attracted by a woman whom he neither esteems nor respects.

Since the mating instinct, or love, is in the female founded on much more direct biological needs, and is much older in the order of development than with the male, it tends to retain even in advanced stages of culture its primitive character. That primitive character completely fulfils the purpose and function of the instinct, and does not require to be reinforced and sustained by adventitious motives. In the male, on the contrary, that transferred feminine instinct, destitute of any relation to purely masculine instincts, is to a very much greater extent apt to become an artificial product of cultural and social development. Hence one of the most important grounds for the differences in the sentiment in man and in woman; it is deeper in the latter, without being so exalted and subject to cultural transfigurations as in man.[1]

That cultural and social evolution is the all-important factor in the development of the sentiment in the male. So little does the emotional complex which we speak of as love bear any resemblance to a primary and universal impulse of life that even a cursory consideration suffices to show the greatest diversities in the forms of those sentiments within the range of familiar historical experience. It has frequently been remarked that 'romantic love' is profoundly influenced by literature and tradition, and that no one would be subject to it in the same form had he never read a novel or seen a play. That social and cultural tradition varies so much that the contrast between its forms among the Greeks, the Romans, or the Arabs, the Hindus, and the modern European

[1] It is necessary to bear in mind in all psychological generalisations as regards sexual differences that fundamental facts are constantly disguised and belied by the mutual transmission of male characters to the female and female characters to the male. Every such generalisation is thus subject to qualifications and exceptions. Male types of instincts and sentiments are constantly to be found in the female, and vice versa. Extreme sexuality in the female, for example, opposed to the periodical character of the female impulse, is undoubtedly a transferred male character. Sexual and mating instincts may thus assume every form and combination in both the male and the female. Unless this is noted misapprehensions are apt to take place in regard to any generalisation.

has thrust itself upon the notice of the least analytical psychology. Romantic love is by many regarded as a product of the Middle Ages and Renaissance, and as having been previously unknown. Early Victorian love is noticed to be not the same thing as twentieth-century love. The Italian's or the Spaniard's notions and sentiments of sexual love differ considerably from those of the Russian, the Norwegian, or the Englishman. If, then, the sentiment can assume so many different forms and variations within that narrow range of human observation, and if so many of its features are manifestly social products of different types of culture, it may be gauged how uncritical is the proceeding which treats all sexual impulses and sentiments, in primitive man, in animals, as though they were even roughly and substantially identical with those of cultured humanity.

Yet that is what is constantly and gravely done. Sexual love is spoken of as if it were a simple and irreducible emotion or impulse, whereas it is in reality the most composite and complex of sentiments. As Herbert Spencer pointed out, in addition to the sexual impulse and mating affection, which are quite distinct, it is made up of an almost boundless aggregate of feelings and sentiments. Love of approbation and self-esteem receive their most vivid gratification in the exclusive choice, the 'blind' admiration and idealisation of the male by the female, and her devotion to his chosen person; hence love is irresistibly bred by love—"amor a nullo amato amar perdona." To those sentiments are added the aesthetic feelings which are themselves highly complex products of culture, and which not only imply an 'ideal of feminine beauty,' but also of charm, of character, of elegance and taste. Few men, for instance, would have enough discrimination to detect, and be attracted by, physical beauty in a woman who was an habitual frump, or grotesque, sluttish, and disgusting or ridiculous in her attire. Admiration for the imaginative objectivation of all ideals of what is deemed desirable is incoporated, no less than aesthetic ideals, in romantic affection, the cultural results of mental and moral development thus forming part of the sentiment. Sympathetic participation, mostly imaginary, in common tastes; the release of conventions in the freedom of intimacy, the gratifications of proprietary feelings and of vanity must be added. The conception of some ideal of future happiness thought of, perhaps, as shaping the whole of life is blended with the sentiments that are regarded as holding out the promise of its realisation. These all enter into the composition of what we speak of as 'love,' which, as Spencer says, "fuses into one immense aggregate most of the elementary excitations of which we

are capable." [1] So complex and comprehensive a sentiment may well become a dominant inspiration of emotional life and of art. The exaltation and intensity which are imparted to its varied components are derived from the strongest impulse of living organisation. But such a complexity is not a biological character of the sexual impulse in the male. Nothing could be simpler than its simplicity. Complexity results from the permeation of all other activities by that impulse. Every aspect and product of human cultural and mental evolution can be directly or indirectly brought into relation with the reproductive impulse when its operation is diverted. Social restrictions and cultural associations have diverted the operation and diffused the energy of the sexual impulse, thus giving rise to highly complex emotional states; these are, in that form, the culmination of the long evolution which has brought about those restrictions and created those associations.[2]

While the sentiments which, deriving originally from the maternal instinct, have become associated with the sexual impulse owe much to cultural and social development, modifying influences even more important have taken place in the opposite direction. Just as the transferred affection of the female for the male is a direct derivative of maternal love, so likewise all feelings of a tender, compassionate, altruistic character, which are in direct contrast to primitive biological impulses, and, while almost entirely absent in animals, have become distinctive of human psychology, are extensions and transformations of the maternal instinct and are directly derived from it. Apart from the relation between mother and offspring there is in competitive animality no germ of that order of feelings, and every form which they have assumed is a derivative product of maternal love. Sympathy for suffering, compassion, the placating of anger and hostility, benevolence, generosity, all those sentiments which are termed 'altruistic,' up to their most abstract and generalised developments, owe the mere possibility of their existence to the growth of mother-love, and have arisen through the transference of those maternal

[1] H. Spencer, *Principles of Psychology*, vol. i, pp. 487 sq. Mantegazza dwells on the same fact with even greater eloquence: "If love is the strongest of human passions, it is also the richest. On its altar every faculty of the mind lays its tribute, every emotion of the heart adds its ardour to it. Every vice and every virtue, every shame and every heroism, every martyrdom and every desire, every balm and every poison may be brought to this temple. All that is human may be involved in the vortex of love" (P. Mantegazza, *Fisiologia dell'amore*, pp. 16 sq.). Cf. also W. McDougall, *Introduction to Social Psychology*, pp. 396 sqq.

[2] See below, vol. ii, pp. 138 sqq.

instincts to the male.[1] That order of sentiments, being of female origin, is developed more spontaneously and more strongly in the female. The sympathetic, protective, compassionate, affectionate attitude, transferred by the female from the offspring to its father, tends to become still farther extended. Woman becomes in general tender-hearted, merciful, compassionate towards all males, towards females also provided they are not possible rivals, towards animals and all living things, and even towards plants, flowers, inanimate things, possessions, which are handled gently, tenderly; whereas the male is disposed to be rough, to destroy and break. The development and extension of sentiments of that order are much more difficult, more unnatural in the male. They are too radically opposed to the character of his instincts and impulses. In spite of the accumulated force of heredity the male child is born cruel; to inflict suffering on other children, on his brothers and sisters, on animals, and to elicit the signs of pain, is his natural propensity. He is destructive, and to destroy even his own most valued possessions affords him pleasure. The operation of social and traditional education is required to enable the dispositions to tenderness inherited through the female line of evolution to attain a high degree of development in the male.[2]

The Filial Instinct.

Those higher developments of maternal tenderness are for the most part phenomena of advanced culture, and have been comparatively late in making their appearance. But the maternal instincts have from the outset given rise to even more momentous derivative products. The sexual associate is not the first in whom the sentiment of affection is reflected. Long before the sexual impulse of the male becomes transformed by such a sentiment, maternal instincts produce an even stronger bond of attachment in their direct object, the offspring itself. The strong feeling of the child for the mother, his dependence and reliance on her affection, her help, her protection, founded upon fundamental experience during the first years of life, is in highly developed societies weakened by a number of causes which do not operate

[1] "From this emotion (the maternal or parental feeling) and its impulse to cherish and protect, spring generosity, gratitude, love, pity, true benevolence, and altruistic conduct of every kind; in it they have their main and absolutely essential root, without which they would not be" (W. McDougall, *Introduction to Social Psychology*, p. 71).

[2] Darwin remarks that all his boys showed the same manifestations of violence, destructiveness and cruelty, whereas he never saw the same behaviour in girls (C. Darwin, "A Biographical Sketch of an Infant," *Mind*, ii, p. 288).

so strongly in the primitive grades of society.[1] The primitive natural sentiment remains much stronger than the counteracting traditional sentiments of 'manliness' and independence, and the 'mauvaise honte' attaching to the notion of being tied to a woman's apron-strings.[2] Savages remain children. In this they closely resemble animals. "Among human beings," remarks Mr. Seton, "the maternal feeling continues longer than the filial: but in most (possibly all) of the lower animals it is the other way. The young could keep on indefinitely deriving sustenance and comfort from the mother, if allowed."[3] That

[1] Yet in extreme distress and need there is nearly always an instinctive reversion of sentiment towards the helper and protector whose instincts can be counted on. In the battlefields of the German war it was noticeable that the semi-delirious cries for help of the mangled and wounded were commonly addressed to their mothers; almost invariably so with the French, and very generally among the British, with whom the tradition of 'manly independence' is stronger.

[2] The same notion of 'manliness' lies at the root of the practice inculcated in boys by their fathers in some tribes of using violence towards their mothers. In Fiji boys are taught to strike their mothers, "a neglect of which would beget a fear lest the child should grow up a coward" (T. Williams and J. Calvert, *Fiji and the Fijians*, p. 139). The same is reported of the Hottentots of Namaland (H. Ploss, *Das Kind*, vol. ii, p. 428), and among the Iroquois and Apaches boys are taught to wound their mothers with arrows (S. Powers, *Tribes of California*, p. 209). These 'tests of valour,' when considered in conjunction with many similar ones practised by war-like tribes, are not evidence of callousness and lack of filial sentiment, but rather the contrary. A similar 'test of valour' described by Mr. W. H. Furness (*Home Life of the Borneo Head-Hunters*, pp. 62 sq.) in an instructive passage, too long to be quoted here at length, shows how the whole point of the test was to overcome the natural sympathy and tender-heartedness of the boys. The victim was in this instance an old slave-woman; and the boy reports that "he could not bear the thought of hurting her," and flatly refused to do so. But "his father, a very great warrior, was right in teaching him to outgrow those feelings. That's the way to become a man." The mothers, in fact, as Ploss states, rejoice and are very proud of their boys when these strike them or prick them with arrows, and I have seen the same pride in European mothers in Italy and Greece when, on their own suggestion, their boys hit them with their little fists. The prevalent custom of killing aged parents appears, to our notions, even more irreconcilable with filial affection. It may, however, be said positively that it is no indication of lack of filial affection, but in the majority of instances of the reverse. It is invariably carried out with the full concurrence and, in the vast majority of cases, at the urgent request of the old people themselves. Apart from the ideas of personal salvation with which it is connected, it is quite usual, even where the custom is not regularly practised, for old people to do away with themselves before they reach the period of inactivity. In Nigeria, for instance, it is common for old women to save up sufficient money for their funeral, and to poison themselves, after getting a young man to undertake the management of the funeral arrangements (G. T. Basden, *Among the Ibos of Nigeria*, pp. 117 sq.).

[3] E. T. Seton, *Life Histories of Northern Animals*, p. 166.

continued dependence upon the mother's affection is a feature of primitive psychology.

"In the very lowest human society," remarks Schweinfurth, "there is a bond which lasts for life between mother and child, although the father may be a stranger to it."[1] The Indians of California "scarcely acknowledge their father, but they preserve a longer attachment for their mother, who has brought them up with extreme tenderness."[2] Filial and parental love is "the strongest affection that an Indian can experience."[3] Among the Iroquois, "the crime which is regarded as most horrible and which is without example is that a son should be rebellious towards his mother. When she becomes old he provides for her."[4] When the Russians first settled in the Aleutian Islands, two of the most intelligent natives were sent to St. Petersburg and earned a good deal of money by exhibiting on the Neva their skill in plying their canoes. They made many friends and were pressed to remain; but they answered that they could not think of staying longer away from their old and decrepit mother, and must return to look after her in her old age.[5] In Melanesia, when engaging a boat's crew for a week or two, one comes upon grown men of forty who say that they are willing to join, but must first obtain the consent of their mother.[6] One of the most conspicuous traits of the Dayaks of northern Borneo is said to be "their devotion to their mothers and the honour they pay them all their lives from the first moment they can understand. Their father they may like, or they may not; they recognise no duty towards him; but their mother is something holy to them, whatever she is like, and no one is ever allowed to breathe a word against her."[7] The Japanese believe that the spirits of mothers look, from the other world, after the welfare of their children.[8] "I have noticed," says M. Giraud in speaking of the natives of the Ivory Coast, "that children, even when grown to manhood, retain their affection for their mother. Their filial sentiments towards her are very much

[1] G. Schweinfurth, *The Heart of Africa*, vol. i, p. 212.

[2] J. F. G. de La Pérouse, *Voyage autour du monde*, vol. ii, p. 305.

[3] S. S. Allison, "Account of the Similkamean Indians," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxi, p. 316. Cf. E. James, *Account of an Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains*, vol. i, p. 244; vol. ii, p. 254; B. de La Potherie, *Histoire de l'Amérique septentrionale*, vol. i, p. 358.

[4] A. R. de Chateaubriand, *Voyage en Amérique*, vol. i, p. 37.

[5] J. Weniaminoff, "Charakter-Züge der Aleuten von den Fuchs-Inseln," in Wrangell, *Statistische und ethnographische Nachrichten über der Russischen Besitzungen an der Nordwesthüste von Amerika*, pp. 206 sq.

[6] J. Chalmers and W. W. Gill, *Work and Adventure in New Guinea*, p. 209.

[7] D. Cator, *Everyday Life among Head-Hunters*, p. 184.

[8] E. Jung, "Japanischer Aberglaube," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, ix, p. 335.

more developed than towards their father." [1] The same thing is reported of the Ewe of Togoland [2] and of the Bangala.[3] Among the Mandingo, says Mungo Park, "the maternal affection, neither suppressed nor diverted by the solicitude of civilised life, is everywhere conspicuous, and creates a corresponding return of tenderness. The same sentiment I found universally to prevail, and observed in all parts of Africa that the greatest affront which could be offered to a negro was to reflect on her who gave him birth." [4] "Strike me, but do not curse my mother," is a common saying among the Mandingo, and also among the Fanti and in the Congo.[5] Lieut. Costermanns is doubtless right in remarking that with the Congo native's respect for his mother is mixed up a superstitious sentiment.[6] In most countries the imprecations intended to be most offensive are directed against a man's mother.[7] Quarrels between children among the Kru and among the Kaffirs are said to arise mostly from some child having insulted another's mother.[8] The most solemn oath among the Damaras and among the Herero is "by the tears of their mother." [9] In Loango grown-up persons invariably call, when in pain or in difficulty, upon the name of their mother, and the mother always addresses her offspring, no matter how old, as 'my children.' They believe that even after death the mother watches over her children and protects them not only from evil men, but also against the influences of spirits and natural forces.[10] "The strongest of all natural ties," says Wilson of the

[1] G. Giraud, in *Revue coloniale*, 1909, p. 183. Cf. J. Clozel and R. Villamur, *Les coutumes indigènes de la Côte d'Ivoire*, p. 278.

[2] J. Spieth, *Die Ewe-Stämme*, p. 565, cf. p. 66; K. Fies, "Der Hostamm in Deutsch-Togo," *Globus*, lxxxvii, p. 76.

[3] C. van Overbergh, *Les Bangala*, p. 201.

[4] Mungo Park, "Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa," in Pinkerton, *Voyages and Travels*, vol. xvi, p. 172. The Mandingo are fond of setting an ethical problem in the form of a little apologue about a man who found that a deadly peril threatened at the same time his cattle, his son and his decrepit old mother. The audience is asked which he should rescue first. The answer is almost invariably "His mother" (H. Hecquard, *Voyage sur la côte et dans l'interieur de l'Afrique occidentale*, pp. 196 sq.).

[5] Mungo Park, *loc. cit.*; T. Winterbottom, *An Account of the Native Africans in the neighbourhood of Sierra Leone*, vol. i, p. 273; R. Clarke, "Sketches of the Colony of Sierra Leone," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society*, N.S., ii, p. 333; J. H. Weeks, *Among the Primitive Bakongo*, p. 157.

[6] Costermanns, "Le District de Stanley-Pool," *Bulletin de la Société des Études coloniales*, ii, p. 70.

[7] Cf. W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, vol. i, pp. 129 sq.; D. Porter, *Journal of a Cruise made to the Pacific Ocean*, vol. ii, p. 25.

[8] J. Wilson, *Western Africa*, p. 116; D. Kidd, *Savage Childhood*, pp. 198, 200.

[9] C. J. Andersson, *Lake Ngami*, p. 231; J. Irle, *Die Herero*, p. 64.

[10] E. Pechuël-Loesche, "Indiscretes aus Loango," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, x, pp. 17 sq.

West African negroes, "are those between the mother and her children. Whatever other estimate we may form of the African, we may not doubt his love for his mother. Her name, whether dead or alive, is always on his lips and in his heart. To her he confides secrets which he would reveal to no other being on the face of the earth. He cares for no one else in time of sickness. She alone must prepare his food, administer his medicine, prepare his ablutions, and spread his mat for him. He flies to her in the hour of distress, for he well knows, if all the rest of the world turn against him, she will be steadfast in her love, whether he is right or wrong."[1] Among the Ibo of Nigeria, "the mother's love for the child, and vice versa, are perhaps the most remarkable elements in the family relationships. The son may not always treat his mother kindly—although not to do so is abhorrent to the Ibo mind, and very seldom indeed is a mother neglected or treated disrespectfully—but the son never forgets his mother. Invariably she is the first in his affections, and she is his confidante in all serious affairs of life. In times of danger his mother is thought of before even wife and children. Wives are always to be had; he cannot get a second mother."[2] "Throughout all the bush-tribes in West Africa," says Miss Kingsley, "this deep affection is the same; next to the mother comes the sister."[3] The same deep affection of children for their mother is noted in Central Africa.[4] Cameron in his travels across Africa was once led a very considerable distance out of his way by one of his guides; it turned out that he had led the expedition astray for hundreds of miles in order to meet his mother.[5] A negro guide of Mr. Felkin resisted the temptation to do the same; "I feared if I saw my mother," he said, "I should want to stay with her, and I must not leave you."[6] In the polygamous African home the husband's mother is generally the first person whom the traveller meets; she is the real head of the female part of the household, and the 'family,' so far as regards the bonds of affection, consists rather of mother and son than of husband and wives.[7] The women, on the other hand, are more closely bound to their mother than to

[1] J. Wilson, *Western Africa*, pp. 116 sq.

[2] G. T. Basden, *Among the Ibos of Nigeria*, pp. 64 sq.

[3] M. Kingsley, *West African Studies*, p. 320.

[4] M. A. Condon, "Contribution to the Ethnography of the Basoga-Batamba, Uganda Protectorate," *Anthropos*, vi, p. 375.

[5] V. L. Cameron, *Across Africa*, p. 321.

[6] C. T. Wilson and R. W. Felkin, *Uganda and the Egyptian Soudan*, vol. ii, p. 124.

[7] A. Werner, *The Natives of British Central Africa*, p. 145; H. H. Johnston, "The Peoples of Eastern Equatorial Africa," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xv, p. 9.

their husband; in Togoland "the bond between mother and daughter is so strong that both remain bound to one another until one dies. Never can love towards the husband displace in the heart of a daughter the love towards her mother."[1] In Oriental as in African harems the mother, and not the chief wife, is usually the head of the household.[2] Lord Cromer, who speaks rather severely of the Egyptians, remarks upon their affection towards their mothers; they often repeat the saying of the Kuran: "Paradise lies at the feet of the mother."[3]

The Social Instincts.

The attachment of the young to the mother differs considerably in its character from maternal love; it consists not so much in a sentiment of tenderness as in a sense of dependence which gives rise to panic fear when that protection is withdrawn and to a dread of solitude. The young of carnivorous animals, even when not hungry, invariably shriek and howl when left alone.[4] Since it thus consists primarily of a sense of dependence the filial sentiment is particularly ready to accept a substitute. It is not primarily the mother as such that it requires—it is a protector, a guide, an individual upon whom it can lean. All young animals will attach themselves to the first creature, animal or human, that will look after them. New-born chickens will follow any moving object. When guided by the sense of sight alone "they seem to have no more disposition to follow a hen than to follow a duck or a human being." By attending to his chickens from birth, Mr. Spalding completely ousted their mother, and the chickens would, without any encouragement, follow him everywhere without taking the slightest notice of their own bereaved parent.[5] "When Indians have killed a cow buffalo," says

[1] K. Fies, "Der Hostamm in Deutsch-Togo," *Globus*, lxxxvi, p. 76.

[2] L. M. Garnett, *Turkish Life in Town and Country*, p. 52.

[3] Lord Cromer, *Modern Egypt*, p. 583. The same sentiment was equally conspicuous among the ancient Egyptians. The scribe Ani, writing about 2700 B.C., has the following passage on the subject: "I gave thee thy mother, she who bore thee with much suffering. She placed thee in the Chamber of Instruction that thou mightest acquire instruction in books. She was unremitting in her care for thee, and had loaves and beer for thee in her house. When thou art grown and hast a wife, and hast a house, cast thine eyes upon her that gave thee birth and provided all good things for thee, thy mother. Let her never reproach thee, lest she lift up her hands to God and He hear her prayer" (F. Chabas, "Les maximes du scribe Ani," *L'Égyptologie*, ii, p. 52).

[4] P. Chalmers Mitchell, *The Childhood of Animals*, p. 168.

[5] D. A. Spalding, "Instinct; with Original Observations on Young Animals," *Macmillan's Magazine*, xxvii, p. 287.

Hennepin, "the calf follows them and licks their hands."[1] Mr. Selous mentions that, having shot a female rhinoceros which had just dropped a calf, the latter at once trotted behind its mother's slayer and quietly followed him to his camp.[2] The manner in which the domestication of animals first took place will be apparent from such instances. The reliance upon the mother extends to all companions, to all individuals who are recognised as not being hostile or dangerous, and results in a general disposition to friendliness and affection. "When wild animals become tame," says Dr. Chalmers Mitchell, "they are really extending or transferring to human beings the confidence and affection they naturally give to their mothers, and this view will be found to explain more facts about tameness than any other. Every creature that would naturally enjoy maternal care is ready to transfer its devotion to other animals or to human beings. The capacity to be tamed is greatest in those animals that remain longest with their parents and that are most intimately associated with them."[3]

Herbivorous animals show scarcely any attachment or affection towards human beings. The carnivores become extremely attached to their keepers; lions and tigers brought up by Herr Hagenbeck showed excitement and joy when seeing him again after an interval of two or three years.[4] Monkeys are the most affectionate of the lower animals towards those who have brought them up, and the anthropoids most of all. Mr. R. B. Walker, who had a large experience in bringing up young gorillas, states that they "become so much attached to their keeper or attendant that a separation from him almost invariably causes these affectionate apes to pine away and die."[5]

Members of the same group, brothers and sisters, are naturally the first substitutes adopted in satisfying the sentiment of dependence, and in appeasing the fear of solitude created by maternal care. Those feelings are even more prone to assume the character of sympathy and tender affection when directed towards companions of the same age than in relation to the mother. An instinct of 'clannishness' which draws a sharp distinction between members of the group, known and familiar individuals, and strangers, becomes a marked feature of such a group. Thus

[1] L. Hennepin, *Voyage, ou nouvelle découverte à un très-grand pays dans l'Amérique*, p. 191.

[2] F. C. Selous, *A Hunter's Wanderings in Africa*, pp. 361 sq.

[3] P. C. Mitchell, *op. cit.*, p. 206.

[4] C. Hagenbeck, *Beast and Man*, pp. 100 sqq.

[5] R. B. Walker, in *Proceedings of the Zoological Society*, xli, p. 684. Cf. W. W. Reade, *ibid.*, xxxi, p. 172; W. T. Hornaday, *The Mind and Manners of Wild Animals*, pp. 95 sqq. The savage and untamable character of the gorilla is one of the many fables that have gathered round this animal.

among Americans bisons "each small group is of the same strain of blood. There is no animal more clannish than the bison. The male calf follows the mother until two years old, when he is driven out of the herd, and the parental tie is entirely broken. The female calf fares better, as she is permitted to stay with her mother's family for life. In a broad sense it will be seen that the small local herd is a family, or rather a clan. Their leader is always an old cow, doubtless she is the grandmother of many of them. A pathetic sight was sometimes witnessed when the mother of one of these families was killed at the first shot. They were so devoted to her, they would linger and wait until the last one could be easily slain."[1] The same group sentiment has been observed by many as being very marked in the elephant. "If by any accident," says Sir E. Tennant, "an elephant becomes hopelessly separated from his herd, he is not permitted to attach himself to any other. No familiarity or intimate association is under any circumstances permitted. To such height is this exclusiveness carried that even amidst the terror of an elephant corral, when an individual, detached from his own party in the 'mêlée' and confusion, has been driven into the enclosure with an unbroken herd, I have seen him repulsed in every attempt to take refuge among them."[2] In those animals which have in numbers been together under the influence of prolonged maternal care, a tendency is observable among the young to continue together after they have left, or been expelled from, the maternal group. This is observed among crows, jackdaws, starlings, and other birds,[3] and in some members of the deer tribe. Among primates the tendency is conspicuous. Monkeys are the only mammals in which a true social instinct may be said to be developed. Until sexual causes come into operation all young monkeys tend to remain associated in troops with the members of the same brood, and in that association are developed for the first time in the animal kingdom sentiments of sympathy. Sympathy is, as Romanes remarked, "more strongly marked in monkeys than in any other animal, not even excepting the dog."[4] He mentions striking instances of that mutual interest which is a conspicuous feature of all associations of monkeys. A sick monkey is waited on with the utmost solicitude and anxiety by his companions, who even forgo dainties in order to offer them to him.[5] A monkey on board a ship is said to have extended a rope overboard in order to save a

[1] E. T. Seton, *op. cit.*, pp. 276 sq.
[2] E. Tennent, *Natural History of Ceylon*, p. 114.
[3] C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, vol. i, p. 74.
[4] G. Romanes, *Animal Intelligence*, p. 471.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 473.

drowning companion.[1] Those social impulses are correlated with the prolonged association of infancy under maternal care.

The so called instinct of sociability or of gregariousness is in reality the effect of the offspring's dependence upon maternal protection, and consequent dread or dislike of solitude on the part of the dependent young. It has been repeated since the time of Aristotle that 'man is a social animal,' and the origin of human society has been set down to the operation of such a supposed innate disposition to association. Modern psychologists have continued to refer to such a supposed primary instinct, and to regard it as an ultimate fact of paramount importance in determining human social organisation. But in doing so they appear to have merely taken for granted a time-honoured assumption. When any attempt is made to justify such an estimate, and to describe the manifestations of the supposed instinct, it is invariably found that other powerful motives are at work.[2] Mr. Marshall is almost singular in judiciously maintaining that all social instincts appertain to a much more recent stratum than other mental tendencies.[3] Dr. Drever cautiously observes that "it is perhaps a matter for the biologist rather than for the psychologist to decide."[4]

[1] G. Romanes, *Animal Intelligence*, p. 475.

[2] Dr. McDougall's treatment of the subject contrasts with the acute psychological analysis which we are accustomed to expect from him (W. McDougall, *An Introduction to Social Psychology*, pp. 84 sqq., 296 sqq.). He ascribes, for instance, the forgathering of crowds to witness pageants to the operation of the gregarious instinct causing people to take pleasure in the crowd for its own sake. But many people are chiefly deterred from such spectacles on that very account, and all are gratified when able to witness them from a position where "there is scarcely anybody." His suggestion that the formation of large cities is primarily due to an impulse towards gregariousness is clearly erroneous. Large cities, not excepting those eastern ones to which Dr. McDougall refers, have never come into existence except through the operation of powerful economic and other motives. Country-dwellers, if no motive of interest calls them to town, positively dislike the latter and its crowds, and when imperative reasons compel them to take up their abode there, suffer from a nostalgic longing for the semi-solitude of the country. Those who are attracted to towns from pure taste are not the primitive, but the highly sophisticated who seek there the gratification of cultural interests or of highly cultivated social intercourse. For the same reasons the industrial town-dweller who has developed a new cultural mentality can no longer regard the more primitive interests of the country-dweller as sufficient. The densely populated cities of China—such as Canton—owe their growth primarily to commercial interests, secondarily to the Chinese traditional custom that successive families shall continue to dwell in the parental house. The 'social instinct' in this instance is towards the family, not towards the crowd.

[3] H. Rutgers Marshall, *Instinct and Reason*, pp. 173 sqq.

[4] J. Drever, *Instinct in Man*, p. 185.

Biological facts give no support to the conception. The supposed 'gregarious instinct' has, indeed, commonly been referred to as the cause of the associations or congregations of animals, in much the same manner as the properties of opium are explained by Molière's physician by a reference to its 'dormitive virtue.' It has been supposed that such an instinct is one of the primary and fundamental impulses of life, and the theory formulated by Buffon in the eighteenth century, that the 'forms of the social instinct' are the chief determining factor of the habits and groupings of animals, persists in many later biological writings. It is constantly suggested or assumed that an instinct of sociability is an innate impulse of all living protoplasm, and that living organisms are naturally attracted towards other living organisms. But those prevalent assumptions will not stand the test of critical examination. Primitive plasmophagous organisms are attracted towards others by hunger, or by the need for conjugation, which is a form of the same impulse. The congregation of micro-organisms is determined, as is easily demonstrated by experiment, not by the presence or absence of other organisms, but by the most favourable conditions of nutrition and temperature. The broods of all organisms naturally accumulate in one spot and are therefore commonly found in groups. But far from there being any indication of a natural tendency to congregate together, the impulses of living organisms show, on the contrary, the opposite tendency. The broods which are accumulated by the reproductive process in the neighbourhood of one spot tend invariably to scatter and spread abroad. The ubiquity of life is the result of that tendency to dispersion. It is the natural consequence of the need for food which is liable to become exhausted where many claimants to it congregate, and must be sought farther afield. It is an advantage to organisms to wander away from the pressure of competition to fresh fields and pastures new.

That impulse of the individual to wander is far more conspicuously manifested among animals, from the lowest to the highest, than any 'gregarious instinct.' In the lower animals the tendency is almost invariably to wander as far afield as possible. Insects, among which the most perfect examples, outside humanity, of social communities are found, are nevertheless eminently solitary. "The majority of insects," says Mr. C. A. Ealand, "are solitary in their habits; each individual, or at most a pair of individuals, lives its life irrespectively of the activities of others of its kind." [1] If a 'social instinct' were an original, or even a common and deep-seated, impulse of life, we should expect to find the majority of animals, especially the higher and more intelligent, aggregated

[1] C. A. Ealand, *Insect Life*, p. 29.

in communities. But that is very far from being the case. On the contrary, the lower and least intelligent birds and the ruminants are found herding in large numbers, while the more highly developed nesting-birds, the birds of prey, and the carnivores are eminently solitary. Even the most typically herding animals have a tendency to segregate themselves and to disperse. Large herds are in reality subdivided into smaller groups of closely related animals, and it is the familial instinct, and not an undifferentiated gregarious instinct, which causes Galton's Damara-ox to feel uneasy when separated from his group. Cattle, sheep, horses, when promiscuously herded together, sort themselves out into separate groups according to colour and varieties, and such groups will hold no communication with one another, and will often segregate themselves in different territories.[1] All animal groups, in the natural state, break up through the operation of the reproductive instincts. The females of nearly all animals seek solitude after impregnation, and in every species, even the most gregarious, the males have a tendency to wander in solitude. Of elephants, Mr. Sanderson remarks: "Much misconception exists on the subject of 'rogues' or solitary elephants. The usually accepted belief that these elephants are turned out of the herds by their companions or rivals is not correct. They leave their companions at times to roam by themselves. Sometimes they make those expeditions merely for the sake of solitude."[2] The same remark doubtless applies to many of the males, which in all species are seen roaming by themselves, or in small groups of two or three. In old males, when both the infantile and the sexual instincts have ceased to operate, instinctive tendencies revert to the more primitive impulse towards dispersal and independence. Of bats it is noted that, "though most bats are gregarious in the summer, in the winter they prefer solitude and quiet. They go off singly, or at most in twos or threes."[3] Those animals which mate in pairs separate after the functions of reproduction are discharged as commonly as do herding animals; and of the animals nearest to man the gorilla has been found alone almost as frequently as in herds, and the orang-utan has scarcely ever been seen except alone or with young. All monkeys strongly resent the intrusion of a stranger in their troops, which are close corporations.[4] Their gregarious instincts are towards the group, not towards the species.

The truth is that there is neither any intrinsic social instinct

[1] See below, p. 205.
[2] G. P. Sanderson, *Thirteen Years among the Wild Beasts of India*, p. 52.
[3] F. Pitt, *Wild Creatures of Garden and Hedges*, p. 16.
[4] F. W. Fitzsimons, *The Monkeyfolk of South Africa*, p. 126.

nor any instinct of solitude; animal life does not, as an inherent impulse, love either society or solitude for its own sake. Such abstract predilections may operate in the realms of culture and conceptual thought, but they have no bearing on the behaviour of unsophisticated life. Other impulses, such as the sexual impulse, or the infantile dependence of offspring, may keep or bring animals together; or they may, as does the competition for food, drive them apart; but whether they come together or seek segregation their behaviour is not the effect of any 'gregarious' or 'anti-gregarious' disposition, but of a need for the satisfaction of which either aggregation or solitude is favourable.

The social instinct, the love of company which has developed in the very highest forms of life, is a special and specifically developed instinct. All familial feeling, all group-sympathy, the essential foundation, therefore, of a social organisation, is the direct product of prolonged maternal care, and does not exist apart from it. The deep, self-protective instincts of timidity and distrust forbid, especially in the male, the extension of those sentiments beyond the group of companions. In regard to individuals that are not members of the family group, the original instincts of the cautious, competitive animal retain their full force; the stranger is regarded with spontaneous hostility and hatred.

To man absolute solitude is abhorrent; it is not good for man to be alone. But that is a very different matter from a 'social instinct.' The distress caused by solitude can usually be remedied by the company of an individual of the opposite sex. The 'social instinct' is here no other than the sexual instinct. As in animals that need may, and commonly does, admit of all sorts of substitutes and extensions. In the absence of a congenial companion of the opposite sex, man, rather than suffer absolute isolation, will draw up even to uncongenial companions, or he will value the companionship of an animal, of a dog, of a horse, or even, as in the legend of Bruce, of a spider. A stranger in an unknown land will find comfort in the silent companionship of other human beings, though they may take no notice of him. In all circumstances he will desire, above all, the companionship, not only of a mate, but of his family, his children, friends, of all who are dear to him.

Those feelings are the expression of the familial sentiment arising out of the operation of the maternal instincts, not of a generalised, indiscriminate 'social instinct.' Far from there existing any indication of such a general social instinct in primitive humanity, the attitude of uncultured human beings towards any individual who is not a member of their own restricted social group is one of profound distrust and generally of active hostility. "In primitive culture," observes Dr. Brinton, "there is a dual

system of morals: the one of kindness, love, help, and peace, applicable to the members of our own clan, tribe, or community; the other of robbery, hatred, enmity, and murder, to be practised against all the rest of the world; and the latter is regarded as quite as much a sacred duty as the former." [1] Among all primitive peoples small groups show the strongest indisposition to fuse into larger ones, and the intrusion of strangers is resented. In the Andaman Islands, before the arrival of Europeans, the inhabitants of the small area of those islands were divided into a number of tribelets which had never held any intercourse with one another. When first brought together they were unable to converse, their languages having during centuries of segregation diverged completely, although they were members of the same race.[2] The island of Raratonga was in like manner inhabited, before the advent of Europeans, by tribes which had no knowledge of one another.[3] When the Veddahs of Ceylon are brought into contact with individuals belonging to another tribelet, which, maybe, dwells only a few miles away, they stand in silent embarrassment, refuse to speak, and scowl at the strangers with a manifest disinclination to associate with them.[4] The attitude of the Fuegians, who live in small, scattered communities, towards members of all other groups is said to be one of strong hostility.[5] Between the North American tribes " there was no intermarriage, no social intercourse, no intermingling of any kind, except that of mortal strife." [6] The most salient trait of the Seri Indians is their implacable hostility towards every human being, Indian or white, who is not a member of their tribe, and even each clan views all others with suspicion.[7] South American natives are divided into innumerable small groups and tribelets who hate one another mortally. " The savages detest all who are not of their family or their tribe, and hunt the Indians of a neighbouring tribe who are at war with their own, as we hunt game." [8] The rough huts of the wild Cashibo of southern

[1] D. G. Brinton, *Races and Peoples*, p. 59; cf. Id., *Religions of Primitive Peoples*, p. 228.

[2] R. C. Temple, in *Census o India*, 1901, vol. iii, p. 51.

[3] W. W. Gill, *Gems of the Coral Islands*, p. 5.

[4] B. F. Hartshorne, " The Weddas," *The Fortnightly Review*, xix (1876), p. 407.

[5] W. H. Stirling, " A Residence in Tierra del Fuego," *The South American Missionary Magazine*, iv, p. 1.

[6] R. I. Dodge, *Our Wild Indians*, p. 45.

[7] W. J. McGee, " The Seri Indians," *Seventeenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, Part i, pp. 11, 130 sq.

[8] A. von Humboldt, *Personal Narrative of Travels to the Equinoctial Regions of the New Continent*, vol. v, p. 422. Cf. G. E. Church, *Aborigines of South America*, p. 29.

Peru are surrounded with pitfalls and concealed spikes.[1] In Australia it is a rule that no blackfellow from one camp may visit another camp without being invited; a messenger or visitor from one clan to another must sit down at some distance from the strange camp and wait until he has been examined by some of the elders before he is asked to approach.[2] "Every stranger who presents himself uninvited amongst them incurs the penalty of death."[3] Among the Ancient Britons no man could approach or pass a village without giving warning of his presence by blowing a horn.[4] The same precaution was observed by the Guatos of South America,[5] and by the Maori of New Zealand.[6]

It is not in obedience to any generalised mutual attraction, to any 'gregarious' or 'social' instinct, that groups, whether of human beings or of animals, are formed or maintained. Wherever such a group exists it is the result of specific needs and instincts, and not of any attraction that impels individuals to association for its own sake. In the higher forms of animal life, what has commonly been called the 'social instinct' is the direct outcome of the relation between mother and offspring, and of the reflection of the maternal instincts in the relations of mutual dependence and sympathy, between members of the same brood or brotherhood. Darwin, although he appeared to share some of the current misconceptions concerning so-called social instincts, perceived that "the feeling of pleasure from society is probably an extension of the parental or filial affection," and that those latter feelings and instincts "lie at the basis of social affections."[7] The material out of which all human society has been constructed is the bond of those sentiments. These have undergone many extensions and transformations, sentiments of brotherhood towards all members of the same clan, and, in higher forms of culture, ideal loyalties, patriotic devotion, and religious altruisms. Those sentiments and social virtues which are necessary to the existence of any form of human society have their original root in the feelings which characterise the relation between mother and offspring. Dr. Ferriani, in discussing the education and reformation of youthful delinquents, that is, of youths who are deficient in social

[1] I. Bowman, *The Andes of Southern Peru*, p. 37.

[2] W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 569 sq.; A. C. R. Bowler, "Aboriginal Customs," *Science of Man*, 1902, p. 203; C. P. Hodgson, *Reminiscences of Australia*, pp. 214 sq.

[3] W. Westgarth, *Report on the Condition, Capabilities, and Prospects of the Australian Aborigines*, p. 19.

[4] J. R. Green, *A Short History of the English People*, p. 3.

[5] M. Schmidt, *Indianerstudien in Zentral Brasilien*, p. 310.

[6] W. Colenso, *On the Maori Races of New Zealand*, p. 53.

[7] C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, vol. i, p. 80.

sentiment and virtues, remarks that the most numerous and most hopeless cases are those where no opportunity has been afforded for the development of filial sentiments. On the other hand, "I never despair," he says, "of youths who honour their mother."[1] The original of all social bonds, the only one which exists among the higher animals and in the most primitive human groups, is that created by mother-love.

[1] L. Ferriani, *Minderjährige Verbrecher*, p. 202.

CHAPTER V

THE HERD AND THE FAMILY AMONGST ANIMALS

Supposed Animal Societies.

GROUPS of associated individuals, among animals, often fulfil functions of cooperation in the quest and storage of food, in constructive activities, and mutual protection; but there exists no instance of an association among animals formed for the sole purpose of discharging such functions. The cause which gives rise to the formation of a group among animals, and the bond which holds such an animal group together, are in every instance manifestations of the reproductive instincts, and every association of individuals in the animal kingdom is, without exception, a reproductive organisation.

The elaborate communities found among insects, such as termites, ants, wasps, bees, are complex reproductive groups in which a remarkable differentiation and coordination of functions is directed to the common end of reproduction. Thus, "the whole arrangement of a 'formicarium,' or ant colony, and all the varied activity of ant-life," observes Bates, "are directed to one main purpose: the perpetuation and dissemination of the species. Most of the labour we see performed by the workers has for its end the sustenance and welfare of the young brood, which are helpless grubs. The true females are incapable of attending to the wants of their offspring; and it is on the poor sterile workers who are denied all the other pleasures of maternity that the entire care devolves."[1] The deep bias which will constantly confront us in the course of our present enquiries, and which leads to the interpretation of biological and social phenomena in terms of the social and sentimental traditions acquired by the interpreter, might be illustrated from the various conceptions that have been put forward concerning the communities of bees. The ancients regarded the egg-laying female as a patriarchal male, and called it 'the king.' The organisation of the community was thought to conform to the most approved current political principles, and bees were divided

[1] H. W. Bates, *The Naturalist on the River Amazons*, vol. i, p. 32.

into patricians and plebeians.[1] When the true sexes of the insects became generally known, the egg-laying female was called 'the queen,' and was thought to exercise a sort of rule or recognised authority over the other members of the community. The hive was still assimilated to a political organisation, though it tended to assume a democratic character, and in the nineteenth century was freely compared to a capitalistic industrial community, a 'hive of industry.' A book which attained considerable popularity during the late war showed clearly that the British nation is analogous to a hive of bees, while the German Empire resembled a pack of wolves. There is not the remotest similarity between the constitution of a community of bees and a human political society. The forces that shape and bind together the communities of insects are not any ideas of authority, loyalty, or obedience, or of social order and cooperation, but the operation of reproductive instincts variously differentiated and modified. In the so-called 'functionless' females, or 'workers,' the impulses which would ordinarily lead to sexual reproduction are diverted to functions no less essential to the reproductive ends of the community and of the race; and the reproductive instincts of those modified females find their satisfaction in nursing activities, which provide for the development of the common brood of the hive. If the egg-laying female, or 'queen,' be removed from a community of bees, the normally sterile females, or workers, will take up the functions which in them were held in abeyance, and will lay eggs. In bees, which are highly specialised, that faculty is only exercised exceptionally by the 'workers,' and the resulting brood consists invariably of drones. But what is exceptional in bees is the general rule among the various species of wasps, which represent successive stages in the

[1] Aristotle, *Animalium historiae*, v. 21; Aelian, *Nat. animal.* i. 10; v. 10 sq.; Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, x. 5. 10. 11. 16. Aristotle mentions, however, that there were some who regarded the 'king' as a female, and called it 'the Mother.' Great difference of opinion existed as to the mode of reproduction of bees. Some thought that the 'workers' constituted the 'king's' seraglio; others thought that bees "neither rejoice in bodily unions, nor waste themselves in love's languors, or bring forth their young by pain of birth; but from the leaves and sweet-scented herbage they gather their children in their mouths, thus sustaining their strength of tiny citizens" (Vergil, *Georgics*, iv. 197 sqq.; cf. Aristotle, *De animalium generatione*, iii. 10). Moses Rusden, the bee-keeper of Charles I, pointed to the hive as a "parallel instance in nature where the system of monarchy was the divinely ordained state." The egg-laying bee "is variously described as a king or queen by writers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but only in the sense of a governor; and the word chosen largely depended on the sex of the august person who happened to occupy the English throne at the time" (T. Edwardes, *The Lore of the Honey-Bee*, pp. 32 sq.).

evolution of that specialisation; a considerable proportion of the 'workers,' sometimes fifty per cent., regularly lay eggs, most male eggs being laid by them. In some species, 'worker' females can also lay female eggs. 'Workers' and 'queens' differ in size only, so that it is sometimes not possible to define any line of demarcation between them. The two sets of functions, that of nursing and that of egg-laying, are reciprocal; if females are artificially compelled to 'nurse,' the maturation of their ova is thereby prevented; if they are prevented from 'nursing,' their eggs mature and they become egg-layers.[1] The differentiation of function in insect communities affords a vivid illustration of the fact that the reproductive or racial impulses may assume quite other forms than the physiological process of propagation, and may be 'sublimated' so as to give rise to manifestations and activities apparently quite different from those directly concerned with the act of reproduction. The modified form of the reproductive instincts in 'functionless' females among bees and wasps is exactly analogous to the maternal instincts in the females of the higher vertebrates, and to the parental instincts of the male. In these the sexual instinct is supplanted by the maternal instinct; among mammals, when the female is about to give birth to her young, and the maternal functions develop, there is invariably a complete disappearance of the sexual instinct, and in the majority of instances a strong aversion is manifested towards the male sex. In the male who develops parental and mating instincts the sexual impulse is checked and modified by those instincts. In insect communities the functions not only of the two sexes, but of a large number of specially differentiated individuals, are correlated in view of the reproductive end. The ordinary correlation, which always takes place between the male and the female of a species, is here greatly extended, though it is in principle the same.

The class of insects is a divergent offshoot from the main stem of animal evolution, and lies outside the direct line of human, and even of vertebrate, ancestry. Among vertebrate animals there exists nothing analogous to the elaborate organisation of insect communities. These depend upon a very special adaptation of the sexual instincts, and no such differentiation exists among the higher animals. Accordingly, no complex form of organisation like that of insect communities is to be found among vertebrates. The group which among vertebrates corresponds to the insect

[1] P. Marchal, "La reproduction et l'évolution des guêpes sociales," *Archives de Zoologie Expérimentale et Générale*, Série 3, iii, pp. 17 sqq., 28 sqq., 49, 56; Id., "Les ouvrières pondeuses chez les abeilles," *Bulletin de la Société Entomologique de France*, 1894, pp. clxxiv sqq.; S. Stone, "Facts connected with the History of a Wasps' Nest," *Transactions of the Entomological Society of London*, 2nd Series, v, pp. 86 sq.

community, is not a society, but a family. Both are reproductive organisations, and there exists no other basis of organisation among animals.

Many of the assemblages of animals are not associations at all. Animals may collect in large numbers in one place because the conditions of temperature, food-supply, etc., which they all seek are to be found there. Thus fish collect together in enormous shoals so as to form almost solid banks. There are neither collective purposes nor definite sexual relations in those aggregations. They are the result of a common appetence towards the most favourable conditions and of retreat from less favourable ones. In the same manner micro-organisms placed on a glass plate unevenly heated congregate in that portion of the plate which offers the optimum conditions of temperature for their metabolism and development. The gatherings of sea-birds at their breeding-grounds, or rookeries, are mainly the result of a common choice of the most suitable conditions. Although a trifling amount of cooperation in warding off enemies may incidentally result, there are more often quarrels and pilferings; and the huge agglomeration really consists of separate groups between which there is no organisation or true association.

Many birds and mammals, again, gather together for their migrations. The causes are here mostly similar to those which bring about the aggregations of fishes. All the individuals or groups are impelled by the same migratory instincts in response to the same stimuli, and are thus brought together; they, at the same time, avail themselves of the advantage afforded by the leads of the first migrants, which are usually the females. There is no collective action or organisation, and the association does not as a rule extend beyond the duration of the causes that brought it about. Migratory birds revert to separate groupings as soon as the migration is accomplished; the same thing takes place among deer and antelopes, which, although usually living in small groups, may gather together in large numbers when moving from one district to another.[1]

The presence of large numbers of the same species in one place often gives rise to the impression that they are gregarious. For

[1] A. Espinas, *Des Sociétés Animales*, p. 465; A. R. Dugmore, *The Romance of the Newfoundland Caribou*, p. 77. Those migrations are undoubtedly due to the quest for more favourable conditions, chiefly in regard to temperature and food-supply. The migratory instinct is consolidated through many thousands of generations and, no doubt, often survives when the actual conditions are no longer the same as those which gave rise to the instinct in the first instance. Insects, locusts, butterflies migrate in huge numbers in the same way as do birds and mammals. I have seen peacock butterflies, *Vanessa cardui*, migrating in dense masses, which took two days to pass a given spot.

instance, African reedbucks are so abundant in the ground near rivers which is their habitat, nearly three or four hundred animals being often seen in close proximity, that they have been described as gregarious. This, however, is an error, for they are really associated in separate pairs with a couple of young each, and their aggregation in large numbers is no more due to association than is that of sea-fowl in their rookeries.[1]

The temporary association of a number of animals is often adventitious and of little significance. Thus lions have been seen in troops of over twenty and even of as many as forty individuals.[2] But, as Mr. F. C. Selous remarks: "I have come to the conclusion that such large assemblages of lions as these are in all probability only of a very temporary nature, the chance meeting and fraternisation of several families which as a rule hunt apart."[3] Hyenas are quite solitary animals, living in couples and remaining in the same lair with their young for some eight or nine months. Yet they are habitually seen in packs, although they are not in any sense associated. "Hyenas do not live in packs, but when a large animal has been killed they scent the blood from afar and collect together for the feast, separating and going off singly to their several lairs soon after daybreak. The rapidity with which hyenas sometimes collect round a carcass is truly astonishing."[4] Such adventitious forgathering may, it is easy to suppose, lead to more permanent association. The packs of wild dogs, jackals, and wolves do, in fact, closely resemble the assemblages of hyenas; and those pack formations are the nearest approach to be found among mammals of association with concerted action. They are confined to the dog-tribe, which are carnivorous animals not sufficiently powerful to attack large prey individually or to hold their own against larger carnivores. The idea, however, that such packs are permanent associations is erroneous. All those animals live singly, and their gathering into packs is exceptional. The South American wolf (*Canis jubatus*) never forms packs, but leads an entirely solitary life.[5] The Indian wolf does not associate in large packs; two is the usual number that are found together, and only exceptionally as many as six or eight.[6] Of the prairie wolf Mr. Seton says: "The most I have seen in one day were eight, and the most at one spot three. They were

[1] P. L. Sclater and O. Thomas, *The Book of the Antelopes*, vol. ii, p. 162.

[2] F. J. Jackson, in *Big Game Shooting* (*Badminton Library*), vol. i, p. 245; C. B. Schillings, *Mit Blitzlicht und Buchse*, p. 287; A. E. Pease, *The Book of the Lion*, pp. 47, 283 sq.

[3] F. C. Selous, *African Nature Notes*, p. 77. Cf. A. E. Pease, *op. cit.*, p. 187.

[4] F. C. Selous, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

[5] St. George Mivart, *Dogs, Jackals, Wolves, and Foxes*, p. 6.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

gathered at a dead calf and scattered immediately after the feast. The most I have heard of together were twelve, also attracted by a carcass."[1] The same excellent authority says of another species: "The most grey wolves I ever saw in a band was five; the most I ever heard of in a band was thirty-two. I think, further, that the species is not gregarious. The packs are probably temporary associations of personal acquaintances for some temporary purpose or passing reason, such as food question or mating instinct. As soon as that is settled they scatter." Describing the pursuit of a prey by a few wolves, Mr. Seton states that after they had secured their prey and finished their meal "they scattered, each going a quarter of a mile or so, no two in the same direction."[2] The Australian dingo is scarcely ever seen except singly or in pairs.[3] The most permanent packs of the dog-tribe are the African wild dog which, when associated, even attack small herds of buffaloes.[4] The European wolf only forgathers temporarily when a large animal has to be attacked. "As soon as the prey is captured and torn they separate singly."[5] Packs of wolves are seen exceptionally in winter only.[6] The various 'tactics' and 'manœuvres' about which much has been written, and which reduce themselves to driving the quarry past an ambush, do not in any instance offer evidence of concerted action; nor is there any indication that individual impulses are, in such instances, held in abeyance in view of a communal sharing of profits. Wolves fight furiously among themselves over the prey.[7] "In captivity wolves are the meanest brutes on earth, and in a wild state they are no better. As a rule the strong ones are ever ready to kill the weaker ones and eat them."[8] An illustration of popular methods of interpreting animal behaviour is afforded by a naturalist who describes the 'tactics' and 'pre-concerted' actions of a dog hunting in concert with a friendly raven![9] The association of animals of the dog-tribe into packs, as it has been conceived by imaginative writers, would offer the only approximation among mammals to concerted association; but those packs, and the 'pack law' so

[1] E. T. Seton, *Life Histories of Northern Animals*, p. 795.
[2] Id., *op. cit.*, pp. 755 sq.
[3] A. H. S. Lucas and W. H. D. Le Souëf, *The Animals of Australia*, p. 10.
[4] F. C. Selous, *op. cit.*, p. 120. "In packs of from four to sixty, but usually about fifteen individuals" (P. L. Sclater, *The Mammals of South Africa*, vol. i, p. 104).
[5] Friederich von Tschudi, *Das Thierleben der Alpenwelt* . 421. Cf. R. Martin, *Les Mammifères de la France*, p. 39.
[6] St. George Mivart, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
[7] E. T. Seton, *op. cit.*, p. 756.
[8] W. T. Hornaday, *The Mind and Manners of Wild Animals* . p. 283.
[9] J. C. Atkinson, "Reason and Instinct," *The Zoologist*, 1857 , p. 5463.

eloquently described by the author of 'The Jungle-Book'[1] in speaking of the Indian wolf, which is scarcely ever known to gather in larger numbers than three, have no existence except in vivid imagination.

Another mammal which has frequently been spoken of as being organised into social communities is the beaver.[2] The members of a beaver colony have been described as working in concert under the authority of a leader. There is no foundation for those fancy pictures. Beavers live in families, and there is no leader. The largest 'communities' ever seen by Agassiz consisted of five families. "It is evident," he says, "that beavers are not really gregarious in their habits, and that the dams and canals are the work of a comparatively small number of animals."[3] Each family builds its own burrow or 'lodge,'[4] or rather it is built by the female, assisted by the male, who only plays the part of a hewer and hauler of wood.[5] In cutting down timber "three are the most that have been seen working at the same tree at once."[6] It has been stated that the various families of a beaver colony cooperate in laying down logs for the building of a dam; but logs are scarcely ever, if at all, used in the building of beaver-dams, unless a fallen tree conveniently placed is utilised.[7] Once a dam is begun by one family, others may take advantage of the work already initiated. "The greatest number of beavers ever seen thus engaged by any of my informants," says Morgan, "was nine, while the usual number

[1] "When Pack meets with Pack in the Jungle and neither will go from the trail,
Lie down till the leaders have spoken—it may be fair words will prevail," etc.
R. Kipling, *The Second Jungle-Book*, p. 23.

[2] According to Buffon, the beaver offers the type of society among mammals. ("Discours sur la Nature des Animaux," *Histoire Naturelle*, vol. xxi, p. 353).

[3] A. Agassiz, "Notes on Beaver Dams," *Proceedings of the Boston Society of Natural History*, xiii (1871), pp. 104 sqq.

[4] The constructive talents of the beaver are part of the building instincts which are strongly developed throughout the order of rodents from mice upwards. Of a pair of field-mice, Mr. Seton says: "The most noticeable thing about them is their fondness for building. When in the loose box the pair gnawed a lot of chips off the side, then arranging them in a circle to one side they demurely seated themselves in the middle and made very much believe it was a nest. Then I gave them some straw and bits of wood; these were greedily seized on and added to the nest. In a couple of days the stronger mouse killed its mate, ate the head, and presently utilised the body as building material" (E. T. Seton, *op. cit.*, pp. 563 sq.).

[5] Brehm-Strassen, *Tierleben*, vol. xi, p. 428.

[6] L. H. Morgan, *The American Beaver and his Works*, p. 220.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 110.

is much less."[1] A dam has been known to be constructed by one solitary beaver.[2]

Romantic descriptions have been given of the 'societies' of 'prairie dogs,' *Gynomys Ludovicianus*, a species of marmot found in large numbers in the Missouri valley. According to Captain Marryat their burrows are laid out in regular streets forming 'prairie-dog cities,' and there are also suburban residences on the outskirts. They are in the habit of paying afternoon calls on one another, and hold conversations by barking; the constitution of their society is monarchical, etc.[3] It is scarcely necessary to say that such fables are without any foundation. Many other species of rodents, owing to their prolific reproduction, occur together in large numbers; but there is not in any assemblage of rodents a trace of association. Of the hare, Mr. Seton says: "They come together when their numbers are such that they cannot help it, nor are they at all benefited by such close association."[4]

'Polygamy' and 'Monogamy' amongst Animals.

The only forms of true association found among the higher vertebrates rest on the sexual and reproductive relations between their constituent individuals.

There is no evidence of any relation between the polygamous or monogamous habits of a species and its efficiency or its position in the scale of development. Several writers have been anxious to discover such a relation, and to suggest that the ideas of sexual morality which have become formed as a result of special social conditions at a late stage of human history, have a bearing on biological development and some sort of validity among the lower animals. One writer makes the extraordinary statement that "monogamous marriage lasting for life" has among animals "become adopted by every dominant race on account of its resulting in the largest number of most efficient offspring."[5] The facts show, on the contrary, that whether sexual relations are 'polygamous' or 'monogamous' is a circumstance which has no direct bearing on the efficiency, development, or advance of a species. The 'polygamous' herbivores have

[1] L. H. Morgan, *op. cit.*, p. 173.
[2] E. T. Seton, *op. cit.*, p. 453.
[3] L. Büchner, *Liebe und Liebesleben in der Thierwelt*, pp. 350 sq.
[4] E. T. Seton, *op. cit.*, p. 628.
[5] Woods Hutchinson, "Animal Marriage," *The Contemporary Review*, October 1904, p. 485. Mr. Hutchinson's article, which abounds in inaccuracies (sometimes unfavourable to the writer's own thesis) is a striking example of this curious moral zeal in the field of natural history. It has obsessed many more scientific writers.

a far more numerous offspring than the 'monogamous' carnivores and are more abundant; and within the same order the smaller antelopes, which are monogamous, are the least developed and efficient, while the typically polygamous 'bovidae' are the most efficient and highly developed. The lion, which is regarded as the most polygamous animal among the land carnivora, is also the most intelligent and highly developed, and bestows more care than any other upon its offspring. Among birds and mammals 'monogamous' relations are found in animals that are lowest, and 'polygamous' relations in those that are highest in the evolutionary scale. Darwin was of opinion that the reason why the lower species of animals are less polygamous than the higher is that they are less intelligent.[1] It has been alleged that polygamy leads to a greater proportion of female births. But, as Darwin has pointed out, "hardly an animal has been rendered so highly polygamous as our English race-horses, and their male and female offspring are almost exactly equal in number."[2] So likewise it has been shown from careful investigation by Dr. J. Campbell in the harems of Siam that the proportion of male and female births is the same as from monogamous unions.[3] Monogamous mating is found characteristically in some birds, and never to the same degree in mammals. As Brehm says, "true marriage is only to be found among birds"[4]; while, on the other hand, "among mammals polygamy is the rule."[5]

The terms 'monogamy' and 'polygamy' applied to animals have not, be it noted, the same meaning as when applied to marriage, for they refer only to the associations that take place during one breeding season. Thus the 'true marriage' of birds merely means pairing during one breeding season. 'Monogamous' birds "are to be found single after pairing-time, and of each sex," observes Gilbert White. "When the house sparrows deprive my martins of their nests, as soon as I cause one to be shot, the other, be he a cock or a hen, presently procures a mate, and so several times following. I have known a dove-cot infested by a pair of white owls, which made great havoc among the young pigeons; one of the owls was shot as soon as possible, but the survivor readily found a mate and the mischief went on."[6] Even the transient seasonal pairing of birds is a very different

[1] C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, vol. i, p. 266.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 303.

[3] James Campbell, "Polygamy: its Influence on Sex and Population," *Journal of Anthropology*, 1870–1871, pp. 192 sqq.

[4] A. E. Brehm, *Thierleben*, vol. ix, p. 285.

[5] Brehm-Strassen, *Tierleben*, vol. x, p. 35.

[6] G. White, *The Natural History of Selborne*, Letter xxxiv. White mentions several other like instances.

thing from what sentimental descriptions are prone to suggest. The male bird continues with the female because it is interested in the hatching of the eggs, but the association ceases to be a sexual one after the short breeding-time, unless indeed the sexual instincts of the male are not adjusted to the periodicity of the female's functions. This is doubtless far from uncommon. Thus the mallard " is ostensibly monogamous, and on the whole seems to be a fairly considerate mate. The normal period of pairing being passed, and the duties of incubation having begun, the female ceases to harbour any further desire for sexual intimacy. Not so the male. He is yet far from satiated ; in him the sexual fever still burns fiercely. He does not scruple to savagely pursue every other female who ventures abroad in his neighbourhood." [1] The circumstances probably represent fairly the conditions of ' true marriage ' in many pairing birds. Still less with mammals does sexual union in isolated pairs necessarily mean ' monogamous ' union even during one season. Thus the bull-moose, the only deer which is spoken of as ' monogamous,' is rarely found with more than one cow at a time, but he does not remain with her for more than a week, and, as the rutting season lasts about two months, he roams during that period from one cow to another, and mates with a considerable number.[2] The same is probably true of the majority of animals who, though not forming polygamous herds, do not remain with the female after sexual union.[3] Among mammals " a union in pairs lasting beyond one season," say Brehm's editors, " has been observed with

[1] W. P. Pycraft, *The Courtship of Animals*, pp. 149 sq.

[2] E. T. Seton, *Life Histories of Northern Animals*, pp. 174 sq.

[3] Even Darwin fell into the practice of labelling ' monogamous ' male animals which do not habitually consort with a herd of females. The lion, he says, " is, as far as I can discover, the sole polygamist in the whole group of the terrestrial carnivora " (*The Descent of Man*, vol. i, p. 268). But the African wild-cat, the ancestor of our domestic cat, has exactly the same sexual habits as his descendant ; that is, it does not cohabit with any female, but copulates indifferently with any that may be at hand (F. W. Fitzsimons, *The Natural History of South Africa*, vol. i, p. 149). The European wild-cat is also polygamous, or rather promiscuous (R. Martin, *Les Mammifères de la France*, p. 27 ; F. von Tschudi, *Das Thierleben der Alpenwelt*, p. 122). It can hardly be supposed that animals like the jaguar, which are known not to cohabit with the female, confine themselves to one. The lion is not only polygynous, but also polyandrous, or, in other words, promiscuous ; one female is almost as commonly found with several adult males as one male with several females (A. E. Pease, *The Book of the Lion*, p. 102 ; C. E. Akeley, *In Brightest Africa* p. 79). There appears to be no difference between the sexual habits of most cats and those of our domestic cat, which could scarcely be termed in any sense ' monogamous.' The alleged ' monogamy ' of wolves is no less questionable. The European wolf is by some authorities definitely stated to be polygamous (R. Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 39).

certainty in the instance of the dwarf antelope only and a few allied species of the smaller antelopes." [1] In those species the pairing depends upon the circumstance that two young, a male and a female, are generally brought forth at a birth; these accordingly, when sexual instincts develop, have no occasion to go in search of a mate, and the species is thus regularly perpetuated by incestuous union. Pairing lasting longer than one sexual season is not known to take place in any other mammalian species.[2]

[1] Brehm-Strassen, *Tierleben*, vol. x, p. 35.

[2] False impressions on the subject are not infrequently created by loose and equivocal statements. Thus Professor Westermarck gives a number of references from Brehm purporting to be examples of animals whose sexual union is "of a more durable character" (*The History of Human Marriage*, vol. i, p. 31). He mentions whales, seals, the hippopotamus, the reindeer, "a few cats and martens," the ichneumon and the yaguarundi, which are "cats and martens," and "possibly the wolf." "Among all these animals," he states, "the sexes are said to remain together even after the birth of the young, the male being the protector of the family." The latter statement is certainly untrue for every one of the animals mentioned, and there is not, except as regards the hippopotamus, a word to suggest it in the authority which he cites. Of whales, Brehm says (vol. iii, pp. 677 sq.) that they live in large flocks and that very little is known concerning their breeding habits. At breeding time "it would appear," he says, "that the herds break up into single pairs, which remain longer together." In the new edition that vaguely worded statement is withdrawn and a less ambiguous one substituted from the observations of Guldberg, to the effect that after sexual congress the sexes "separate entirely" (vol. xii, p. 502). This is in accordance with the experience of whalers, who know that only cow-whales are found with schools of young, and that they retire with these to the shallower waters, where the males are never seen (see A. W. Scott, *Seals, Dugongs, Whales*, pp. 132 sqq.). Seals, whose reproductive habits are better known than those of most mammals, certainly do not "remain together even after the birth of the young," nor does Brehm make any such statement. They are among the most typically polygamous of animals, and the females pass from one male to another as the first males become spent. The young which are born just before the rut are those of the previous season, and the sexes separate as soon as those young are able to take to the water (see below, p. 184). Of the hippopotami, which always live in considerable herds, Brehm says that he "thinks he may venture to assume" that the father protects the young. No other observer, as far as I know, has received that impression; on the contrary, according to the best accounts, "the mother . . . is sedulous in her attention to her offspring, but the male is apt to be evilly disposed towards it" (R. Lyddeker, *Royal Natural History*, 1894, vol. ii, p. 450). The hippopotamus is a herding, promiscuous, and not a pairing animal (cf. J. A. Nicolls and W. Eglington, *The Sportsman in South Africa*, p. 65; F. V. Kirby, *In Haunts of Wild Game*, p. 538; Brehm-Strassen, *Tierleben*, vol. xiii, p. 41; D. Livingstone, *Missionary Travels*, pp. 241 sq.; E. Pechuel-Loesche, in *Die Loango-Epedition*, Part iii, p. 213). The reindeer of which Brehm speaks in the passage referred to by Professor Westermarck is the semi-domesticated Norwegian animal. "The life of the domesticated reindeer differs," he says, "in almost every respect from that of the wild reindeer." At rutting time, "the Lapps allow

While monogamous associations are found among the lower mammalian forms, such as the rodents, polygamy is universal among the highest mammals, the monkeys and the anthropoids. They are without any known exception polygamous. A report has been current, and has been passed on from book to book, that "some species" of monkeys are monogamous. There is not, so far as I have been able to discover, any valid ground or colour for the statement.[1] When "some species" are mentioned it is found that they reduce themselves to two. One is the 'sacred monkey' of Madras and Ceylon, *Presbytis entellus*, which, according to one statement, is said to live "in pairs or family parties of four or five."[2] According to the recognised authority on the subject, however, it is found "in moderately sized troops composed of males, females, and young infants clasped by their mothers. An old male is occasionally found solitary."[3] Other authorities again describe males and females living apart in separate troops except at certain seasons of the year when the females are found with "one or two old males in each colony."[4] According to Brehm the social habits of this ape "are those of all other monkeys. They

their reindeer to enjoy their freedom, provided no wolves are about, and the domesticated animals mix with the wild herds, much to the joy of the owner, whose stock is thereby improved" (Brehm-Strassen, *Tierleben*, vol. xiii, p. 115).

[1] Statements such as the following are still used as a basis for far-reaching arguments: "The monogamous family life of some species of primates is said to be regular and affectionate," etc. (C. Read, "No Paternity," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlviii, p. 147). "All African monkeys are polygamous" (A. E. Brehm, *Thierleben*, vol. i, p. 48). "*Semnopithecus* lives in bands of twenty to thirty" (*ibid.*, p. 102); *Colobus* "in large bands" (*ibid.*, p. 115); *Macacus* "in bands often of a hundred of all ages" (*ibid.*, pp. 127, 130); *Cercopithecus* likewise (*ibid.*, p. 124); "they associate in troops of both sexes and all ages. The adult males are at all times jealous of each other, and frequent battles are fought" (F. W. Fitzsimons, *The Natural History of South Africa*, vol. i, p. 2). Baboons occur "in troops of from a dozen or so to a hundred or more individuals"; there are generally about fifteen males and twice as many females (Brehm, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 97). "All *Cynopithecus* monkeys are polygamous" (*ibid.*, p. 105). Of the South American monkeys, "*Atales* is generally found in troops of ten to twelve, sometimes in pairs, often alone" (*ibid.*, vol. i, p. 196). "In the family of Capucin monkeys (*Cebus*) the number of females exceeds that of the males, and it may confidently be concluded that these monkeys live in polygamy" (*ibid.*, p. 202); "*Cebus azarae* is found in troops of five to ten individuals, more than half being females" (J. R. Rengger, *Naturgeschichte der Säugethiere von Paraguay*, p. 38); "*Mycetes* is likewise found in troops, in which the females are three to eight males" (*ibid.*, p. 19).

[2] W. Rice, *Indian Game Animals*, p. 129.

[3] H. O. Forbes, *A Handbook to the Primates*, vol. ii, p. 106.

[4] T. C. Jerdon, *The Mammals of India*, p. 5; R. A. Sterndale, *Natural History of the Mammalia of India and Ceylon*, p. 15.

form in the forest numerous bands led by a male who has remained victorious after obstinate battles."[1] The only other species of monkey which has been reported as being monogamous is *Nyctipithecus vergatus*. This is a South American marmoset, about a foot long, which is entirely nocturnal and is incapable of seeing clearly in daylight. Rengger reported that he had never found it except in pairs.[2] This is, however, not in accordance with the experience of Bates;[3] Forbes states that it is found "in small troops."[4] Another animal which has been instanced as a "monogamous monkey" is the 'Maki' of Madagascar.[5] The Maki is not, however, a monkey, but a lemur; there are no monkeys in Madagascar. It lives "in bands of six to twelve."[6]

The social and sexual habits of the anthropoid apes do not appear to differ essentially from those of other quadrumana. Gibbons live in large troops which, according to the report of the Malay natives, are led by an old male.[7] *Hylobates lenciscus* is said to occur usually in bands of ten or twelve; *H. concolor* in bands of twenty or thirty; *H. varigatus*, the common siamang, in troops of fifty, sixty, or more.[8] As with other apes, the size of the groups

[1] Brehm-Strassen, *Tierleben*, vol. xiii, p. 604.

[2] J. R. Rengger, *Naturgeschichte der Säugethiere von Paraguay*, p. 62.

[3] H. W. Bates, *The Naturalist on the River Amazons*, vol. ii, p. 317.

[4] H. O. Forbes, *A Handbook to the Primates*, vol. i, p. 168.

[5] P. Topinard, *L'Anthropologie et la Science Sociale*, p. 83. I do not know the source of Professor Topinard's information.

[6] Brehm-Strassen, *Tierleben*, vol. xiii, p. 385. Darwin, arguing against primitive human promiscuity, "from the analogy of the lower animals, more particularly of those which come nearest to man," suggests, though he gives no evidence, a tendency towards monogamy in monkeys (*The Descent of Man*, vol. ii, pp. 36 sqq.). Yet, including the references which he gives to Rengger and Owen, and counting as he does the orang-utan as 'monogamous,' though on what grounds it is difficult to see, Darwin only refers altogether to the two above-mentioned monkeys and the orang as being entitled to be considered monogamous. The treatment of the whole subject is truly extraordinary on the part of Darwin, and the whole passage is singularly loose in its wording and reasoning. One is, indeed, at a loss to know to what facts he refers; possibly what he meant was that the sexual association, irrespectively of its being 'monogamous' or 'polygamous,' is more permanent among monkeys and apes than among most other mammals; though the orang-utan is a strange example to cite in support of that view. As the association between mother and offspring is, indeed, much more permanent among monkeys than other mammals, the notion may have thence arisen that the 'family,' that is the sexual association between male and female, must also be more permanent. There exists, however, no evidence at all in support of that supposition. Darwin, whom one cannot suspect of tendentiousness in the presentation of evidence, certainly does not offer any indication of monogamous habits among monkeys.

[7] A. E. Brehm, *Thierleben*, vol. i, p. 97.

[8] O. Mohnike, "Die Affen auf die indischen Inseln," *Das Ausland*, xlv, p. 895.

would seem to depend upon local circumstances; the gibbon may sometimes be found in quite small groups, which may be called families.[1] Solitary individual males are common.[2] With the orang-utan, whose usual habitat in Borneo and Sumatra is on the edge of the numerous broad streams which flow through the forest, there is no sexual association at all. All observers agree that the sexes, except when they come together for reproduction, live entirely separate. Wallace never saw two full-grown animals together;[3] and other observers have had the same experience.[4] "The adult male," says Mohnike, "associates with the female at the time of pairing only; at other times it lives in solitude and independence. One commonly comes upon females with three or four young of different ages."[5] Heeren Schlegel and Müller say: "Except at the time of pairing adult male orang-utans live mostly alone. The immature males and the adult females are often found in groups of two or three, and the mothers keep their young with them When pregnant and approaching the time of their delivery, the females separate entirely from all others, and they continue alone for some time after birth takes place. The young orang-utans, which are very slow in coming to maturity and very timid, live under the protection of their mother." No pairing season is known.[6] The males fight furiously with one another, as is shown by the numerous scars found in all specimens; some have their ears, some their lower lip, some a finger bitten off.[7] There is no appearance of 'monogamy' in the casual pairing of the orang-utan. Brooke saw a troop of eight in which there were three adults;[8] Volz saw a male in the company of two females.[9]

Chimpanzees, on the other hand, are usually found in considerable bands, which may contain some fifty individuals.[10]

[1] W. Volz, *Nord Sumatra*, vol. ii, p. 368.

[2] S. R. Tickell, "Notes on the Gibbon of Tenasserim, *Hylobates lar*," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, xxxiii, p. 196.

[3] A. Wallace, *The Malay Archipelago*, vol. i, p. 93.

[4] A. von Wenckstern, "Orang-Utan's von der Ostküste von Sumatra," *Correspondenz-Blatt der deutschen Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte*, xxii, p. 32.

[5] O. Mohnike, "Die Affen auf die indischen Inseln," *Das Ausland*, xlv, p. 850.

[6] H. Schlegel en S. Müller, "Bijdragen tot de naturlijke historie van den Orang-oetan (Simia satyrus)," *Verhandlingen over de naturlijke geschiednis der Nederlandsche overzeesche bezittingen: Zoologie*, p. 13.

[7] W. T. Hornaday, "On the Species of the Bornean Orangs, with Notes on their Habits," *Proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, 20th Meeting* (Salem, 1880), p. 442; Id., *The Mind and Manners of Wild Animals*, pp. 272 sq.

[8] C. Brooke, *Ten Years in Sarawak*, vol. i, p. 100.

[9] W. Volz, *Nord Sumatra*, vol. ii, p. 364.

[10] T. S. Savage and J. Wyman, "Observations on the External Characters and Habits of the Troglodytes Niger," *Boston Journal of Natural*

Smaller troops are found, formed by one adult male with three or four females and a number of immature young.[1] The young usually remain associated together for a time after they have separated from the parental group. Solitary individuals are also commonly found.[2]

The gorilla, a huge ape allied to the baboons, does not differ from other African apes and monkeys in its social habits. The great difficulty which was for a long time experienced in observing the animal in its secluded haunts and the scantiness of our information spread a shroud of mystery round the gorilla, and gave occasion for various sensational reports concerning it. Dr. Hartmann, relying exclusively on an article by Herr von Koppenfels in a German popular magazine, asserted that "the gorilla is monogamous,"[3] and the statement was used by Dr. Westermarck

History, v, p. 423; Duke A. F. von Mecklemburg-Strelitz, *In the Heart of Africa*, p. 139.

[1] A. E. Brehm, *Thierleben*, vol. i, p. 54; W. Winwood Reade, *Savage Africa*, p. 219; A. E. Jenk, "Bulu Knowledge of the Gorilla and Chimpanzee," *The American Anthropologist*, xiii, p. 60; R. L. Garner, *Gorillas and Chimpanzees*, p. 54; Duke A. F. von Mecklemburg-Strelitz, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

[2] Duke A. F. von Mecklemburg-Strelitz, *op. cit.*, p. 139.

[3] H. Hartmann, *The Anthropoid Apes*, p. 229. Von Koppenfels does not, in his article, expressly state that the gorilla is monogamous, but says that "it lives, except as regards hypocondriacal old males, in a close family circle (im engern Familienkreise)" (H. von Koppenfels, "Meine Jagden auf Gorillas," *Die Gartenlaube*, 1877, p. 418); and he relates having seen on one occasion a group of gorillas consisting of "the two parents and two young of different ages" (*ibid.*, p. 419). His article is illustrated by an awe-inspiring picture composed under his direction, and which he states to be "very successful." It resembles that which Burton showed to some native gorilla-hunters, and which caused them to be convulsed with laughter, and to ask whether anyone in his senses imagined that they would dare to approach such a monster (R. F. Burton, *Two Trips to Gorilla Land and the Cataracts of the Congo*, p. 249). Popular notions concerning the gorilla were also for a long time derived from the stories of Du Chaillu. Winwood Reade showed conclusively that, at the time of writing those accounts, Du Chaillu had never set eyes on a wild gorilla (W. Winwood Reade, "Notes on the Derbyan Eland, the African Elephant, and the Gorilla," *Proceedings of the Zoological Society*, xxxi, pp. 171 sq.; id., *Savage Africa*, p. 212; cf. *Globus*, iii, pp. 183 sq.). All the skins which were purchased from Du Chaillu, and which may now be seen in the British Museum, show that the animals were killed with spears by native hunters; the wounds are in the back (see J. E. Gray, in *Proceedings of the Zoological Society*, xxix, p. 213). In justice to Du Chaillu it should be mentioned that he later retracted the imaginary accounts of 'gorilla families' which gained such wide currency. On the first occasion when he did come upon gorillas they were in a troop. "I counted," he says, "ten gorillas, who, as soon as they saw me came down and made off in the dense forest. We must assume from this circumstance that the gorilla is, at least sometimes, gregarious, a feature of its habits which I denied in my former work" (P. B. Du Chaillu, "Second Journey into Equatorial Western Africa," *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, xxxvi, p. 66).

as a foundation for his theory of 'human marriage.' None of even the older information affords any ground for the supposition, and no other writer who has given attention to the subject makes such a statement. The oldest extant account of the gorilla, that of the sailor Andrew Bartell, who spent eighteen years in Angola, states that gorillas "goe many together."[1] Darwin's conclusion was that "the gorilla is polygamous."[2] Brehm concluded that the gorilla is polygamous.[3] He regarded the evidence collected from native hunters by Winwood Reade as the most reliable which was available at the time he wrote. Reade says: "The gorilla is polygamous, and the male frequently solitary; in fact I never saw more than one track at a time, but there is no doubt that both gorillas and chimpanzees are found in bands."[4] Dr. T. Savage and Mr. J. Wyman say: "They (gorillas) live in bands, but are not so numerous as the chimpanzees; the females generally exceed the other sex in number."[5] Dr. R. L. Garner says "it is certain that the gorilla is polygamous."[6] The air of mystery formerly surrounding the gorilla and the uncertainty of our information concerning the animal have now been dissipated, and we know that, as Winwood Reade observes, "there is nothing remarkable in the habits of the gorilla, nothing which broadly distinguishes it from other African apes."[7] Mr. F. Guthrie, a gentleman who resided for many years in the Cameroons, and who was on intimate terms with native hunters, collected their evidence in a very careful manner, and checked it by the testimonies of various tribes. "The gorilla of the Cameroons," he states, "live in small companies, scarcely to be called families, except in the younger days of the band when only two, three, or four individuals are found together. A company seldom comprises more than twelve members, and is said never to exceed fifteen or sixteen. The smaller companies consist of one male with his one, two, or three wives, and some small children. A company of six or seven would probably have two adult males. As the young members grow up they take, or rather keep, their place in the company. When the old male becomes cross, or

[1] "The Strange Adventures of Andrew Bartell," etc., in *Hakluytus Posthumus, or Purchas His Pilgrimes*, vol. vi, p. 398.

[2] C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, vol. i, p. 266; vol. ii, pp. 361 sq.

[3] A. E. Brehm, *Thierleben*, vol. i, p. 65.

[4] W. Winwood Reade, "The Habits of the Gorilla," *The American Naturalist*, i, p. 179; cf. Id., *Savage Africa*, p. 214.

[5] T. S. Savage and J. Wyman, "Observations on the External Characters and Habits of the Troglodytes Niger," *Boston Journal of Natural History*, iv, p. 423.

[6] R. L. Garner, *Gorillas and Chimpanzees*, p. 224.

[7] W. Winwood Reade, "The Habits of the Gorilla," *The American Naturalist*, i, p. 180.

possibly, it may be, too infirm to travel with the company, he goes off by himself and spends the rest of his life without companionship. As to whether this isolation is from individual choice, or whether the females refuse to have to do with the old male, or whether the young males band together and force his retirement, the natives do not agree." [1] Herr G. Zenker saw one male accompanied by several females and young. Von Oertzen describes the traces of a troop which, he says, must have consisted of about ten individuals.[2] Grenfell found gorillas in "parties." [3] Captain Dominick found the gorilla in the Cameroons in much larger troops; according to him "the gorilla in the Cameroons is a thoroughly gregarious animal, and, as with the baboon, several adult males are found in each troop." [4] Mr. T. A. Barns has also found the gorilla in the eastern Congo living in large troops consisting of "quite a number of gorillas," each troop including at least two females with several young of varying ages.[5] Mr. Akeley found gorillas in polygamous bands.[6] Prince William of Sweden and his party have had several opportunities of watching the animals undisturbed at considerable leisure. "Generally," says Prince William, "they congregate in flocks of ten to thirty." In a troop of about twenty, four adult males were killed. The younger animals, as with all other species, appear to be in the exclusive charge of the females who keep together, the males remaining apart. A large troop, after some individuals had been shot, was observed to move off in single file, the females leading with the half-grown individuals in their charge; then came the younger ones, of which eight were counted, and the adult males followed.[7]

As will be seen, our present information entirely disposes of any supposition as to monogamous habits among gorillas. Other stories concerning the animal have likewise become relegated to their proper sphere. Herr von Koppenfels gave an oft-cited description of the male gorilla building a nest in a tree for the female,

[1] A. E. Jenks, "Bulu Knowledge of the Gorilla and Chimpanzee," *The American Anthropologist*, N.S., xiii, pp. 52 sq.

[2] Brehm-Strassen, *Tierleben* (1920), vol. xiii, pp. 684 sq.

[3] H. H. Johnston, *George Grenfell and the Congo*, p. 344.

[4] T. Zell, "Das Einfangen ausgewachsenen Gorillas," *Die Gartenlaube*, 1907, p. 880. Captain Dominick performed the unique feat of capturing three adult gorillas alive. He organised, in order to do so, a drive on a large scale, in which several thousands of natives took part. The animals were driven into a rocky gorge, near Mt. Launde, and those captured alive were secured by means of nets and Y-shaped forks. They were sent to Europe—one to Berlin and two to Hagenbeck's menagerie at Hamburg—where they died shortly after their arrival.

[5] T. A. Barns, *The Wonderland of the Eastern Congo*, pp. 84 sq.

[6] C. E. Akeley, *In Brightest Africa*, p. 247.

[7] Prince William of Sweden, *Among Pygmies and Gorillas*, pp. 98 sq. 101, 133, 193 sq.

and "mounting guard" at the foot of the tree to "protect his family from the attacks of leopards."[1] "The gorilla," says Dr. Zell on the authority of Captain Dominick, "although an excellent climber, lives chiefly on the ground, and may be classed as a rock-dweller."[2] Mr. Barns says: "Non-arboreal in habit, this monster ape would seem to have no enemies, failing man; and even man, the most dreaded of all the animal world, holds little fear for the gorilla in his inaccessible home. As before described, they never sleep in trees, but prefer to make a nest, or shelter, on the ground, frequently in the centre of a clump of bamboo stems. Judging from my observations, it may be said they scarcely ever climb trees and, moreover, are not partial to fruit or nuts, preferring to feed on grass herbage and bamboo leaves."[3] The only anthropoid which has actually been observed building a nest was a female orang-utan.[4] No instance has been reported of a male gorilla defending his 'family.' The animal is most fierce and dangerous not when in the company of females and young, but when solitary; old, solitary gorillas are the only ones that have been known to attack man unprovoked.[5] The only trustworthy account with which I am acquainted of a gorilla coming to the rescue of a companion describes how an old female sacrificed her life in endeavouring to rescue an adult male.[6]

Almost every account of anthropoid apes lays stress upon the prevalence of 'solitary males'; the male orang-utan is, save for brief periods, always solitary, the gorilla is so often solitary that Reade did not meet with direct evidence of any but solitary individuals. It is quite improbable that all such unattached males are, in von Koppenfels' phrase, "hypochondriacal old males," that is, as is generally supposed, males past the reproductive age. This, as in the case of 'rogue' elephants,[7] is merely an assumption. It appears likely that male anthropoids are not in general permanently attached to a given group, but join a female, or group of females, as does the orang, according as their instincts prompt them. It is also extremely probable that the females, whose young remain actually clasped to their bodies during a considerable period, have no relations with the males during

[1] H. von Koppenfels, *loc. cit.*, p. 418.

[2] T. Zell, *loc. cit.*

[3] T. A. Barns, *op. cit.*, p. 87. Cf. C. E. Akeley, *op. cit.*, pp. 239 sqq.

[4] H. O. Forbes, *A Handbook to the Primates*, vol. ii, p. 178.

[5] Duke A. F. von Mecklemburg-Strelitz, *From the Congo to the Niger and the Nile*, vol. ii, p. 106. This is a general rule among mammals. Solitary males are usually the fiercest (cf. D. Livingstone, *Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa*, pp. 231 sq.).

[6] A. E. Jenks, *loc. cit.*, p. 58.

[7] See above, p. 156.

most of the time of lactation. The females and young of the gorilla, according to Prince William of Sweden's observations, keep strictly to themselves, the males forming a group apart. The true permanent group among anthropoids would thus appear to consist of females with their young, the adult males constituting, so to speak, a shifting population.

The causes which determine the polygamous herding habits prevalent among the herbivores and the family-grouping characteristic of carnivores are very obscure. The two types are not the effect of any difference in the proportions of the sexes, for there is no correlation between the two facts. The reproductive physiology and habits of herbivores, among whom the young have scarcely any period of infancy and require little or no maternal care, are obviously related to the needs of animals which are obliged to be perpetually moving and to trust to speed in escaping from their enemies. Prolonged infancy and maternal care, and therefore the formation of the family group, are, on the other hand, only possible when food can be brought to a given spot and there is no need for constant change of abode and of territory. But we have, I think, no sufficient evidence to enable us to say whether food-habits are determined by reproductive habits or reproductive habits are determined by food habits. The factors which determine both are the resultant of an inextricable complexity of conditions: temperature, climatic conditions, the number and nature of enemies, the means of defence, parasites, local and seasonal variations of those conditions, and a number of other factors which we are unable to follow up and analyse. To assign any given effect to the operation of any one of those factors is rash theorising. One fact may, however, be with confidence predicated concerning the operation of those varied factors: it is by their effect on the reproductive system of the species, and in particular upon that of the female, that the resulting form of sexual behaviour is determined. The movements of animals from one territory to another, their migrations, take place in accordance with the needs of the females in regard to the conditions most favourable to the prospective offspring, and are initiated by the females; the coming together of breeding-herds at rut-time is likewise determined by the initiative of the females, who join the males at such time; segregation into smaller groups, when the conditions of food-supply permit of it, is also the act of the female who retires to form a separate group with her young, whether the male is or is not a member of that group. As is always the case, a corresponding adjustment takes place in the physiological sexual organisation of the male. In the reproductive herd his male instincts are intensified, while the maternal instincts of the female are reduced to a minimum. Those instincts lead the male to the impregnation of as many females as possible; his

whole character is developed in harmony with that accentuation of male functions.

Jealousy amongst Animals.

It is among the herbivores that, together with instincts of competition with other males for the possession of females, the weapons of sexual combat which are characteristic of that competition are found. Among carnivora that competition is far less keen, and combats between males for the possession of females more rare. Selous pointed out that among lions such duels between males can hardly be supposed ever to take place, for the skins of male lions are never found to be marked by scars, which, if such combats occurred, would show clearly as indelible marks.[1] The excitable rivalry among males, which is prominent among herding animals, is by no means a universal trait of animal psychology. It has been observed that among bats "jealousy does not seem to be in their nature. I have seen," says Brehm, "males of the smaller species of bats quietly looking on while other males paired with a female, and not betray the least sign of jealousy. Pagenstecker has observed that several males quietly waited their turn to pair with the same female."[2]

In the most typically combative species, the various members of the deer-tribe, rivalry makes its appearance during the actual time of rut only. Observing the American reindeer just before the onset of the rutting season, Major A. R. Dugmore says that "the stags showed scarcely any spirit of restlessness—in fact, I was surprised to find that they were distributed among the does without attracting the slightest attention, and there were several full-grown ones to each herd. Occasionally a young stag whose passions were beginning to develop would become restless and walk slowly among the herd, but the larger stags paid not the slightest attention to the disturbance."[3] The combativeness of male animals in rut does not denote anything corresponding to what we term jealousy. Jealousy implies discrimination, the choice of a particular female, the appreciation of differences; no such sexual discrimination is observable among animals, and the force of the reproductive instinct is with them far too strong to admit of limitations imposed by selection. "Jealousy in the full sense of the word," observes Dr. McDougall, "is a complex emotion that supposes an organised sentiment, and there is no reason to regard the hostile behaviour of the male animal in the presence of rivals as necessarily implying any such complex emotion or senti-

[1] W. P. Pycraft, *The Courtship of Animals*, p. 78.
[2] Brehm-Strassen, *Tierleben*, vol. x, p. 387.
[3] A. Radclyffe Dugmore, *The Romance of the Newfoundland Caribou*, p. 45.

ment." [1] Sexual selection among animals was supposed by Darwin to be exercised by the females, not by the males; and the theory, which as an explanation of the development of male secondary sexual characters has long been abandoned, is of more than doubtful application in a psychological sense. Any fine discrimination either on the part of the female or of the male is out of the question. Displays of colours and male decoration are conspicuous in insects; male fishes assume the most brilliant colours during the breeding season, although the eggs are fertilised in the water and no congress of the sexes takes place.[2] Those displays of male decoration appear to be for the most part expressional manifestations of male metabolism; [3] functionally they serve to distinguish the sexes and to attract attention, as do call-notes, not to influence choice.

In the earliest appearances of so-called sexual 'jealousy' among the lower vertebrates, it is not the female who is the object of the instinct, but the eggs. In many species of fishes the male 'jealously' guards the eggs, and drives away all rivals; the female may not enter into the relation at all, and is herself driven away after she has spawned.[4] Male salmon exhibit the phenomena of animal 'jealousy' in as marked a degree as any of the higher mammalia. The exertions which they undertake under the influence of the reproductive impulse are among the marvels of natural history, and a large number of males succumb from exhaustion as a result. They develop at the breeding season one of the most curious weapons of sexual combat, a hook-like projection on the lower jaw, which is absorbed after the rut is over, and they engage in desperate combats with other males. Yet during the whole process the female is a subordinate object of the male instincts, which are not directed towards her, but towards the eggs which she lays, and which are anxiously guarded by the male. The furious combats between male sticklebacks and their 'courtship' have often been described in terms of human sentiments. But there is no relation between those combats and the selection of any female or females. The fighting which takes place between males at all times is intensified during the breeding season, but irrespectively of the presence of females. As with birds, it appears to have reference chiefly to territory. "While the males disport themselves in these chivalrous tournaments, or rather, fight for their nests, the females swim about

[1] W. McDougall, *Introduction to Social Psychology*, p. 83.

[2] C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, vol. ii, pp. 13 sq.

[3] It has been shown that amongst fishes the bright colours often presented by the males can perform no possible function in regard to sexual selection. In some, bright pigments are deposited in the internal organs of their bodies (J. Millot, "Signification biologique de l'argenture des poissons," *Bulletin de la Société Zoologique*, xlvii, p. 196).

[4] See above, p. 136, n. 6.

in long troops of greater or less strength outside the battle ground." A whole troop of females " as densely packed as possible " assembles over the nest; " the rapidity with which they disperse renders it impossible to observe whether it is always the same female that takes the lead or whether they change places." " The stickleback is by no means a monogamist, as was once believed, but endeavours to induce a number of females to deposit eggs in the nest he has built." [1]

The struggles and contests of male animals are not for the possession of particular females, but for access to females in general; they commonly take place in the absence of all females. Male animals fight for the opportunity of reproduction as they fight for food; to speak of that competition as 'jealousy' is as appropriate as it would be to describe their desire for food as 'love.' When in possession of a female they may fight for retention of that possession, as a dog fights to retain possession of a bone; they may fight also to gain access to as many females as possible. Brehm had two pairs of bears which, although the bear is not naturally a pairing animal, appeared to be very affectionate couples. He had occasion to place the two pairs in the same pit. " When I introduced the second pair of bears in the pit hitherto occupied by the first pair, a fierce combat at once took place between the two males, but it was not at all for the love of *one* of the females, but purely and solely for the possession of both of them at the same time. The stronger bear, who soon defeated the other, at once paired with the latter's she-bear under the eyes of her rightful spouse, who, from the perch where he had taken refuge, was obliged to look on." [2] Combativeness at rutting time appears to be a manifestation of the same exuberance which produces secondary sexual characters, and often seems to operate in an aimless manner as a general undirected instinct of combativity. Some animals at this season not only attack one another, but also animals of another species, and even man.[3] Hagenbeck remarks that, with the large carnivora, " their jealousy of any possible rival is even greater than their tenderness towards the object of their affection. It is very remarkable that a love-sick lion is not only jealous of his own kind, but also of any human being, the keeper not excepted, who may happen to approach the cage." [4] " One might be tempted to ask," observes Major Dugmore, " why the animals fight. But the question cannot be answered, because no

[1] Th. Gill, " Parental Care among Fresh-water Fishes," *Smithsonian Reports for 1905*, pp. 500 sq.

[2] A. E. Brehm, *Thierleben*, vol. ii, p. 164.

[3] C. H. Merriam, "The Vertebrates of the Adirondack Region," *Transactions of the Linnaean Society of New York*, ii, p. 19.

[4] See C. Hagenbeck, *Beasts and Men*, p. 111.

person knows for certain. Apparently it is the desire to acquire the does, utterly regardless of the number already possessed. Perhaps it is simply that the animal is in a passionate condition and so highly irritable that the sight of a possible rival in a same frame of mind and body inspires a desire to fight. Possibly it is only exuberance of spirits or animal strength seeking outlet." [1] "I have seen," says the same observer, "several cases of stags leaving all their does and taking possession of an entirely new herd. By way of example, let me tell of one occasion when I was watching a very fair stag that had possession of eight does, some of which had their fawns with them. The stag was in a very excited condition, perpetually grunting and never quiet for a moment, except when watching a doe that appeared to be thinking of taking her departure. Immediately she moved away he would rush after her and force her back to the herd. Across the barren was another stag of about his own size with nine does. For some time both stags continued to stare at one another. The further does did not stop, however, but continued to come slowly across the barren. Before long both stags started forward at a fast trot, the newcomer soon overtaking his herd. On they came, and I felt sure there was going to be a fight, as both stags appeared very irritable. They stopped for a moment regarding each other intently and then, strange as it may sound, they passed on in the direction they had been going, and each took possession of the other one's herd of does." [2] Again: "It must not be imagined for a moment that a single stag has undisputed and sole right to a herd of does. In most cases that came before my notice a small herd of from five or six to about fifteen would be in the charge of at least two stags. . . . Several stags often keep possession of a herd together, so that the common belief in the inevitable antagonism of the stags is without foundation. Fights do take place, very often perhaps, but they are by no means so frequent as some people believe." [3] The sharing of one herd among several males is, of course, common among all herding animals.[4] It has been noted that among sable antelopes the bulls do not seem to have any desire to drive away the younger ones.[5]

[1] A. R. Dugmore, *op. cit.*, p. 61. As has been so ably shown by Mr. H. E. Howard (*Territory in Bird Life*), fights between animals are not only for the possession of females, but also for the no less important object of securing or retaining food-territory. The same thing has been remarked of the large cats (F. W. Fitzsimons, *Natural History of South Africa*, vol. i, p. 125); and it is well known that among dogs in Egypt and in Turkey territorial boundaries are strictly enforced (see below, p. 205 sq.).

[2] A. R. Dugmore, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 26, 51.

[4] E.g., S. Baker, *Wild Beasts and their Ways*, vol. i, p. 161.

[5] A. P. Sclater and O. Thomas, *The Book of Antelopes*, vol. iii, p. 36.

One of the best opportunities of observing closely the sexual relations of mammals is offered by the seals, and we possess, accordingly, a number of detailed accounts of their habits. The males gather in hundreds and thousands on the rookeries several weeks before the arrival of the females and they engage in fierce and continual fighting among themselves, chiefly with the object of securing a favourable position near the shore, each bull taking up a territory about six or eight feet square. The younger bulls are obliged to settle down on the higher ground. On the arrival of the females they are received one by one with much attention, and are coaxed by each bull into his territory. Frequently while one female is being escorted by a bull, some of the others, which had already been established in his territory, are appropriated by neighbours; but in most cases this is not noticed by the bull, whose attention is absorbed by each newcomer. The females are pregnant and come in the first place in order to give birth to their young. No sexual congress takes place until some days after that event; but fierce fights meanwhile take place among the males.[1] Notwithstanding this fighting the bull does not appear to know his own females individually, and when once one has strayed beyond his territory he has no further concern in her. "It is the cows and not the bulls," says Major Barrett Hamilton, "which have the real control of the harem system. The bulls in spite of all their bluster, had but the flimsiest of nominal dominions, and the cows were always able to, and frequently did, leave the harem daily to dally with the cowless bulls on the outside." Some young bulls were even observed to mate with the females under the eyes of the old bull and within his territory without eliciting any manifestation on his part.[2] It is clear that the blind sexual hunger of the males contains no element of individual attachment or of 'jealousy' in the usual sense of the word.

The male becomes 'spent' after the short period of rut. In a herd of red deer the master-stag, which weighed eighteen stone at the beginning of the season, was found to weigh no more than ten or eleven a few weeks later.[3] The caribou, who at the beginning of the rutting season is a splendid animal, presents the sorriest appearance in a week or two, and loses all interest in 'his' herd, which, as with other deer, then passes to younger animals.[4] Similarly the male seals become extremely reduced after a while,

[1] H. W. Elliott, "Report on the Seal Islands of Alaska," *Tenth United States Census*, 1884, vol. viii, pp. 32–40; J. A. Allen, *History of the North American Pinnipeds*, pp. 348–360.

[2] Quoted by Pycraft, *The Courtship of Animals*, pp. 85 sq.

[3] H. A. Macpherson, *The Red Deer*, p. 30.

[4] A. R. Dugmore, *The Romance of the Newfoundland Caribou*, p. 27.

and their 'harem' is taken over by those animals who were not able at first to secure a favourable position in the rookery.[1]

The Female in the Animal Group.

The females in a polygamous herd are more or less kept together by the males; but that control has reference to sexual relations only. The actual leader which guides the herd in its movements and keeps watch against possible dangers, is usually an old female. "Among ruminants, especially the deer, the leading animal which guides the band and watches over the safety of the others is always an old, experienced female."[2] In a herd of American reindeer the leader "is an old doe, whose sense of duty is so highly developed that she feels it incumbent on her to watch over the welfare of her herd with unremitting care. She is the one to give the signal for moving at the slightest intimation of danger. To the constant watchfulness of these does I owe so many failures to secure photographs, and I confess to a far from friendly feeling, although I am lost in admiration for them. She seems more alert than the stags and therefore better able to guide the herd." The stags, on the contrary, "will often walk blindly into the most apparent danger."[3] Buffalo herds are likewise led by an old cow: "Their leader is always an old cow; doubtless she is the grandmother of many of them."[4] Again, "there is a widespread idea that the big bull is, as a matter of course, the leader of the wapiti herd. This is not the case. Numberless observations show that the wise one is not the big bull, but almost invariably an elderly female. This female leadership is common to most, if not all, horned ruminants."[5] Among African antelopes, "the master bull is not generally the leader of the herd; that function is usually performed by some old and wary cow."[6] The same has been observed of gazelles,[7] chamois,[8] elands,[9] of zebras[10]

[1] H. W. Elliott, *op. cit.*, p. 40.
[2] Brehm-Strassen, *Tierleben*, vol. x, p. 35.
[3] A. R. Dugmore, *op. cit.*, pp. 27 sq., 33, 44, 82, 118.
[4] E. T. Seton, *Life Histories of Northern Animals*, p. 276.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 54. Cf. W. T. Hornaday, *The Mind and Manners of Wild Animals*, pp. 229 sq.
[6] T. Roosevelt and E. Heller, *The Life Histories of African Game Animals*, p. 504. This again is specially noted of the sable antelope (P. L. Sclater and O. Thomas, *The Book of Antelopes*, vol. iv, p. 36).
[7] R. E. Drake Brockman, *The Mammals of Somaliland*, p. 82.
[8] R. Martin, *Mammifères de la France*, p. 45.
[9] F. V. Kirby, *In Haunts of Wild Game*, p. 301.
[10] D. Livingstone, *Missionary Travels and Researches*, p. 547.

and of seals.[1] "Sometimes," says Dr. Hornaday, "a herd of elk is completely tyrannised by an old doe, who makes the young bucks fly from her in terror, when one prod of their sharp antlers would quickly send her to the rear."[2] When male and female elephants consort during the breeding season, "a herd is invariably led by a female, never by a male. Females with their calves form the advanced guard, whilst the tuskers follow leisurely behind; though, if terrified and put to flight, the order is speedily reversed, the mothers with calves falling behind, as the unencumbered tuskers have no one to see to but themselves. I have not known a case of a tusker undertaking to cover the retreat of a herd."[3] When a male and a female tiger are found in company "the tigress is generally in advance of the male";[4] and the same behaviour has been noted of the lioness.[5]

The migrations of mammals are led by the females, and it is the herds of females who take the initiative in starting the long journeys, the males following later.[6] Migratory instincts in mammals appear to be mainly determined by the females' search for favourable grounds to bring up their offspring.

The dominance of the male is, then, even in the typically polygamous herd by no means so absolute as would seem at first sight. The parental, protective, social functions are chiefly discharged by the females. As regards sexual relations in the narrowest sense, the herd is, however, dominated by the specifically male instincts, to which the instincts of the female also are adapted. Those instincts operate in the direction of the greatest amount of polygamy, and of the exclusion of young males as soon as they reach sexual maturity. Far more lasting and real in the strength of its bonds than that sexual association during the period of rut, is the association between mother and offspring. That, no matter what the form of sexual relations, whether solitary or herding, monogamous or polygamous, is the real animal group; it is that group and not the association between the sexes at the period of rut, which constitutes the analogue and the germ of social organisation among the higher animals.

That group tends to be broken up by the sexual instincts of

[1] C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, vol. i, p. 74.

[2] W. T. Hornaday, *The Mind and Manners of Wild Animals*, p. 281.

[3] G. P. Sanderson, *Thirteen Years among the Wild Beasts of India*, p. 49. The same is reported of the African elephant (T. Roosevelt and E. Heller, *op. cit.*, p. 719; F. A. Dickinson, *Big Game Shooting in the Equator*, p. 73).

[4] S. Baker, *Wild Beasts and their Ways*, vol. i, p. 176.

[5] A. E. Pease, *The Book of the Lion*, p. 103; C. B. Schillings, *Mit Blitzlicht und Büchse*, p. 262.

[6] E. T. Seton, *op. cit.*, p. 274; A. R. Dugmore, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

the male. In the typical herbivorous species, as, for instance, in the red deer, the female, which has withdrawn from the herd after impregnation, leads an entirely solitary life with her calf until the autumn. If the hind then joins the herd of a stag, her male offspring is driven off by the latter, and is thus weaned, while if the female be followed by a hind-calf, the latter is allowed to remain and the mother continues to suckle in the herd.[1] In other instances the presence of the young male either within the herd or on its outskirts is tolerated longer, but in any case the operation of the maternal instincts terminates with the renewed sexual association of the rut season.

There is thus opposition between the maternal and the sexual instinct. The invariable tendency of the female is to segregate herself and to form an isolated group with her offspring. The more prolonged the immaturity of the offspring, the longer and more complete will be the segregation of the maternal group. Accordingly the maternal instincts are rudimentary in the herbivorous ungulates by comparison with the carnivores. The herbivorous mother neither feeds nor trains her young. " It is the business of the young to find, follow and stick to the mother rather than of the mother, as amongst the carnivora, to take the initiative. The young find the feeding-ground by following the mother; there is practically no training of the young by the parents." [2] Among the carnivores, on the other hand, not only is the cub fed by the mother with milk, but a process of training takes place in the difficult art of hunting.[3]

We naturally associate beasts of prey with fierceness and ruthless ferocity. But there is another aspect. At the same time that they learn in their nursery their business as hunters, they have also to learn to distinguish between friend and foe. " It would be a shorter and simpler business if they had to develop only their instincts of ferocity, to learn to use their natural powers only for deadly purposes. But they have a double lesson to learn and they do learn it." In their preparatory sham-fights with their mother and with their brothers and sisters, they have to learn to reserve their strength, to consider its effect upon the feelings of another creature. Consequently, " even the fiercest carnivores associate in peace, and are naturally friendly rather than quarrelsome both with one another and with human beings, or even allied species." [4] To the herding animal, on the contrary, affection and sympathy are virtually unknown.

[1] H. A. Macpherson, in *The Red Deer*, p. 31.
[2] P. Chalmers Mitchell, *The Childhood of Animals*, p. 175.
[3] S. Baker, *Wild Beasts and their Ways*, vol. i, p. 175.
[4] P. Chalmers Mitchell, *op. cit.*, p. 170.

Thus we have the paradox, as it seems to our traditional notions, that those animals that are termed 'gregarious' are devoid of any sentiment binding them to their fellows, while it is, on the contrary, in the 'non-gregarious' creatures that sentiments of affection, the germ of a social instinct, have developed. It is in the maternal, not in the sexual, association that the growth of the so-called 'social instinct' takes place.[1]

There exists among the higher animals no society, no lasting, concerted association of any size comparable, for example, to the communities of insects. The only form of association found among birds and mammals which, while it lasts, is truly solidary is the group constituted by the mother and her offspring, or, as we may call it, the animal family. In addition to that group another form of association is met with—the herd. In most instances the true herd exists side by side with the family in the same species; the breeding-season brings the sexes together, the mother afterwards retires to form her own family group with her offspring for the rest of the year; or she may, after a while, join, together with her offspring, a loose aggregate, or false herd, consisting of other females with their offspring, accompanied or not by the males, but not otherwise associated with them.

The animal family is the product of the maternal instincts and of those alone; the mother is the sole centre and bond of it. The sexual instincts which bring the male and the female together have no part in the formation of the group. Sexual attraction is, on the contrary, antagonistic to the animal family; the sexual instincts break up the family into the promiscuous herd and cause the connection between the mother and her offspring to be severed. The male has no share in forming the animal family; he is not an essential member of it; he may join that maternal group, but commonly does not do so. When he attaches himself to the animal family his association with it is loose and precarious; in no animal species does it appear to survive the exercise of the sexual functions: old males separate from the maternal group. The sexual function is the only one which the male fulfils in the animal family when he is a member of it. There is no division of labour between the sexes in procuring the means of subsistence. The

[1] The profound misunderstanding which has generally pervaded the biological premises of anthropological and social science is well illustrated by the articles of the Italian naturalist, A. Zanetti ("La Società fra gli Animali," *Nuova Antologia*, Firenze, 1875–1876). Summing up some of that writer's conclusions, Giraud-Teulon said: "Le trait remarquable que M. Zanetti croit constater dans toutes les espèces animales c'est que partout où la société est très développée (meaning 'very large'—the herd!) la famille l'est moins, et que partout, au contraire, où la famille devient le trait caractéristique d'une espèce l'instinct de sociabilité décroit jusque même à disparaître" (*Origines du mariage et de la famille*, p. 511).

protective functions are exercised by the female and not by the male. Nor is any growing tendency towards a closer association of the male with the family discernible as we rise in the scale of evolution; the inclusion of the male in the animal family is more common in birds than in mammals, in rodents than in carnivora. In the nearest animal relatives of man, in the anthropoid apes, the male is not more closely associated with the animal family than in other species; with the orang no such association exists, with the gorilla the male is often solitary.

Owing to the imperfection of our distinctions it is usual to apply the term 'family,' even in the human race, to groups differing profoundly in their constitution; for lack of a better term it is convenient to use the word in speaking of the animal group. There is, however, no analogy between that group and the patriarchal human family; to equate the two is a proceeding for which there is no justification. The patriarchal family in the form in which it exists today is a juridic institution. Whatever external and superficial similarities there may be in the constitution of the human and of the animal family, there is one profound and fundamental difference. The patriarchal family is founded upon the supremacy of the male as 'pater familias,' as head of the family. This is not the case in the animal family. It is, on the contrary, entirely the product and manifestation of the female's instincts; she, and not the male, is its head. We may occasionally find the male employed in foraging for the brood and for the mother, while the latter is lying quiescent in charge of her eggs or brood; but there is nothing in those appearances to justify us in regarding the animal family as patriarchal; on the contrary, the conduct of the group is entirely determined not by the male but by the female. The male is physically more powerful, although that difference is by no means so marked and so invariable among animals as it is in the human species. It is doubtful, for instance, whether the male lion is much superior in strength and ferocity to the lioness: a lioness with cubs is generally considered by far the fiercer and more dangerous opponent.[1] But whatever the superiority of the male in physical strength, it is clear that it has nothing to do with his relation to the female in the animal family. Nowhere do we know of the male using compulsion towards the female in the family organisation. On the contrary, the animal family is formed by the male yielding to the instincts of the female. Where he uses compulsion in the service of his own instincts he does not form a family but a herd, which is a form of association radically dissimilar in constitution to the family. The physical advantage of the male, which is so

[1] W. S. Rainsford, *The Land of the Lion*, p. 101.

considerable a factor in the constitution of the human family, is irrelevant in the conditions of the animal family. It is, therefore, beside the point to base our conception of its constitution upon that supposed physical superiority. The family group of animals is the manifestation of a mutual correlation of instincts, not of a process of physical domination.

Nor is the position of the male in the animal group affected by any mental superiority over the female; for the respective capacity among animals is the reverse. Whatever view we may take of the respective intellectual capacities of men and women under modern conditions, they are quite inapplicable to animals, and also to primitive humanity. Masculine intellectual superiority, assuming the extremest view of its nature, has reference to mental spheres which are products, for the most part advanced products, of social evolution. In primitive conditions that superiority has no application. In the practical sphere, which is alone of importance in the most primitive conditions, there is no such masculine superiority. Among animals the position with regard to mental efficiency is reversed. The evidence on that point is unambiguous. The female is the more cautious, wary, ingenious, and sagacious; while the male is reckless, incautious, and often stupid in comparison. The functions of protection, of leadership, of watching over the group and keeping a look-out for danger, are accordingly almost invariably exercised by the female. With most animals, males are much more often caught or shot than females, a circumstance which often proves misleading in estimating the numerical proportion of the sexes. Of some kinds of monkeys it is said that females are never captured. In bands of monkeys, it is generally stated, the leader is an old male. While it must be noted that the same statement was made about all other animals, until closer observation proved it to be incorrect,[1] it may in this instance be accurate. There is a good reason why an old male, and not, as in most other species, a female, should take up the function of guide; among monkeys the females are almost invariably burdened with their young, which they carry in their arms. In some species, such as the gibbons, the male also is said to assist in carrying the young;

[1] So natural does the assumption appear, that the natives of India used to say that the leader of a band of elephants must be a very old male, for his tusks were so worn that they could not be seen. The difference between a male and a female elephant is apparent even at a great distance by the conspicuous prominence of the tusks in the male and their rudimentary development in the female; yet, in spite of that unmistakable appearance, a special theory was invented in order to transform the female into a male.

it is, therefore, presumable that in those instances the 'old male,' who acts as leader, is not the sexual head of the group. A troop of chimpanzees which was, some years ago, set free in a reserve in the island of Teneriffe followed the lead of the oldest male, but the rearguard was brought up by an old female, who, "commanding the most respect, was the one to whom the rest ran in time of danger, and . . . who easily carried the whole troop with her when she changed her occupation or place."[1] The descriptions of the gorilla family as ideally patriarchal need not now be taken seriously into account. The alarm is invariably given by the females and it is they and not the males who lead the movements of the troop. The male never attacks a man 'in defence of his family'; he is the shyest of animals, always endeavours to escape, and only shows fight when actually wounded.[2]

The female, not the male, determines all the conditions of the animal family. Where the female can derive no benefit from association with the male, no such association takes place. Where male cooperation is useful, the male seeks out or follows the female, and it is the latter who determines the segregation of the group and selects its abode. Among birds the female, with or without the assistance of the male, builds the nest. Among mammals the selection of the abode lies entirely with the female. With animals that make their own burrows, such as rodents, foxes, wolves in southern climes, the female undertakes the task alone, and often makes several burrows in different places and moves from one to the other. The vixen makes several visits during her pregnancy to the burrows in the neighbourhood, and only after prolonged house-hunting finally decides on a suitable one.[3] Among beavers, the most distinguished among animal builders of homes, it is, "as with most animals, the female who is the chief builder; the male is merely a carrier and hauler."[4] The mammalian female is extremely particular, and even capricious, as to the choice of an abode, and is careful to select a well-concealed, dark, and protected spot; she constantly changes it both before and after the birth of the young, and invariably

[1] Brehm-Strassen, *Tierleben*, vol. xiii, p. 661; W. Köhler, *The Mentality of Apes*, p. 310.

[2] Brehm-Strassen, *op. cit.*, vol. xiii, p. 685. Cf. R. F. Burton, *Two Trips to Gorilla Land*, p. 252. The method of native hunters is founded upon that invariable behaviour of the male gorilla. The animal is surrounded; one hunter attacks him in front; while he does so another hunter transfixes him with a spear from behind. Hence it is that gorilla skins, including those 'shot' by Mr. Du Chaillu, invariably show the main wound to have been inflicted from behind.

[3] Brehm-Strassen, *op. cit.*, vol. xii, p. 175.

[4] *Ibid.*, vol. xi, p. 428.

at the least sign of danger. In menageries it is found advisable to provide a choice of at least two retreats for a young-bearing female, "for the mother, even if she be not disturbed, is restless after the cubs are born, and frequently will carry them from one place to another until she finds a nook to her liking." [1] The male, who is prone to mistake the cubs for articles of food, is usually driven away, and is allowed to return only after a few days, when the nature of the brood has become more evident. The female forages for herself. The male's activities are conditioned and dictated by the instincts of the female, and it is not only by the operation of a transferred female instinct in radical conflict with his male impulses that he performs his functions; it is under the control of the mother that he does so.

The group produced as the manifestation of the masculine instincts, is the very reverse of the animal family. It is the herd. The instincts of the male are not modified or checked by any superadded mating instinct, they are not transformed by transferred female sexual characters; they simply impel the male to impregnate as many females as possible. The herd is a product of the sexual impulses only; mating or maternal instincts have no part in it. It is limited in stability by the operation of the sexual instincts, and can therefore have no foundation, except during the season of rut. To regard the herd as an assemblage differing merely in size from the family is to misunderstand the nature of the two groups. They are not merely different, but opposite. True herd association, when and while it takes place, means the dissolution of the maternal group, or family. The maternal instincts are checked and rudimentary. When the mother, in obedience to the sexual impulse, joins the herd, she renounces the exercise of those maternal instincts which directly conflict with the sexual instincts, and abandons her male offspring. The family group is abolished. The circumstance of polygamy or of monogamy has no bearing on the essential constitution of the groups. The maternal instinct is not atrophied as a result of polygamous intercourse, but the polygamous group results from the atrophied condition of the maternal instinct; polygamy is an effect, not a cause. "When polygamy obtains," observes Mr. Pycraft, "the females are not seized and captured by the males, they are not the victims of a lecherous lord. On the contrary they seek the males, and the intensity of the desire to satisfy their natural cravings extinguishes any feelings of jealousy." [2] Instead of 'feelings of jealousy'—which are unknown in that sense to the animal female—it would be more appropriate

[1] P. Chalmers Mitchell, *op. cit.*, p. 167.
[2] W. P. Pycraft, *The Courtship of Animals*, p. 130.

to say, 'instincts of maternity.' Whether the female associates with one or many males, or the male with one or many females—as do practically all animals, whether labelled polygamous or no—is immaterial. What does matter is whether the operation of the maternal instincts is prolonged or shortened, and whether the group formed by those instincts is or is not broken up by a different association in which the maternal are supplanted by the sexual impulses. The association of males and females results in the animal family group, in the subordination of the sexual to the maternal instincts of the female; in the herd, it results, on the contrary, in subordination of the maternal to the sexual instincts, and in the inhibition of the former. The herd is the expression of the masculine instincts as the animal family is the expression of the feminine instincts; the herd is the masculine group; the family, the feminine, or maternal group.

The conditions required by the latter are secured by the segregation of the female, who retires and secludes herself. This is done by herbivorous and carnivorous females alike; but whereas the former separate from their offspring to join the male herd, the carnivorous female is, on the contrary, joined in her abode by the male, whose sexual instincts are inhibited by the requirements of the female's maternal functions. The masculine herd is patrilocal, the animal family is matrilocal. Whenever associations of large numbers of animals take place either accidentally owing to proximity, or casually when they are in quest of the same conditions, there is a tendency more or less pronounced for the family group to lapse into the herd. Among birds, which are predominantly and typically pairing, when they forgather in large numbers and build their nests in close proximity to one another, as with wild-ducks, sea-fowl, natatores in general, gallinaceous birds, rasores, humming-birds, the assemblage becomes promiscuous.[1] Rodents, such as rats, prairie dogs, rabbits, hares, which gather in large numbers, become promiscuous. The dogs which gather into packs, wolves, jackals, although typically pairing, become herding and polygamous. Association in large numbers inevitably means the breaking-up of the family grouping into the herd, of the feminine association into the masculine association. The family group can be maintained only by the segregation and retirement of the female; and, while that form of group easily lapses into the promiscuous herd, it is, on the other hand, well-nigh impossible for the herd to become transformed, except by breaking up completely, into a group of families.

The male herd, the product of ephemeral sexual impulses, is not a stable association. The only group, among the higher

[1] C. arwin, *The Descent of Man*, vol. i, pp. 338 sq.

animals, which is founded upon a real bond of union is the animal family, which is not, as superficial appearances have led it to be considered, the equivalent of the patriarchal family developed in the course of social evolution, but is a group produced exclusively by the operation of the maternal instincts and created by the mothers.

CHAPTER VI

THE PRIMITIVE HUMAN GROUP

WHAT was the form of the most primitive human groups, is a question of the first importance, for upon the constitution of those first rudiments all subsequent human development, social and mental, has depended. The question is much more complex than might at first be supposed. It is, indeed, among the most difficult problems of anthropology; for a little consideration will show that the earlier human groups must have differed from any human society at present existing, and that the psychological forces, which determined their constitution, were of necessity very different from those which are familiar as the products of social traditions. It must be assumed, that the earliest human societies developed out of some form of animal assemblage. They were, therefore, like all animal groups, primarily reproductive in function, and not like existing human societies, cooperative organisations.

It may also be confidently concluded that the human group did not develop out of the animal herd. The distinctive characters of the human species are the unparalleled development of social instincts which, as has been seen, depend in turn upon the prolonged association of the offspring under maternal tutelage; and mankind is, in fact, marked physiologically by a development of the maternal functions, prolonged gestation, prolonged immaturity of the offspring, which exceeds anything of the kind to be found elsewhere in the animal kingdom. Herd-formation is incompatible with those characters and functions, and is invariably associated with a low degree of their development. The earliest human assemblages must therefore have been derived from animal groups belonging to the type of the animal family; they were not the manifestations of the sexual impulses of the male, but of the maternal instincts of the female.

But it is, on the other hand, impossible to suppose that human society consisted in the first stages of its development, of small isolated groups corresponding in size to what we understand by families. Such limited groups could, in fact, offer no scope

for the development of those social relations and instincts which are the essential human characters or for the mental evolution which has depended upon them. It is in the last analysis on closer intercourse and association between individuals that those characters depend. The human mind is from the first a social product. Out of closer interrelation have all those developments of sentiment and feeling arisen that are distinctively human. It is as a product, and at the same time an organ, of that closer intercourse that the culminating factor of language, the condition of conceptual thought, of the 'human faculty,' has developed.[1] That development could not have taken place in isolated groups consisting of a few individuals only.

Some races on the lowest level of material and social culture are, it is true, found in small scattered groups which include sexual associates and may be called families. This is the case with the savages of Tierra del Fuego. Captain Wilkes received the impression that the Fuegians "appear to live in families and not in tribes."[2] The natives of the Patagonian Channel are said to "live in families and have no idea of a community. Now and then some families keep together, probably those related to each other, as for instance, two brothers with their wives and children."[3] Some of the most wretched tribes in the forests of the upper valleys of the Amazon and Parana are also found for the most part in small isolated family groups.[4] Among the Eskimo, likewise, the population is often very scattered; clan-organisation is in a state of decay and, especially in the poorest districts and most nomadic sections of the race, the small scattered groups consist of families and not of clans.[5] The same thing is

[1] As Professor Carveth Read justly points out, family life is insufficient for the development of articulate speech (C. Read, "On the Differentiation of Man from the Anthropoids," *Man*, xiv, p. 183).

[2] C. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition*, vol. i, p. 124.

[3] C. Skottsberg, *The Wilds of Patagonia*, p. 97.

[4] C. F. Ph. von Martius, *Beiträge zur Ethnographie und Sprachenkunde Amerika's zumal Brasiliens*, vol. i, pp. 244, 247. Other examples are given by E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. i, pp. 56 sq. Dr. Westermarck cites the remark of von Martius that "travellers in Brazil often meet with a language used only by a few individuals connected with each other by relationship, who are completely isolated, and can hold no communication with any of their other countrymen far or near." It is evident that in those conditions there can be very little chance of progressive development, and indeed that those people could never have got so far as to even acquire any language at all had their forebears always existed in those conditions.

[5] I. Petroff, "Report on the Population, Industries and Resources of Alaska," *Tenth Census of the United States*, vol. viii, p. 135.

reported of some other arctic populations of Siberia. Among the natives of the Northern Yenisei valley, for instance, " the family is practically the social unit, though they were probably originally organised in clans. The conditions of their life prevent these people from living together in sufficient numbers to form anything like villages. They are wanderers roaming with their herds of reindeer wherever the prospect of good hunting or fishing, combined with that of finding an abundance of moss for the herds, may lead them." [1] The forest Veddahs of Ceylon are also found in small groups, consisting for the most part of sexual partners. " Each village consists of one or two huts for one or two families, but most commonly one family settles down alone." [2] Similar conditions are found occasionally among some forest negrito races of Malacca and parts of Indonesia.[3]

Those populations are not only 'primitive' in the sense of having remained down to the present time in a wretchedly backward condition of material culture; they are also races that have been defeated and driven by more successful ones towards the most segregated and uninhabitable parts of the earth. The Fuegians belong to the same ethnic stock as the other races of South America.[4] A constant prey to their neighbours, driven to their present abode under the pressure of defeat and misery, they have been " literally pushed off the edge of the world," and " forced to break up into small clan or family groups." [5] " To all appearances," as Dr. Forster remarks, " they are only degenerated into that forlorn appearance in which we

[1] M. A. Czaplicka, *My Siberian Year*, p. 101.

[2] E. Deschamps, " Les Veddas de Ceylon," *L'Anthropologie*, ii, p. 305.

[3] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. i, pp. 60 sq., from whom most of the above examples are cited. In several of the examples given by Dr. Westermarck ambiguity results from the use of the word 'family' in an indefinite sense, when the group spoken of is really a small clan. Dr. Westermarck also mentions the Australian aborigines in illustration of family-grouping; but nowhere is the clan-organisation of society more definite than in Australia.

[4] P. Rivet, " La race de Lagoa-Santa chez les populations précolombiennes de l'équateur," *Bulletin de la Société d'Anthropologie*, 5e Série, ix, pp. 241, 253 sqq., 264; P. Hyades and J. Deniker, in *Mission scientifique du Cap Horn*, vol. vii, pp. 161 sqq.; N. O. G. Nordenskjöld, " Algunos datos sobre la parte austral del continente sud-americano segun estudios per la comision cientifica sueca," *Actes de la Société scientifique du Chili*, vii (1897), pp. 163 sq. 167 sq.; R. Verneau, *Les anciens Patagons*, pp. 327 sqq.; E. A. Holmberg, *Viaje al interior de Tierra del Fuego*, p. 52; J. M. Cooper, *Analytical and Critical Bibliography of the Tribes of Tierra del Fuego and Adjacent Territory* (*Bureau of American Ethnology*, Bulletin 63), pp. 222 sqq.

[5] C. W. Furlong, " The Vanishing People of the Land of Fire," *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, cxx, pp. 220, 229.

found them sunk. They are the outcasts of the human species." [1] The forest tribes of Brazil have been driven to their present unfavourable habitat by Caribbean invaders, and their history has been one long struggle to fight their way back to the seaboard. In their present unfavourable conditions "it is safe to assume that they never could have emerged from their savage state." [2] So likewise there can be no doubt that it is under dire pressure that the Eskimo have been forced to maintain themselves amid barren deserts of ice and snow, and there are clear traces among them of a former solidary organisation into clans, which has now fallen, owing to physical circumstances, into almost complete decay. The Veddahs of Ceylon, according to both the traditional history of the country and their own belief, are the descendants of the aboriginal royal race, who were driven into the jungle by invaders.[3] They regard themselves as nobler than the Singhalese, upon whom they look down with contempt, and they invariably spoke of, and to, the kings of Kandy as their cousins; [4] the Singhalese themselves although they may in many ways despise them, nevertheless acknowledge that they belong to a 'higher caste.' [5] The Veddahs, as Captain Lamprey remarks, "descended from ancestors who were more civilised than themselves," and lived in large, organised communities.[6]

Such primitive and degenerate human groups as we still find in a form approaching to a family grouping undoubtedly represent, not a primitive condition of human society, but the effects of its dissolution under the pressure of the most unfavourable conditions. It is very unsound reasoning to infer the condition of incipient humanity from that of the lowest and most wretched human races which barely manage to exist on the very fringe of subsistence. Those are defeated, unsuccessful races; the animal race which developed into humanity was of necessity an exsurgent and favoured race. The beginning of humanity, like the beginning of life itself, postulates exceptionally propitious conditions.

[1] J. R. Forster, *Observations made on a Voyage round the World*, pp. 290, 301.

[2] G. E. Church, *Aborigines of South America*, pp. 10, 20, 67.

[3] Mahânâma, *The Mahâwanso*, pp. 49 sqq.; C. Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, vol. i, p. 200; J. E. Tennent, *Ceylon*, vol. i, pp. 372, 569, vol. ii, p. 436; J. Bailey, "An Account of the Wild Tribes of the Veddahs of Ceylon," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society*, N.S., ii, pp. 306 sqq.; "On the Weddos," by a Tamil native of Ceylon, *ibid.*, iii, p. 70; B. F. Hartshorne, "The Weddas," *The Fortnightly Review*, 1876, p. 417; E. Deschamps, *Au pays des Veddas*, pp. 340 sqq.

[4] J. Bailey, *loc. cit.*, p. 309; Tamil native, *loc. cit.*; J. Lamprey, "Note by the Secretary," *Journal of the Asiatic Society, Ceylon Branch*, ii, p. 89.

[5] J. Lamprey, "On the Veddahs of Ceylon," *The Natural History Review*, iii, p. 31. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 37. Cf. E. Deschamps, *loc. cit.*

It was in the midst of the advantages afforded by the most bounteous and prodigal natural circumstances alone that the crowning achievement of organic evolution can be supposed to have taken place. That the social human group should be much larger than the animal family is a condition of human progress no less indispensable than the permanency of its character. All that is involved in human evolution postulates a much larger group than the family, and we, in fact, find all human communities above the most miserable and degenerate, in much larger groups, and the larger those groups, the greater, as a rule, is their cultural and social development.[1]

How came those larger groups to be formed? The question may surprise the reader, who may fail to see that there is here any problem at all. The formation of a larger group from the original family group appears to be a quite obvious process. It might take place in two ways: either a number of neighbouring families might come together; or the mature offspring of the original family, instead of separating from their parents, might remain with them and found secondary families. An ever-increasing group consisting of a number of associated families would thus result.

Such a simple and apparently obvious view of the mode of origin of human society has commonly been taken for granted from ancient times until the present.[2] It, however, merely begs the question at issue. When it is supposed that a larger group can be formed by the aggregation of a number of family groups, it is assumed that those family groups will continue distinct within the larger group, and will retain under those new conditions their character and constitution; that is to say, it is postulated that those characters are already consolidated in such a manner that they will be preserved unaltered, notwithstanding the conditions presented by a different type of association. There is nothing to justify such an assumption. It follows, on the contrary, from all that we know of animal groupings that the coming together into close association of a number of separate families must at once put an end to a form of organisation which

[1] Mr. A. Sutherland has very clearly exhibited the relation which obtains in primitive society between its cultural development and the numerical size of the group (*The Origin and Growth of the Moral Instinct*, vol. i, pp. 359 sqq.). That law holds, other things being equal, of all culture and civilisation at every stage. In apparent exceptions, as in ancient Athens, it will, I think, invariably be found that extended relations and cultural contacts with other groups perform the same function as extensive social relations within the group itself.

[2] E.g., Cicero, *De Officiis*, i. 17. 54; E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage* (1901), p. 49.

demands as the first condition of its existence isolation and segregation. Whenever, among animals, such an assemblage of a large number of families takes place even temporarily, the family grouping tends to be broken up, and the constitution of larger group lapses into that of the promiscuous herd. This takes place among those animals which are most typically pairing and family-forming, among birds; it takes place in the short space of time that they gather in large numbers during the breeding season. As a permanent form of association it is impossible for the animal family group to survive, when the conditions of isolation and segregation upon which it depends are abolished. Amalgamation of a number of families substitutes the exactly opposite conditions for those on which the family group depends. The biological family is a manifestation of the maternal instincts of the female. But if that group be transformed into a group quite differently constituted, a group of families, the new grouping is no longer the product of the formative and regulative forces which give rise to, and maintain, the family organisation; it becomes an entirely different type of group, one which is no longer the manifestation of the maternal instincts, but the expression and product of male instincts. From a maternal group it is changed into a masculine group, from a family into a herd.[1]

Among the apes we find, it is true, large assemblages, and the maternal instincts are more highly developed than among any other animals. But those assemblages are not under the dominance of the males. The conditions are quite different in human groups. There is no division of labour amongst apes; in the human group, the male is differentiated as a hunter and a warrior. In a promiscuous human herd in which the males should unite with the females of the group a struggle would inevitably take place for the possession of the females, and would at once result in the complete dominance of the most powerful males. The group would, in fact, be a patriarchal herd in which a few of the stronger males would hold the weaker ones and all the females in subjection.

Unless some principle can be shown to operate which will maintain the arrangement without precedent in biological history, of an associated group of separate families, the result of simple aggregation will not be a group of families, but a promiscuous herd. It is easy enough to bring a number of families together, but by so doing nothing is explained; the difficulty is to main-

[1] " Si l'on se demande par quelle voie on peut passer de la famille à la société supérieure, on s'aperçoit, non sans surprise, que tant que la famille subsiste il n'y en a aucune " (A. Espinas, *Des Sociétés Animales*, p. 470).

tain that abnormal biological grouping. If, on the other hand, the compound group is supposed to be formed by the offspring of a single family continuing with their parents and giving rise to new families, the difficulties are even more clearly marked. If the sons, after they grow up, continue with their parents, they must either marry their sisters or else remove women from another group and import them into the parental group. The effect on an incipient human society would be exactly equivalent to the haphazard fusion of family groups into a herd and the dissolution of the family. The capture of females from another group and their introduction into the parental group would result in a complete transformation of the group's constitution. If the compound family grouping is to grow out of the original animal family, and to retain the peculiar advantages distinctive of that grouping, the feminine constitution of the family must be maintained; and it cannot be maintained if the sons remain and import wives, and the daughters are in turn taken away by strangers. The structure of the group would thus be transformed; its original constitution would be broken up, and quite another structure and principle of organisation substituted. The female line of influence would be destroyed, and, in its stead, a new grouping, owing its initiative exclusively to the males, would be formed. Such a transformation has taken place in later stages of social evolution, and where the racial development is already fairly advanced, it is not attended with untoward effects; but in the initial stages of that development, it would abolish those very conditions upon which the emergence of the social group has depended. The group would cease to be a maternal animal family, it would become a masculine herd.

There is, in fact, one way, and one only, whereby the feminine constitution of the family could have been maintained, while it expanded at the same time into a larger assemblage, namely, by the sons leaving the group, and the daughters remaining and pairing with males from some other group. That seems an odd arrangement, and is contrary to the ideas and habits of our society, but it is the only one whereby the maternal family could grow into a larger group without losing its character and becoming a herd dominated by masculine instincts.

That peculiar arrangement is in point of fact the one which was adopted by nascent humanity. It is known to everyone who has even a passing acquaintance with anthropological science that the most general rule governing the organisation of primitive social groups is that known as 'exogamy'—the rule, namely, that marriages shall not take place within the group, but always with a member of another group. The manner in which that rule is carried out in a large number of primitive societies, and

was, as we shall see, in all probability observed originally by all, is by the males either leaving the parental group and being adopted into the group to which their wives belong, and living with them, or simply visiting them while they continue to live in their own group. In either case the daughters do not leave the family group in which they were born.

It would be easy to point to the strange teleology of those usages as to a provision that has shaped the rough-hewn ends of human destinies. The germ of human development lay in the feminine family group nursed to more powerful maturity by the maternal instinct; the fruits of that development were possible only by the formation of larger associations. Nearly every possible way in which such larger associations could have been formed would have entailed the destruction of the characters of the group which made human development possible, and would have broken it up into a herd in which those favourable conditions were lacking. Only one seemingly rather complex and round-about arrangement could fulfil the required conditions, preserving the original character of the family group while allowing of its expansion into a larger association; and that peculiar arrangement is the one which has been adopted. In truth the procedure was inevitable for two reasons. In the first place, any other constitution, if it was tried—and quite possibly other arrangements may have been tried—would have immediately resulted in the destruction of the evolutionary advantages enjoyed by the advanced family group, and would not have given rise to any human development at all. Such experiments would be eliminated by natural selection. Secondly, the nascent human family—being what it was, the most developed expression of the maternal type of animal association, of the maternal instincts—was dominated by these, and was, therefore, radically opposed to, if not absolutely incompatible with, the formation of groups dominated by male instincts.

The exogamic system is regarded by the great majority of societies in the more primitive stages of culture as the most important, the most inviolable principle of their social organisation. It has in many communities assumed complicated forms. The group is subdivided into two, four or even eight sub-groups, and frequently the members of one group may intermarry with members of one particular other group only. With those complexities we need not concern ourselves here. They are necessary effects of the development of the exogamic group which must needs subdivide in time, and of the palimpsest of accumulated traditions and acquired customs. It is with the principle of exogamy itself, the principle governing the constitution of the primitive human group, that we are here concerned, the marrying out of the males, and the continuance of the females with the group.

Fundamentally that principle—the first part of it at least—is identical with the prohibition of incest, for in the primitive family group there is no alternative to the marrying out of the males except union with their own sisters: and our own horror of incest represents among ourselves the very principle, which appears to us to operate so strangely in the exogamic regulations of primitive man.

It is significant that of those primary foundations of all human society, the principle of exogamy and the feeling against incest which it represents, nothing approaching to a satisfying explanation has been offered. The constant and world-wide products of the primitive human mind all present us with enigmas, but of those enigmas none has proved more baffling than the fundamental principle on which rests the whole primitive social order. None of the suggestions admittedly tentative and diffident that have been offered stands the test of examination. The horror of incest so deep-seated in our own feelings appears as refractory to any attempt to rationalise it and account for it, as the social principle that governed the organisation of incipient humanity. That failure seems to point to some radical fault in our method or in our assumptions.

J. F. McLennan, the first expounder of the principle of exogamy and one of the most acute among the founders of the modern science of man, had no better hypothesis to offer than that the practice of exogamy arose from the scarcity of women resulting from the prevalence of female infanticide among savages.[1] Both his arguments and his facts have been so fully refuted, and the objections against the former are so obvious, that it is needless to dwell upon them. Lord Avebury ascribed the law to the practice of capturing wives, a cause which would produce results exactly opposite to those that are known to be constant concomitants of exogamic organisation, and one which, moreover, there are, as we shall see, definite grounds for regarding as much posterior to that organisation.

To appeal to the 'natural horror of incest' is merely to beg the question at issue. However great our horror at the very idea of incestuous relations, we are as completely at a loss to account rationally for the sentiment as we are to explain exogamy. Plutarch numbers the question, "Why the Romans do not marry their near relations?" among his puzzling and unanswered queries in social science.[2] To regard the sentiment as 'natural' can only mean that it is established as an instinct in biological evolution, and has been inherited by humanity from its animal

[1] J. F. McLennan, *Studies in Ancient History*, pp. 75, 90, 115, 160.
[2] Plutarch, *Quaest. Roman.*, cv.

ancestry. But that is simply not true. There is no indication of any such instinct in the animal kingdom. A couple of anecdotes have been mentioned of horses or dogs showing a disinclination to couple with their sisters;[1] but, in view of universal experience, no more importance can be attached to such irresponsible stories than to the assurance of Pliny that a horse, on discovering that it had unwittingly been guilty of incest, committed suicide by throwing itself over a cliff.[2] The edifying anecdote gives Thomas Heywood occasion for the following comment: "If then this sinne be so hatefull in bruite beasts and vnreasonable creatures, how much more ought it to be auoided in men and women, and, which is more, in Christians?"[3] The sentiment against incest is a purely human sentiment, and its origin must consequently be sought in human conditions alone.

Alleged injurious effects of Inbreeding among Animals.

It has been supposed that the tendency to marrying out might be in some manner connected with the injurious effects which were at one time believed to result from inbreeding. The belief that inbreeding is injurious to the race, and that, in particular, the offspring of individuals who are closely related by blood is liable to suffer from various afflictions and to be of low vitality, has been practically universal from time immemorial, and has been held by many distinguished men of science. It is only since the end of the last century that endeavours have been made to enquire into the grounds of that belief, and to substantiate it by a reference to facts. Those attempts have resulted in complete failure; but, since that ancient belief is still sometimes supposed to be a subject of controversy, and some writers even continue to assume it as a basis for the explanation of the constitution of human society, it will be necessary to examine briefly some of the facts.

All animal species propagate without regard to the closest inbreeding, and there exists no provision, either in the form of instincts or other devices, whereby any check is placed upon such inbreeding. Reproduction without any regard to relationship takes place habitually in animal species, such as rats, rabbits, and other rodents, which by their fertility and vitality have become obnoxious as vermin. Many animals appear to propagate exclusively by what we should term the closest incestuous unions.

[1] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. ii, pp. 195 sq.
[2] Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, viii. 64.
[3] Thomas Heywood, *The General History of Women*, pp. 176 sq.

Thus the African reedbuck usually brings forth two young at a birth, a male and a female; these, when they become mature, pair with one another, and the race is thus perpetuated by the union of brothers and sisters.[1] The same appears to be true of most of the smaller species of antelopes.[2] It is also the invariable rule among red-deer.[3] A tigress also has usually two cubs, one male and one female; they remain with their mother for two or three years until sexually mature, when they set up for themselves.[4] Among American buffaloes, breeding is said to take place mainly among the immediate offspring of the same cow.[5] The tendency to keep in small groups which closely interbreed has been noted among several herding animals. Thus, for example, the cattle which was introduced on the Falkland Islands from La Plata, and which from a few individuals developed into a fine and numerous breed, was noticed to break up into smaller herds, according to the colour of the animals, each herd keeping strictly to itself, the close inbreeding out of which the race sprang being thus intensified by the operation of the animals' natural instincts.[6] The same thing is reported by Rengger in regard to the horses of Paraguay;[7] and in Circassia the horses living a free life similarly remain in small herds which refuse to mingle or cross.[8] Even pariah dogs in Cairo keep strictly to their own group and to their quarter of the town, and any trespassing beyond the boundaries of their respective districts is strongly resented.[9] The same thing has been noted of the dogs in Constantinople.[10] There can be little doubt that this behaviour is the manifestation of a natural instinct which operates among most, if not all, wild animals, restricting them in general to a small given territory. Among monkeys, likewise, the troop is a close corporation, and the intrusion of strangers from another group is strongly resisted.[11] Referring to

[1] P. L. Sclater and O. Thomas, *The Book of Antelopes*, vol. ii, p. 162.

[2] Brehm-Strassen, *Tierleben*, vol. x, p. 35.

[3] D. G. F. Macdonald, *Cattle, Sheep and Deer*, p. 643.

[4] R. Lyddeker, *A Hand-book to the Carnivora*, Part i; *Cats, Civets and Mungooses*, pp. 52 sq.

[5] E. T. Seton, *Life Histories of Northern Animals*, p. 276.

[6] C. Darwin, *The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication*, vol. ii, p. 80.

[7] J. R. Rengger, *Naturgeschichte der Säugethiere von Paraguay*, p. 336. Dr. Westermarck offers the suggestion that differences in colour among animals may serve the purpose of preventing inbreeding (E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. i, p. 488; vol. ii, p. 224).

[8] C. Darwin, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 80.

[9] E. W. Lane, *An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, vol. i, p. 438.

[10] A. H. Huth, *The Marriage of Near Kin*, p. 275, citing from *The Times*, January 1876.

[11] F. W. Fitzsimons, *The Monkeyfolk of South Africa*, p. 126.

some of those facts, Mr. Huth asks pertinently: "Is this Nature's horror of in-and-in breeding? Is this her delight in crosses?"[1] It has been urged that we do not know enough concerning the habits of wild animals to form an opinion as to the prevalence of inbreeding amongst them; but there is every reason to believe that habits like those just mentioned are representative, that solitary carnivora live in small well-defined districts, and that breeding takes place for the most part from closely allied individuals; while with animals which form herds, of even considerable size, these are subdivided into smaller groups, and it is mostly from members of the same or of closely allied broods that reproduction takes place. It appears indeed probable that close and constant inbreeding is the general rule throughout the animal kingdom.

It is a general law among animals that varieties, however slightly differentiated from one another, show a marked aversion to mingle and cross. Thus, for example, the sheep in the Shetland Islands refused to mix with or cross with south-country breeds which were introduced to improve their size, and "the two breeds kept themselves as distinct as rooks from pigeons."[2] Ancon sheep, a variety produced by artificial selection and inbreeding, when mixed with other sheep, will at once separate out into a herd of their own, and refuse to mix with the others.[3] Similarly varieties of pigeons show a positive aversion to one another's company, and the greatest reluctance to cross.[4] "We have now abundant evidence," says Darwin, "that if it were not for this feeling, many more hybrids would be naturally produced than is the case."[5]

We also know that whole countries have been overrun in a very short time by the offspring of single pairs, or of a very small number of individuals which have been turned loose. Rabbits have become a plague in Australia; yet they are the progeny of but a few individuals brought there in 1863. In New Zealand an abundant and hardy race of wild pigs, much sturdier than any of our domesticated breeds, is the offspring of a couple of sows and a boar left there by Captain Cook on his second voyage, and of a few animals similarly turned loose in subsequent years.[6] The small island of Juan Fernandez swarms with goats and with cats, both races being the descendants of

[1] A. H. Huth, *op. cit.*, p. 261.
[2] C. Darwin, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 81.
[3] *Ibid.*, *loc. cit.*
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 81 sq.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 80.
[6] G. T. Thomson, *The Naturalisation of Animals and Plants in New Zealand*, pp. 33 sqq.

some stray individuals left there by Spanish ships.[1] In innumerable instances of acclimatisation, single pairs or a few individuals have similarly given rise to healthy and prolific races. All South American cattle are originally descended from a few brought there in 1850; only seven years later they had multiplied in such astonishing numbers that 64,350 skins were exported.[2] The horses of the Argentine Pampas are the descendants of five mares and six stallions which were turned loose by Pedro de Mendoza in 1535. By the end of the century herds of incredible size roamed the country.[3]

It should be noted that those facts, as well as all similar positive evidence which will have to be mentioned presently, either in regard to animals or to human beings, constitute in themselves definite proof that inbreeding is not in itself a cause of injurious effects tending to the extinction of the race, whereas no evidence, real or supposed, professing to exhibit such injurious effects can be accepted as proving the contrary thesis; for it is not possible in the majority of instances to eliminate from such cases the operation of other factors, and to demonstrate that the alleged evil effects are the result of inbreeding and not of other causes. No doubt this seems somewhat hard on the advocates of the existence of those evil results, but, unfortunately for them, the rules of evidence are unfairly one-sided as regards the 'onus probandi' which they have undertaken; and while even a few instances where no evil effects are shown to result from prolonged inbreeding are proof positive against them, a thousand instances to the contrary would afford no evidence on their behalf unless it could be clearly shown that the alleged effects are due to inbreeding, and not to causes acting concomitantly in the instances advanced.

Numerous experiments have been carried out on rats, mice, guinea-pigs, rabbits, by causing them to inbreed closely for many generations. They have in most instances shown no perceptible evil effects as regards the quality and size of the animals, but a diminution in fertility has been observed.[4] It is, however, well known that all animals suffer a diminution of fertility when kept in close confinement. Rodents are particularly affected. In the Zoological

[1] W. Funnell, *A Voyage Round the World*, pp. 19 sq.

[2] A. H. Huth, *op. cit.*, p. 260. Cf. T. Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, vol. iii, p. 494 n.

[3] G. E. Church, *Aborigines of South America*, pp. 298 sq.

[4] J. A. Thomson, *Heredity*, p. 392; C. Düsing, *Die Regulierung des Geschlechtsverhältnisses bei der Vermehrung der Menschen, Tiere und Pflanzen*, p. 246; A. H. Huth, *The Marriage of Near Kin*, pp. 286 sq.; Ritzema Bos, "Untersuchungen über die Folgen der Zucht in engster Blutverwandschaft," *Biologisches Centralblatt*, xiv, pp. 78 sq.

Gardens in London "some rodents have coupled, but never produced young, some have neither coupled nor bred, but a few have bred." The common hare, when confined, "has never bred in Europe." Squirrels never breed in confinement.[1] The extremely prolific species experimented on would be unique if their fertility were not affected by close confinement. Those experiments have more recently been repeated on a larger scale by Dr. H. D. King on white rats. The primary object of the investigation was to determine whether the sex-ratio was affected by inbreeding, but, secondarily, care was taken to breed only from healthy specimens. Two series were inbred from two pairs of rats, brothers being mated regularly with sisters, and control breeds were kept which were allowed to reproduce at haphazard. "These laboratory rats, which have been inbred as closely as possible for twenty-two generations, are in every respect superior to the stock rats from which they took their start six years ago, and which have since been bred in the usual indiscriminate manner." The male inbred rats were 15 per cent. heavier than the stock male rats, the females 3 per cent. heavier. The largest albino rat ever recorded was produced. The inbred rats "live fully as long as do the stock rats, and they appear equally resistant to disease"; the proportion of unhealthy individuals was the same among inbred and stock rats. The fertility of the inbred rats was nearly 8 per cent. greater than that of the stock rats.[2]

It has been very generally supposed that the experience of breeders of domesticated animals affords evidence that inbreeding carried on for many generations results in degenerative changes and impaired vitality and fertility, and almost all breeders firmly believe in the injurious effect of close inbreeding, and are ready to testify to its reality. This may at first sight appear strange, seeing that their occupation consists for the most part in causing those animals to inbreed in the closest manner. The general object of stock-breeding from domesticated animals is to interfere with the natural course of haphazard procreation with a view to preserving or accentuating certain characters, which are of special value in respect of the various uses for which domesticated animals are kept. This is accomplished by artificial selection for breeding of those animals in which the desired characters are most pronounced. Since those characters and the tendency to produce them are found in the highest degree in particular broods, the interest of breeders is to inbreed those stocks closely to the

[1] C. Darwin, *The Variations of Animals and Plants under Domestication*, vol. ii, p. 135.

[2] P. Popenoe, "Experimental In-breeding," *Journal of Heredity*, vii, pp. 74 sqq.

utmost. The stock, herd, or flock must, further, in order that those characters should be maintained, be kept 'pure' from any extraneous admixture, and must consequently be regularly and strictly inbred. All the most highly valued domestic stocks, and the individual animals which are esteemed most precious, are the outcome of such inbreeding carried often to the utmost limits. For example, a closely inbred prize bull is mentioned by Darwin which was matched with its daughter, its grand-daughter, and its great-grand-daughter; the offspring of the latter, a cow, had 93·75 per cent. of the blood of the breeding bull. This cow was matched with a bull which had 62·5 per cent. of the blood of the same animal. The resulting offspring was the realisation of the breeder's highest dreams of perfection.[1] The English race-horse is one of the most closely inbred of existing animals. Elaborate investigations have several times been made from the stud records of famous English race-horses; and it has invariably been found that noted winners excelled in almost exact proportion to the close inbreeding shown by their pedigrees.[2] A famous breed of horses, the Kladrub horses, which were reserved for the use of the Austrian Imperial family and of a Church dignitary, the Archbishop of Olmütz, are said to have been even more closely inbred than the English thoroughbred. They were originally imported from Spain, where they had been inbred for centuries. Their numbers are limited to about a hundred individuals; but there has been no diminution in fertility. They are perhaps one of the most magnificent breeds of carriage horses, being noted for their paces, their great height, averaging seventeen to eighteen hands, and their remarkable vigour, and also for their longevity.[3] The Percheron horses are also a closely inbred race, most of the individuals being traceable to two original sires.[4]

Numerous similar illustrations of exceptionally fine breeds of domestic animals, the products of close and prolonged inbreeding, are mentioned by Darwin in his book on 'The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication.'[5] Indeed, Darwin's work, in which he upholds the thesis of the evils of inbreeding,

[1] C. Darwin, *The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication*, vol. ii, p. 96.

[2] A. Sanson, "Sur les unions consanguines chez les animaux domestiques," *Bulletin de la Société d'Anthropologie*, 1e Série, iii, pp. 254 sqq., 355 sqq.; G. Lehndorff, *Horse Breeding Recollections*, pp. 44 sqq. and *passim*.

[3] C. Wriedt, in an interview reported in *The Journal of Heredity*, vii, p. 205.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] C. Darwin, *The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication* vol. ii, pp. 118 sqq.

might appear almost ludicrous from the abundance of counter evidence of the most damning kind which, with his usual perfect candour, he has occasion to mention, were it not that he appeared to rely for the support of his thesis not so much on any observed effects of inbreeding as on the benefits sometimes observed in domesticated animals from the practice of occasionally crossing them with another breed.

It must not, however, be supposed that the opinion of breeders that continued inbreeding of domesticated animals is attended with injurious effects is destitute of any foundation in fact. In some instances very definite evil effects have been observed to follow close and continued inbreeding. This is more especially the case in regard to pigs. It is mentioned that pigs subjected for several generations to close inbreeding sometimes give rise to offspring whose bristles are soft, whose limbs are short and feeble; relative sterility sets in, the sows are unable to nourish their young, and at last "the feeble and frequently monstrous offspring will be incapable of being reared up, and thus the miserable race will utterly perish."[1] But, as Darwin himself remarked, there is a very obvious reason for those degenerate effects in the inbreeding of the domesticated pig. Of all domestic animals pigs are most especially bred with a view to the accentuation of one character only, namely fat. "Selection has always tended towards one and the same end. With most domestic animals the result of selection has been divergence of character, here it has been convergence."[2] Accordingly, with no other domesticated animals have the definite disastrous results of close inbreeding been observed which manifest themselves in pigs. With regard to cattle and sheep, which are generally bred and selected not for one character alone, but for a number of varied characters, Darwin had mostly to rest content with general assurances from breeders that "they were convinced," or that "they had no doubt," that such evil effects were produced; but it is difficult to obtain any more definite evidence. "The evil effects from close inbreeding," he says, "are difficult to detect."[3] A lowered fertility is the most definite of the evils which have been noted. It is considered that the English race-horse has suffered a slight diminution in this respect, but, at the same time, that impaired fertility is stated to disappear completely and at once on transference to another climate, such as that of Australia.[4]

[1] D. Low, *On the Domesticated Animals of the British Islands*, pp. lxiii sq.
[2] C. Darwin, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 77.
[3] *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 392.
[4] C. Darwin, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 115. Cf. F. H. A. Marshall, *The Physiology of Reproduction*, p. 208.

Nevertheless, there appears no reason to doubt either the degenerative changes which have occasionally been reported, however vaguely, in closely inbred domestic animals, or, still less, the beneficial effects of an occasional cross with a less inbred stock. The surprising circumstance is that those evil effects are not more common and more conspicuous. All domesticated animals are bred and reared under wholly artificial conditions, as is conspicuously illustrated by the rapidity with which most of them revert to the type of the wild species as soon as artificial selection is relaxed. The 'qualities' in respect of which those animals are bred are such as are of value to the breeders and users of the animals, but in most respects they are not at all such as are of value from the animal's point of view. In fact, most of those 'qualities' are just as much pathological conditions as the fatty degeneration artificially induced in pigs or in Strassburg geese, and the 'faults' which breeders are anxious to eliminate are the normal, healthy characters of the race in its natural state. Extreme adiposity, although not so exclusively sought in other animals as in pigs, is one of the chief 'qualities' aimed at in breeding cattle and sheep; but those unnatural monsters which are the pride and reward of the successful breeder, and the merits of which are recognised by the prizes bestowed upon them at agricultural shows and the high prices they command, are deformed invalids which would, in a natural state, be deprived of any chance of surviving. Obesity is notoriously correlated with sterility, not only in animals, but also in the human species.[1] The attenuated, spindle-legged English thoroughbred is, in reality, no less pathological. There is good reason to think that a much stronger case could have been made out for its degeneration than Darwin did with the material then at his disposal. Sir James Penn Boucaut has brought together a large mass of evidence as to the real degeneracy of the English thoroughbred. The reason is that English race-horses have, especially of late years, been bred exclusively with a view to winning races.[2] They have been defeated again and again in long-distance trials by the Arab, from which they originally derive their qualities.[3] There is, in fact, not a single character or so-called 'quality' which differentiates a domesticated breed from the wild species out of

[1] W. Youatt, *The Pig*, pp. 47 sq.; H. Stephens, *The Book of the Farm*, vol. i, p. 258; E. Laverack, *The Setter*, p. 32; G. Hewitt, *The Diseases of Women*, p. 689; Aristotle, *Hist. Animal.*, v. 12. 9.

[2] Sir James Penn Boucaut, *The Arab Horse, the Thoroughbred, and the Turf*, more especially pp. 142 sqq. See also Sir Archdall Reid's introduction.

[3] H. K. Bush-Brown, "Heredity in Horses," *The Journal of Heredity*, xi, p. 226.

which it has arisen, which does not constitute in the biological sense a degeneration. Even the dog is, as Dr. Chalmers Mitchell points out, a wretchedly degenerate animal from which all spirit and every correlative of healthy natural vitality has been bred out.[1] It can, therefore, scarcely be regarded as a matter for wonder that, when a breeder, by close inbreeding of selected animals afflicted with pathological conditions, has been doing his utmost to produce more and more marked unnatural characters, he should in fact obtain diseased and unnatural animals. But the circumstance shows no connection between inbreeding and unhealthy constitutional effects. The point of view from which professional breeders judge of the merits and 'qualities' of a breed is entirely different from that by which the constitutional fitness, vitality and health of the animals might be estimated. It is no wonder that when marked deterioration in respect of vital characters makes itself felt owing to the excessive development of those 'qualities,' the breeder is at a loss to describe the nature of that deterioration; those vital characters belong to a scale of values different from that in terms of which professional breeders are accustomed to judge animals.

The occasional introduction of fresh blood from a less highly domesticated stock is necessary to arrest the progress of such degeneration. But, at the same time, that necessity is dreaded by the breeder as jeopardising by a sudden return to a more natural type those abnormalities and deformities which he has been at pains to produce, and which can only be maintained by close inbreeding. To effect such an introduction of new blood without undesired results is an operation which calls for the utmost judgment on the part of the breeder, for the usual effect is that the whole stock is rendered valueless. "The bad qualities of the cross," says Mr. Youatt, "are too soon engrafted on the original stock, and once engrafted they are not for many generations eradicated. The good qualities of both are occasionally neutralised to a mortifying degree."[2]

Although 'an occasional cross' is naturally beneficial where a stock of domesticated animals has been bred mostly with reference to highly artificial characters only, and vital qualities of constitution and health have been correspondingly neglected—in short, where the stock has been injudiciously bred—the latter circumstance is the only one which renders the cross beneficial. The notion has thus arisen that the 'occasional cross' is beneficial, or necessary

[1] P. Chalmers Mitchell, *The Childhood of Animals*, pp. 205 sq.

[2] W. Youatt, *The Horse*, p. 327. Cf. D. G. F. Macdonald, *Cattle, Sheep, and Deer*, pp. 268, 276.

in itself, and in every instance; and the practice has come to be carried out by many breeders, not from any indication of its need, but as a matter of custom and tradition, or perhaps as a sort of expiatory rite in attenuation of the indecent inbreeding which they have fostered at other times. It was, says Mr. Carr, "the general practice of cattle-breeders, who seemed to think it a matter of course to effect at certain intervals a change in their stock." One of the most successful breeders of shorthorns, Mr. J. Booth, saw no reason for the practice, and systematically dispensed with it. This caused a good deal of distress to his professional friends, and one of them kept urging that the Booth herds would be the better for 'an occasional cross.' "Have any of the evils, which are usually attributed to in-and-in breeding manifested themselves in my herd?" asked Mr. Booth. "Is there any degeneracy in size, substance, or vigour in the animals? any tendency to premature age? any lack of milking or thriving disposition in the cows, or of capacity of frame, or hardiness of constitution? Are the bulls deficient in masculine character and efficacy, or the sires of a puny or feeble offspring?" To those questions the voluntary adviser was obliged to reply in the negative. Nevertheless, Mr. Booth expressed his willingness, in spite of the disastrous results he had observed in the herds of other breeders from the practice, to try a cross, provided he could be told where to find a better stock than his own for the purpose—a perplexing question which the adviser was not able to answer.[1] Many breeders are of opinion that more harm than good is done by 'occasional crosses.' Breeds of dogs are much less satisfactory than breeds of cattle or sheep, owing to the inevitable prevalence of mongrels, and Mr. Laverack, a high authority on sporting dogs, considers that setters have steadily degenerated in consequence of crosses.[2] In America there existed for a long time a strong prejudice against too close inbreeding, "but," says Mr. Burges, "of late years experience has modified these views, and our best horses, cattle, and dogs are at least interbred."[3] "The superstitious fear of inbreeding in any form is rapidly disappearing."[4] In the Argentine the frequent introduction of crosses is a matter of absolute necessity. The herds of 20,000 head of cattle and more live on the vast ranches in conditions approximating to their natural state; consequently the animals tend to revert rapidly to the type of their

[1] W. Carr, *The History of the Rise and Progress of the Killerby, Studley, and Warlaby Herds of Shorthorns*, pp. 39, 127 sq.

[2] E. Laverack, *The Setter*, p. 30.

[3] A. Burges, *American Kennel and Sporting Field*, pp. 55 sq.

[4] P. Popenoe, "Experimental In-breeding," *The Journal of Heredity*, vii, p. 76.

wild ancestors. It is therefore imperative to import, chiefly from England, expensive prize-bulls, the products of the closest inter-breeding, so as to prevent the Argentine cattle from losing altogether the effects of artificial breeding and domestication. In this instance the necessity for an occasional cross does not arise from the undesirable effects of inbreeding, but of insufficient inbreeding.

In Central Europe and the Baltic countries the art of stock-breeding has been for a long time a complete failure; nobody ever heard of a reputable breed of German or Scandinavian horses or cattle, and breeds of domesticated animals had constantly to be improved by importations from England, France, or Spain. The chief reason for those disastrous results was the great authority attached in those countries to the works of Professor Settegast,[1] a savant of that dangerous type that has not infrequently appeared in countries of Germanic culture, where learning has so often been pressed into the service of political and other dogmas, and in whom enormous industry in research and great dialectic ability are combined with settled preconceptions, which distort all evidence in the service of an invulnerable dogmatism. Settegast fiercely denounced inbreeding in any shape or form, and enlarged with a great display of alleged evidence and much casuistry on the retribution which must needs follow such an iniquitous practice. The results of the undisputed authority which he wielded were, indeed, scarcely less disastrous than any with which he had threatened dissenters; and it exercised the same paralysing influence upon the practical pursuits of the farmer and the stock-breeder as similar methods have frequently exercised on the progress of science. Those baneful effects were not checked until Count Lehndorff, by thorough and judicial research, shook the authority of the theoretical dictator; and later the publication of the great work of A. de Chapeaurouge [2] exposed the baseless dogmas which had barred the way to any success in those pursuits. Since then the art of breeding has been taken up scientifically in Germany and Scandinavia, the results have improved by leaps and bounds, and those countries have become independent of importations of foreign stock.[3]

If the results of the breeding of domesticated animals prove anything, it is the absolute innocuousness, if not the actually beneficial effects, of inbreeding. Apart from the inbreeding, which is the rule in all valuable domestic stocks, and which has seldom been shown to lead to any definite deterioration,

[1] H. G. Settegast, *Die Thierzucht* (Breslau, 1868).

[2] A. de Chapeaurouge, *Einiges über Inzucht und ihre Leistung auf verschiedenen Zuchtgebieter* (Hamburg, 1909).

[3] Chr. Wriedt, reported in *The Journal of Heredity*, vii, pp. 204 sqq.

innumerable instances can be adduced of stocks in which no crossing has taken place or been called for. This appears to be particularly the case where animals are kept in a semi-wild state and interfered with as little as possible. Thus in many British parks, such as Cadzow Castle, Chartley, Lyme Park, Somerford, herds of cattle have been left to inbreed, literally from time immemorial, and, for ought I know, still continue to do so. Care is taken merely to keep down their numbers, and some noted herds have been kept down to such small dimensions, as 70, 40, or even only 20 head, so as greatly to intensify the inbreeding which is left to take place naturally.[1] The Arabs inbreed their famous horses as closely as possible without any scientific refinements. "I cannot take upon me," says Mr. N. H. Smith, a famous breeder who long resided in Arabia, "to say how often an incestuous breed may be carried on before a degeneracy takes place, as I am not aware of that being the case in any instance, and experiment is in favour of breeding from son to mother, and father to daughter."[2] Stocks which are not doing well have often been improved solely by selective inbreeding, the process in such instances not being directed to accentuating abnormal characters, but to improving the general strength and vitality of the animals. Thus a flock of 300 merino sheep which was imported into France from Saxony suffered at first from general debility, owing to their not being acclimatised to their new surroundings. By reducing their numbers considerably, and thus causing them to inbreed more closely, they not only rapidly recovered, but soon surpassed all neighbouring flocks in vitality and fertility.[3]

It is no more than the soberest conclusion that there is not in the records of breeding from domesticated animals a single fact, alleged or verified, which indicates, much less evidences, that inbreeding, even the closest, is in itself productive of evil effects.

That conclusion, far from being intemperate, agrees with that of Darwin himself. "Consanguinity by itself counts for nothing," he writes, "but acts solely from related organisms generally having similar constitutions, and having been exposed in most cases to similar conditions;" and he cites with approval the opinion of Mr. Carr that "change of soil and climate effects perhaps almost as great a change in the constitution as would result from the infusion of new blood."[4] Wallace expresses his

[1] A. H. Huth, *The Marriage of Near Kin*, pp. 258 sq.

[2] N. H. Smith, *Observations on Breeding for the Turf*, pp. 49 sq.

[3] J. Beaudouin, "Faits pour servir à l'histoire des effets de la consanguinité chez les animaux domestiques," *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences*, lv, pp. 236 sqq.

[4] C. Darwin, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 94.

view in similar terms: "It appears probable," he says, "that it is not interbreeding in itself that is hurtful, but interbreeding without rigid selection or some change of conditions." [1]

It thus appears that Darwin, by far the most authoritative advocate on the side of the doctrine of the injurious effects of inbreeding as regards animals, does not actually maintain that doctrine at all, but ascribes the alleged evil effects to quite other causes than consanguinity in the parents. That, as we shall have occasion to note presently, is also the case with the great majority of those who have upheld the doctrine. It might be supposed, and Darwin himself appears to have supposed, that whether the alleged evil effects are produced directly by the inbreeding or indirectly by some cause associated with that inbreeding, comes in effect to much the same thing, and that the distinction scarcely constitutes a difference. But that is not so. Deductions drawn from effects indirectly associated in certain cases with inbreeding, on the assumption that they are equivalent to direct effects due to inbreeding itself, are invalid and fallacious. Thus the supposed evidence adduced as regards domesticated animals has no bearing on animals in their natural state. We shall see that, as regards human beings, even the common assumption implied in Darwin's statement, which goes somewhat beyond the evidence which he has been able to adduce, that breeding from consanguine individuals must result in the accentuation or summation of any defect or constitutional weakness which may be present in those individuals, has by no means been proved to be correct, and does not logically follow from what we know of the laws of hereditary transmission.

Darwin was led to accept the popular belief in the evil effects of consanguineous unions—although, by the way, he himself married his cousin—chiefly from the impression which he derived from his extensive study of the devices for cross-fertilisation in some kinds of flowering plants. That consideration, he says, "has had a great influence on my mind." [2] But it would be a bold step to draw conclusions from the details of reproduction in plants to the human race, in the absence of evidence as regards all forms of life intermediate between the two. The great interest which attaches to the elaborate devices presented in some orchids and other flowering plants, which have been so admirably elucidated and described by Darwin, may easily lead one to over-estimate the prevalence of such devices, and to overlook the facts that even in the same orders of flowering-plants there are many in which they are not present, that innumerable species reproduce regularly by self-fertilisation, that even those species which are adapted

[1] A. R. Wallace, *Darwinism*, p. 326.
[2] C. Darwin, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 95.

to cross-fertilisation by insects readily revert to their original mode of self-fertilisation. Far from plants differing from animals in the prevalence of devices and provisions to ensure and encourage crosses, the same general tendency to guard against such crosses exists among them as among animals. Varieties of flowering plants, differing but slightly from one another, and sprung from the same original stock, keep distinct by flowering at different times; and this has also been noted in slightly differentiated varieties of maize and of wheat.[1] Plants thus illustrate as do animals the development of definite provisions to ensure, and not to prevent, inbreeding. It is not proved, and is, I believe, highly improbable, that devices for fertilisation by insects have been developed in relations to disadvantages arising from inbreeding and advantages from crossing. There are many other purposes useful to the race which such an arrangement might serve, as, for instance, the greatly extended length of the period of reproduction which results from anthers and pistils maturing at different times. That plants which have become adapted to such a mode of reproduction should not thrive so well when artificially self-fertilised is manifestly no proof that such a result is the cause rather than the effect of the adaptation. The structural provision for cross-fertilisation has proceeded much farther in plants, such as palms, which are dioecious, the male and female elements being developed in distinct individuals; yet those plants, which are fertilised by the wind, the numerous female plants crowding round the rare males, are instances of the closest possible inbreeding. It does not, therefore, appear necessary even to discuss in detail the evidence so much relied on from the instance of some flowering plants, for that supposed evidence bears no character of conclusiveness which, in the absence of other evidence from animals, can render it relevant as regards the human race.

Results of Inbreeding in Human Communities.

In the human race the evidence of facts is, if anything, even more definite than among animals. Close inbreeding takes place habitually among many peoples; for even where the principle of exogamy is strictly observed, if marriage outside the group takes place, as is commonly the case, for generation after generation in one particular other group, the intermarrying members stand to one another in the relation of cousins, and the two groups come to constitute in fact a single group in which close inbreeding may take place for centuries. It is, as we shall have

[1] C. Darwin, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 79.

occasion to note later, a very widespread custom for a man to marry his first cousin, the daughter of his maternal, or in some cases of his paternal uncle.[1] Those marriages are regarded in many parts of the world as obligatory, and the rule has been strictly observed from immemorial time. Yet nowhere have indications of any resulting evil effects been observed, and the races which habitually practise those marriages include some of the finest physical types of mankind. Thus, among the Bedawi a man almost invariably marries his first cousin; yet, as Doughty remarks, "notwithstanding the affinity in all their wedlock there was none deformed or lunatic of these robust hill Beduins."[2] "Here," says Burton, "no evil results are anticipated from the union of first cousins, and the experience of ages and of a mighty nation may be trusted. Our physiologists adduce the 'sangre azul' of Spain and the case of the lower animals to prove that degeneracy inevitably follows breeding in. Either they have theorised from insufficient facts, or civilisation and artificial living exercise some peculiar influence, or Arabia is a solitary exception to a general rule. The fact which I have mentioned is patent to every Eastern traveller."[3] But far from being "a solitary exception," the same experience is repeated wherever intermarriage is the custom. Among the Bataks of Sumatra the practice of taking to wife the daughter of one's maternal uncle has been rigorously observed from time untold. The race is described as being physically the best developed in the Indian Archipelago, and the men, Junghuhn remarks, might have stood as models for the sculptors of Greece.[4] Among the Fijians likewise marriage between first cousins was an ancient institution and regarded as a sacred duty. An elaborate census of a portion of the population carried out by Sir Basil H. Thomson and Mr. Stewart, showed that marriages between first cousins according to the old usage were associated with a higher birth-rate and a markedly greater vitality in the offspring than unions between non-relatives. So much so that the Fijians who still adhere to the ancestral custom of first-cousin marriage are the only ones who succeed in maintaining their numbers, while those who do not intermarry are rapidly dying out.[5]

From the large number of peoples who in every part of the

[1] See below, pp. 564 sqq.

[2] C. M. Doughty, *Travels in Arabia Deserta*, vol. i, p. 472.

[3] R. F. Burton, *Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to Al-Medinah and Meccah*, vol. ii, p. 85.

[4] F. Junghuhn, *Die Battaländer auf Sumatra*, vol. ii, p. 7.

[5] B. H. Thomson, "Concubitancy in the Classificatory System of Relationship," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxiv, pp. 383 sqq.; Id., *The Fijians*, pp. 195 sqq.

world give the preference to cousin marriages there has not been brought forward any instance which might be set against the testimony of such representative instances as the above. Dr. Westermarck has, with his customary industry, ransacked ethnological literature for examples, and may be confidently trusted to have collected any that are available. Yet he feels compelled to apologise for the results and for "their vagueness and more or less hypothetical character."[1] They are in fact nothing but expressions of the immemorial belief by various persons in reference to any real or supposed defect in the peoples of whom they are speaking. Such, for instance, is the opinion of a Registrar-General for New Zealand that the decrease in the numbers of the Maori may be "partly attributable to constitutional feebleness caused by the practice of intermarriage";[2] or that of Mr. Davis that the Pueblo Indians—culturally and intellectually the most advanced native race on the American continent, and physically one of the finest—are deteriorating "because of their constant intermarriage"; or the suggestion of Mr. Sibree that the sterility frequent among Malagasy women "may be due to intermarriage of near relatives."[3] It may incidentally be noted that the relative infertility of savage as compared with European women, which has been set down in turn to every custom and practice of which European sentiment disapproves, though it cannot be statistically or otherwise associated with any, has one constant cause, namely, the custom of suckling children "until they wean themselves," that is, for two, three, and not infrequently five years, or more.[4]

Besides peoples with whom cousin-marriage is customary, there exist in almost every part of the world small and isolated communities where for centuries, marriages have of necessity taken place between closely related individuals. They are almost invariably distinguished by conspicuously fine bodily development and robust health. For example, in the Tengger Hills of Java the Surabaya community numbers some 1,200 people who for ages have intermarried. "They differ from the people

[1] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. ii, p. 230.

[2] An even more eloquent tirade upon the pernicious effects of inbreeding among the Maori by a well-known medical authority has escaped Dr. Westermarck's searching eye (J. Batty Tuke, "Medical Notes on New Zealand," *Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal*, ix, pp. 222 sqq.). What those pernicious effects are is, however, not specified. With the usual inconsistency of such writers, Dr. Tuke, after stating that among the Maori "for generations breeding in and in has been the rule, not the exception," goes on to remark that "a finer human animal is rarely seen."

[3] E. Westermarck, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, pp. 230, 231, 232.

[4] See below, vol. ii, pp. 391 sq.

of the plain, being taller and more robust."[1] Again, in Western Java there exists a small segregated community, the Baduwis, who number no more than about forty families all told. They have refused to adopt any other religion than their ancient animism, and so strictly do they keep themselves segregated from all neighbours that no woman is allowed to leave the district except for a few hours. They are remarkable for their powerful build and the vigorous health of both men and women, and they have the reputation of being the best behaved, the most honest and law-abiding among the native population, and the most scrupulous in the regular payment of their taxes.[2] In Europe such intermarrying communities are common enough in hill districts and among fisherfolk. That of Batz, near Croisic, which numbers about 3,300 people, was made the subject of a very thorough investigation by Dr. Voisin. He did not find an instance of malformation, mental disease, or any of the evils ascribed to inbreeding; marriages between first cousins in that community were found to produce an average of 4·6 of offspring, whereas the general average for France at that time was only 3.[3] The island of St. Kilda, which is barely six square miles in area, is far removed from the nearest land, and contains twenty-seven families, supplies, as Dr. Kerr Love remarks, the proper conditions for the production of all the evils ascribed to intermarriage. "Until recently, except for the purpose of rent collection, this lonely island, situated far out in the Atlantic, was wholly unvisited by strangers. It had no communication with the outer world. The inhabitants are poor and badly housed. Dr. C. R. Macdonald, the Medical Officer of Health for Ayrshire, has described the diseases which attack the inhabitants. On enquiry he assures the writer 'that there is no history of any case of deaf-mutism in this remote islet, nor, moreover, of other signs usually attributed to the results of intermarrying.' In the article above referred to, he says: 'There are no cases of deaf-mutism; insanity and idiocy are unknown, and cases of imbecility are extremely rare.' This is after centuries of intermarrying. The only disease this author feels inclined to connect with consanguinity is 'trismus nascentium,' or infantile lockjaw, which cuts off about half the children shortly after birth. This affection, which is probably due to a special bacillus, has lately been prevented by dressing the

[1] J. Beete Jukes, *Narrative of the Surveying Voyage of H.M.S. 'Fly' in Torres Strait, New Guinea, and other Islands of the Eastern Archipelago*, vol. ii, p. 80.

[2] Kruseman, "Enkele dagen onder de Baduwis," *De Indische Gids*, i, p. 113.

[3] A. Voisin, "Contribution à l'histoire des mariages consanguins," *Mémoires de la Société d'Anthropologie*, ii, pp. 433 sqq.

umbilical cord antiseptically after birth." [1] At Staithes, a village between Whitby and Saltburn, there existed until quite lately a community which for ages "have so intermarried as to be all more or less closely related to one another." They are a hardy race of fishers; "the men are well grown, athletic and powerful, the maidens straight and comely, and the children as sturdy as could anywhere be found in the three kingdoms." [2] At Smith's Island, off the coast of Maryland, all the inhabitants, who do not exceed seven hundred in number, are said to be interrelated; "a physician who lived in the community for three years failed to find among the seven hundred persons a single case of idiocy, insanity, epilepsy, or congenital deafness." [3] Many similar examples are forthcoming.[4] A few instances have been adduced, mostly in a vague manner, of isolated and intermarrying communities which are, like non-isolated and non-intermarrying communities, afflicted with various diseases.[5] It would, indeed, be strange if intermarriage were an infallible preventive against all bodily afflictions.

It is equally irrelevant to adduce that in such isolated communities numbering one, two, or three thousands, or a few hundreds, the closer prohibited degrees of relationship are observed. The curious objection is mentioned by Dr. Westermarck in regard to the Pitcairn Islanders, who are descended from nine of the mutineers of the 'Bounty' who in 1790 were deposited in the Island together with six men and twelve women from Tahiti, and who in 1800 consisted of twenty-five people. They are described by all observers as remarkably strong, healthy and well built, the

[1] J. Kerr Love, *Deaf Mutism*, p. 108. The article of Dr. C. R. Macdonald, referred to, "St. Kilda, the Inhabitants and the Diseases peculiar to them," appeared in the *British Medical Journal*, July 1886.

[2] A. H. Huth, *The Marriage of Near Kin*, p. 145, quoting *The Times*, September 7, 1885.

[3] P. Popenoe, "Consanguineous Marriage," *The Journal of Heredity*, iv, p. 345.

[4] See A. H. Huth, *op. cit.*, pp. 144 sqq.

[5] E.g., A. Graham Bell, in *Minutes of Evidence taken before the Royal Commission on the Blind, the Deaf and Dumb*, etc. (London, 1889), vol. iii, Answers to questions, 21, 450 sqq. (referring to Martha's Vineyard, an island about fifty miles from Boston, which, he stated, produced a large proportion of deaf-mutes); Sir Arthur Mitchell, "Blood Relationship in Marriage, considered in its influence upon offspring," *Memoirs Read before the Anthropological Society of London*, ii, pp. 402 sqq.; Id. in *Edinburgh Medical Journal*, 1865 (some cases of deaf-mutism occur in some isolated Scotch communities; none, and no apparent evil effects, in others. The fallacy of Sir Arthur Mitchell's statistical deductions will be referred to later); Johannes Mygge, *Om Aegstekaber mellem Blodbeslaegtede*, pp. 171 sq. (similarly in secluded parishes in Denmark: conditions set down to intermarriage in some, no discoverable evil effects in others); C. A. Penrose, "Sanitary Conditions of the Bahama Islands," *Geographical Society of Baltimore*, 1905.

men averaging six feet in height, both sexes being well formed and handsome, the women being as muscular as the men, and taller than the generality of women, and the children uniformly healthy.[1] In a curious case reported from Dahomey the degrees of relationship were as little observed as they could have been among the twenty-five progenitors of the present Pitcairn Islanders. "In 1849, at Widah, in the kingdom of Dahomey, a Portuguese landed proprietor, Da Souza by name, well known to all captains visiting the west coast of Africa, died. This man, being in his time an important personage in that country, had made a large fortune in the slave-trade. At his death he left behind him a host of children, the fruits of his harem containing four hundred wives. The government of the king of Dahomey, suspicious of, and hostile to, the introduction of a mongrel population, confined this numerous offspring in an enclosed space, under the superintendence of one of Da Souza's sons. Despised by the natives, and strictly guarded, these Mestizoes could only propagate by intermixing among themselves. In 1863 there were already amongst them children of the third generation. In spite of this intermixing of the family, defying every moral and conventional law, there were amongst this offspring neither deaf-mutes, blind, cretin, nor ill-developed individuals."[2] This human herd was, we are told, decreasing rapidly, a circumstance which can cause little surprise under the conditions of a concentration camp.

While the manifestations of racial degeneration in royal families, such as the Hapsburgs and the Spanish Bourbons, are often referred to popularly—it is hard to see on what grounds—as illustrating the evils of inbreeding, those royal families who have systematically practised dynastic incest furnish no evidence of those supposed evils. None is afforded by the Ptolemies; the practice which they adopted when they took over the throne of Egypt had been regularly observed in that country for at least 3,000 years; it was to our knowledge practised to what one might call excess in the golden age of the Egyptian monarchy, during the XIXth and XXth Dynasties, every king of the former marrying his sister as the lawful mother of the heir to the throne.[3] Yet the race that produced Seti and Rameses affords no evidence of degeneration, nor does there exist in the

[1] A. H. Huth, *op. cit.*, after T. B. Murray, *Pitcairn: the Island, the People, and their Pastor*, and other authorities. The latest report given by Mr. H. H. Dyke, in *Man*, xvii, p. 123, confirms those accounts and describes the people as "strong and active, the women the same, and both well developed," a description which is amply supported by the photograph given of sturdy natives.

[2] Thibault, "Mariages consanguins dans la race noire," *Archives de Médecine Navale*, vol. i, p. 310.

[3] See below, vol. iii, p. 24, n. [2].

age-long records of by far the longest line of kings in the world's history, among whom, not mere inbreeding, but actual incest was a fundamental and immemorial principle, any fact that can lend support to the doctrine of the evil results of inbreeding.[1]

If there existed a constant relation between consanguineous unions and any form of racial degeneration or disease, not only might it reasonably be expected that such effects should in some way be plainly manifested in the numerous populations with whom inbreeding is the rule, but there should be no difficulty in demonstrating the fact beyond dispute, by statistical investigations. Yet no attempt to do this has met with any success. The most thorough general investigation of the kind is still that which was undertaken by Sir George H. Darwin. It is a classic of conscientious statistical enquiry. Its value is enhanced by the fact that the author—himself the offspring of a cousin-marriage—was, like his father, strongly disposed to believe that inbreeding is attended with injurious effects, and hoped by the investigation to place the belief on a scientific basis. His results as regards the incidence of insanity and mental derangements were that the percentage of offspring from cousin marriages to be found in asylums is no greater than the percentage of offspring from non-related persons. With reference to deaf-mutism, the percentage of offspring from cousin-marriages was exactly the same as from other marriages.[2] As regards fertility he found that the

[1] The family history of the Ptolemies has been carefully analysed by Mr. Huth (*op. cit.*, pp. 36 sq.). Sir Francis Galton has sought to show that they were subject to sterility (*Hereditary Genius*, p.152), and K. E. von Ujfalvy has published an elaborate essay in which every possible evil, physical and mental, is discovered in that family ("Die Ptolemäer. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Anthropologie," *Archiv für Anthropologie*, N.F., ii, pp. 73 sqq.). There would be no difficulty in putting together a similar tale of horror in regard to any royal dynasty, including those of England. It is easy to call Cleopatra a 'moral degenerate' on the ground that her sexual morality was not in accordance with Victorian standards; but it is difficult to perceive in the brilliant and clever woman, the last scion of the race, any manifestation of evils traceable to dynastic incest. What the history of Egyptian dynasties shows clearly is that constant incest through many generations did not give rise to any gross and manifest evil effects, and was not inconsistent with the production of healthy and long-lived individuals of conspicuous ability. To search for hidden, obscure, and hypothetical defects or taints is not possible with the materials at our disposal, and cannot lead to any conclusion or even presumption. Dr. H. R. Hall says that the practice "resulted in destroying dynasty after dynasty" (*The Ancient History of the Near East*, p. 374). But Egypt is surely not the only country where dynasty after dynasty has been destroyed; and I venture to doubt that even Dr. Hall knows enough about Egyptian kings to trace the phenomenon to physiological causes.

[2] G. H. Darwin, "Marriages between First Cousins in England, and their Effects," *Journal of the Statistical Society*, xxxviii, p. 172.

balance was slightly in favour of cousin-marriages.[1] He further collected statistics with reference to a special class, namely, the peerage, in which a different result might have been expected; the figures showed, however, that there was no less fertility and no less vitality in the offspring of peers who had married their cousins than in the offspring of those who had married non-relatives.[2] While he holds the view that inbreeding may in some manner not known have injurious effects, the final conclusion of his investigation was that "there is no evidence whatever of any ill results accruing to the offspring in consequence of cousinship of parents."[3]

The distinguished Italian anthropologist, Dr. Mantegazza, was an even more ardent advocate of the injuriousness of consanguineous unions than Sir George Darwin, and devoted at one time much labour to collecting statistics with a view to demonstrating the grounds of his belief. He had, however, the disappointment of having to admit that no such relation as he had supposed could be shown from his materials.[4]

Supposed Production of Deaf-mutism and other Conditions by Consanguineous Marriages.

The specific evil effects which have most commonly been alleged to result from consanguineous marriages are mental deficiency, deaf-mutism and sterility. It is to be noted that the last two conditions appear to be incompatible with one another. "All authors who have directed their attention to this subject," writes Dr. Holger Mygind, "agree that the marriages producing deaf-mutes are remarkable for their fertility."[5] So pronounced and

[1] G. H. Darwin, *op. cit.*, p. 180.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 182.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 172. Dr. Westermarck cites from Darwin's paper to the effect that in some instances—and not in others—Sir George Darwin thought that he observed "a slightly lowered vitality amongst the offspring of cousin-marriages"; and he complains that "it is curious that in spite of such unambiguous statements Darwin's paper has generally been quoted as evidence of the perfect harmlessness of first-cousin marriages" (E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. ii, p. 226).

[4] P. Mantegazza, "Studi sui matrimoni consanguinei," *Rendiconti dell'Instituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere*, 1868, pp. 106 sqq.

[5] H. Mygind, *Deaf-mutism*, p. 98. Thus the average number of children in marriages producing deaf-mutes was found to be, in Magdeburg, 5·63 children per marriage (B. F. Wilhelmi, *Statistik der Taubstummen der Regierungsbezirkes Magdeburg*, pp. 76, 82); in Denmark, 5 children per marriage (H. Mygind, *loc. cit.*); in Saxony, 6 children per marriage (H. Schmaltz, *Die Taubstummen im Königreich Sachsen*, p. 131); in Ireland, 5 or 6 children per family (R. W. Wilde, *Practical Observations on Aural*

constant is that procreative power, that Dr. Graham Bell was apprehensive lest it should lead to the formation of "a deaf variety of the human race."[1] The defenders of the doctrine of the injuriousness of consanguineous marriages are therefore under the necessity of choosing between the two evils which they are desirous of inflicting upon the progeny of those unions; if they insist that they shall be deaf, they must allow them a more than normal fertility; if they wish them to be afflicted with sterility and their race to be extinguished, they should say nothing about deaf-mutism. Since the same high rate of fertility has also been noted in regard to other congenital pathological conditions which are set down to consanguineous unions,[2] the dilemma would appear to have extensive bearings.

In attempts to demonstrate the supposed evil effects of in-breeding, by far the largest amount of attention has been devoted to the condition of deaf-mutism and to the statistics referring to it. Many eminent medical authorities have expressed, with greater or less emphasis, the opinion that consanguineous marriages are a factor, an important factor, or even the paramount factor, in the production of congenital deaf-mutism.[3] All modern authorities who hold that view are careful to insist that they confine the claim to truly congenital cases only, and that they do not refer to cases in which deafness has been acquired after birth.[4]

The former class of cases is, however, extremely rare. Some of the older writers supposed that they were common. Hartmann thought that about half the cases of deaf-mutism were congenital;[5] Schmaltz went so far as to state that there were twice

Surgery, p. 471). Marriages in which the partners themselves are deaf are generally said to be comparatively infertile (1 to 2 per marriage), though complete infertility is particularly rare. But, as Mygind points out, the appearance is probably deceptive and due to statistical conditions under which the returns were necessarily taken. Cf. W. W. Ireland, *Mental Affections of Children*, p. 30; J. Kerr Love, *Deaf Mutism*, p. 79.

[1] A. G. Bell, *Memoir upon the Formation of a Deaf Variety of the Human Race* (Washington, 1884).

[2] H. Mygind, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

[3] Among the eminent authorities who have held that view may be mentioned A. Trousseau (*Clinique médicale de l'Hôtel Dieu de Paris*, vol. ii, pp. 129 sq.); P. Menière ("Recherches sur l'origine de la surdi-mutité," *Gazette Médicale de Paris*, xvie année, vol. i, p. 225); I. B. Puybonnieux (*Mutisme et surdité*, p. 12); S. G. Howe (*On the Causes of Idiocy*, p. 35); W. Wilde (*Practical Observations on Aural Surgery*, p. 470); A. Politzer (*A Text-book of Diseases of the Ear*, p. 819); H. Mygind (*Deaf-mutism*, p. 90); V. Hammerschlag ("Ein neues Eintheilungsprincip für die verschiedenen Formen der Taubstummheit," *Archiv für Ohrenheilkunde*, lvi, p. 175); J. Kerr Love ("Deafness and Mendelism," *Maternity and Child Welfare*, v [1921], p. 66).

[4] H. Mygind, *Deaf-mutism*, p. 92.

[5] A. Hartmann, *Deafmutism and the Education of Deaf-mutes*, p. 51.

as many congenital as acquired cases;[1] Falk thought that he had found 69 congenital cases out of a total of 79.[2] The progress of our knowledge has constantly reduced the proportion. When patients in deaf-mute institutions come to be carefully examined by experts, it is found that scarcely any that have been classified as 'congenital' can be regarded as undoubtedly such, and that the vast majority show unmistakable signs of acquired inflammatory conditions of the ears.[3] The incidence of those conditions increases enormously in proportion to the youth of the patient; the majority occur in the first year, many more in the second than in the third year, and by far the greatest number originate in the first months of life.[4] The new-born child is deaf, and not until four or five months after birth does the fact that it hears or not the human voice become patent to casual observers.[5] It is apparent that in those circumstances "the assertion of uneducated people that the children are deaf from birth is not worthy of trust."[6] Under insanitary conditions and with the poorer classes, among whom the vast majority of cases occur, discharges from the ear produced by inflammatory conditions are extremely common and very little notice of them is taken. "Even by a thorough scientific examination," says Dr. Politzer, "in a number of cases it cannot be ascertained with certainty [the English is not mine] whether the case is one of congenital or acquired deaf-mutism."[7] The question cannot even in many instances be settled by a post-mortem examination.[8] Modern authorities are agreed that deafness is due in the great majority of instances to acquired disease, and that truly congenital cases are very rare.[9] Dr. Langdon Down was of opinion that

[1] H. Schmaltz, *Die Taubstummen im Königreich Sachsen*, p. 71.

[2] Falk, "Zur Statistick der Taubstummheit," *Archiv für Psychiatrie und Nervenkrankheiten*, iii, p. 407.

[3] A. Politzer, *A Text-book of Diseases of the Ear*, p. 821; A. Bliss, "A Contribution to the Study of Deaf-Mutism," *The Medical News* (Philadelphia), 1895, pp. 146 sq.; O. Frankenberger, "Adenoide Vegetationen bei Taubstummen nebst einigen Bemerkungen über die Aetiologie der Taubstummheit," *Monatschrift für Ohrenheilkunde*, xxx, p. 434.

[4] J. Kerr Love, *Deaf Mutism*, p. 68; H. Schmaltz, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

[5] W. Preyer, *Die Seele des Kindes*, pp. 48 sq.; M. W. Shinn, *Notes on the Development of a Child*, vol. i, pp. 107 sqq.; E. A. Fay, *Marriages of the Deaf in America*, pp. 36 sq.

[6] C. W. Saegert, *Das Taubstummen-Bildungswesen in Preussen*, pp. 16 sq. Cf. O. Frankenberger, *op. cit.*, p. 435.

[7] A. Politzer, *op. cit.*, p. 820. Cf. H. Schmaltz, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

[8] *Ibid.*; H. Mygind, *op. cit.*, p. 182.

[9] J. Kerr Love, *Deaf Mutism*, pp. 68, 179; A. Bliss, "A Contribution to the Study of Deaf-Mutism," *The Medical News*, 1895, p. 147; O. Frankeberger, *op. cit.*, p. 434; V. Hammerschlag, *op. cit.*, p. 174. Cf. E. A. Fay, *Marriages of the Deaf in America*, p. 37.

the majority of such cases, if not all, are tubercular; tuberculosis is, after measles, the commonest ascertained cause of inflammatory ear affections, scarlet fever coming next.[1] Of late it has been realised that a large proportion of such 'congenital' cases is due to syphilis.[2] Neither tubercle nor syphilis can be taken into account in discussing natural heredity. The residue of truly 'congenital' cases is, indeed, so small and so constantly dwindling with the advance of knowledge that it becomes doubtful whether it exists. Dr. Hammerschlag thinks it would be better to drop the term 'congenital' in reference to the condition.[3] There can, in any case, be no doubt that by far the larger number of cases which appear as 'congenital' in statistics, especially in the older, are not such.

It is apparent from the above considerations alone that the value to be attached to the most careful statistical statements purporting to show a greater incidence of congenital deafness in the progeny of consanguineous parents than in that from other marriages is very questionable.[4] Those circumstances would be sufficient to invalidate conclusions drawn from large numbers and showing pronounced tendencies; but since the numbers of supposed congenital cases and of consanguineous marriages are both small, it is, even in extensive statistics, on very small numbers and minimal differences that claims are based. The earlier statements purporting to be founded upon statistics which led to the belief that the ancient opinion regarding the evil effects of consanguineous unions was corroborated by facts, did, indeed, represent quite a large proportion of deaf-mutes as having been born of parents related by blood. One of the first of those statements, which impressed many authorities, and set that class of enquiry on foot, was published by an elderly retired French

[1] D. Guthrie, "Notes on Thirteen Cases of Aural Tuberculosis," *The Journal of Laryngology, Rhinology and Otology*, xxxv, p. 99.

[2] J. Kerr Love, "Deafness and Mendelism," *Maternity and Child Welfare*, v, p. 66; V. Hammerschlag, *op. cit.*, p. 165.

[3] V. Hammerschlag, *op. cit.*, p. 174 n.

[4] The sources of fallacy above referred to are, of course, far from being the only ones. Every work dealing with those statistics points out many such causes, some avoidable, others inevitable, and all fatal to the validity of the data as a basis for conclusions. As illustrating the manner in which statistics of deaf-mutism appearing in official returns are liable to be collected—a process which would require much discrimination even on the part of the most expert authorities—the following amusing instance may be mentioned. In the Irish census returns of 1881 suspicion was aroused by the enormous number of deaf-mutes recorded in a certain district. Investigation revealed the fact that the genial Irish census officer had put down as "congenitally deaf-mutes" all the babies in the district who could not talk! (*Census of Ireland*, 1881, Part ii, *General Report*, p. xliv).

army doctor, Major Boudin, who paid a visit to the Institution for Deaf-mutes in Paris and examined the books, and also entered into correspondence with the superintendents of various institutions in other parts of France. His announcement was that over 28 per cent. of deaf-mutes were the offspring of consanguineous marriages.[1] It was, however, subsequently shown that Major Boudin's statements were, probably from mere zeal, false; that he had examined only a selected number of cases in the Paris institution, and that he had ascribed to correspondents statements which they repudiated.[2] He was followed by other zealous advocates who produced similar large percentages. All later attempts to exhibit a relation between deaf-mutism and consanguineous unions, although they show, as Mr. Huth puts it, "a pleasing variety," refer to much more moderate proportions, most of them ranging from 1 to 6 per cent., and the highest rising to 9. Those figures are, of course, of no significance unless they are compared with the numbers of consanguineous marriages which do not produce deaf-mutes. Those data are obviously difficult to obtain. The question, though ignored by the older advocates, is dealt with as far as possible by the more recent and least untrustworthy statisticians. When such a comparison is instituted we find that we are dealing with decimal figures. Thus according to the Irish statistics for 1881 the deaf-mute offspring of consanguineous marriages is on an average 1·62 per marriage, of non-consanguineous marriages 1·30;[3] in Magdeburg, according to Wilhelmi, consanguineous marriages produce an average of 1·71 deaf children, non-consanguineous marriages 1·26;[4] the results of Dr. Mygind's investigation in Denmark are, for consanguineous marriages 1·75, for other marriages 1·34.[5]

Sir Arthur Mitchell enquired into the numbers of deaf-mutes whose parents were consanguineously related, in secluded parts of Scotland where close intermarriage is prevalent. In some parishes he could obtain little or no material, in others he found a considerable proportion. Summing up his results, he states: "Out of 408 deaf-mutes, we have 25·1 where parents were blood relations, or 1 in 16·2. If cousin marriages have no influence in the production of this result, then such unions in the general community ought to be to others in the proportion of 1 to 17. I have no figures to

[1] J. Ch. M. Boudin, *Danger des unions consanguines et nécessité des croisements dans l'espèce humaine* (Paris, 1862).

[2] E. Dally, *Recherches sur les mariages consanguins et sur les races pures*, pp. 24 sqq.

[3] *Census of Ireland*, 1881, Part ii, *General Report*, p. 43.

[4] B. F. Wilhelmi, *Statistik der Taubstummen des Regierungsbezirkes Magdeburg nach der Volkzählung von* 1871, pp. 73, 76.

[5] H. Mygind, *Deaf-mutism*, p. 90.

show that this is not the case, nor can I obtain them; but I believe all will at once agree with me in considering such a proportion as far too great. The average in Great Britain is probably not more than 1 to 60 or 70."[1] Sir Arthur Mitchell's guess was very wide of the mark. In estimating the proportion of cousin-marriages among the peerage and landed gentry, for which task fairly full information is obtainable from 'Burke,' Sir George Darwin found that the proportion was 4·06 and 3·93 per cent., or 1 in 25; and Mr. Jacobs, after having very carefully estimated the proportion of cousin-marriages among Jews in England, arrives at the conclusion that they constitute 7·5 per cent. of all marriages, or 1 in 14.[2] A proportion of 1 in 17 for figures derived for the most part from very isolated districts and islands inhabited by a clannish Scottish population is not, therefore, by any means excessive.

The statistics of deaf-mutism have been repeatedly subjected to critical analysis both by opponents and by supporters of the doctrine of the injurious effects from consanguineous unions. The conclusion of Mr. Huth's exhaustive discussion is that "statistics on which so much reliance has been placed as a proof of the harmfulness of consanguineous marriages are, when not absolutely false, miserably misleading and defective."[3] As Mr. Huth does not believe in the doctrine, his judgment may be regarded as biassed. Dr. A. Graham Bell, one of the most ardent apostles of that doctrine, states that "We have no statistics that undeniably prove that consanguineous marriage is a cause of deafness."[4] Mr. Mygge is also a zealous upholder of that doctrine, and has devoted much labour to defending it. He regards all earlier attempts to do so as founded on unreliable statistics or purely theoretical considerations, and, not considering any of them as trustworthy, felt compelled to institute a census of his own by personal enquiry. His methods appear, however, to be open in no small degree to the criticisms which he directs against those of his predecessors.[5] Dr. H. Schmaltz has carried out an elaborate and detailed analysis of the statistical returns for Saxony, with no special reference to the question of consanguineous marriages. As regards that question, however, he arrives at the conclusion

[1] A. Mitchell, "Blood Relationship in Marriage, Considered in its Influence upon Offspring," *Memoirs read before the Anthropological Society of London*, ii, p. 456.

[2] J. Jacobs, "Studies in Jewish Statistics," *The Jewish Chronicle*, January 1883, p. 10.

[3] A. H. Huth, *The Marriage of Near Kin*, p. 338.

[4] A. Graham Bell, in *Minutes of Evidence taken before the Royal Commission on the Blind, the Deaf and Dumb*, etc., vol. iii, Answer to question 21.

[5] J. Mygge, *Om Aegsteskaber mellem Blodbeslaegtede*, pp. 35 sqq., 233 sqq. Cf. above, p. 221, n. 5.

that the facts "do not appear to support, but on the contrary tell strongly against, the assumption that the number of deaf-mutes increases with that of consanguineous marriages, or, in other words, that the children of consanguineous unions are particularly liable to deaf-mutism." [1] Dr. H. Mygind is probably the highest expert authority on deaf-mutism. He is a believer in the theory of the injuriousness of consanguineous marriages; his work is, however, marked by a judicial, scientific and scholarly spirit. Dr. Mygind did not regard any existing statistics as conclusive, and, like Mr. Mygge, considered it desirable to undertake a fresh enquiry into the subject. He followed a somewhat different method from his predecessors, for he included in his investigation of the histories of deaf-mute patients not only cases of deaf-mutism, but also conditions such as neuroses, epilepsy, insanity, goitre, which he regarded as associated with deaf-mutism. His result as regards the latter condition has already been mentioned, namely an excess of 0·41 of deaf offspring in the unions of blood-relations. The conclusion he draws from the result is that "should other statistics confirm the above, there will be reason to suppose that consanguineous marriages, contracted between members of a family with defects which are known to be of importance as remote causes of deaf-mutism, are more likely to produce deaf-mute children than others." [2]

Such a conclusion, which is apparently the utmost that a supporter of the theory of the evils from consanguineous unions feels himself fairly warranted in drawing from the evidence, leaves the theory, in fact, entirely destitute of evidential grounds; for the greater liability to transmit a pathological tendency present in both parents applies equally whether the parents are or are not related by blood. Yet when the claims of the upholders of the doctrine in question are brought into relation with the actual facts, it is found that in every instance those claims become qualified in the same manner. Dr. J. Kerr Love is also an advocate of the doctrine. Like all others, he has no reply to offer to the proofs advanced, notably by Mr. Huth, that consanguinity in the parents is not in itself injurious to the offspring. Yet he appears to be under the impression that he is traversing those proofs by saying: "There is a fallacy here; and it consists in this. One of the factors in the calculation is absent. Not only must consanguinity be reckoned with, but the presence of hereditary tendencies must be taken into account." [3] Some of the most vigorous critics of the doctrine—as, for instance,

[1] H. Schmaltz, *Die Taubstumme im Königreich Sachsen*, p. 137.

[2] H. Mygind, *op. cit.*, p. 93. Cf. p. 92: "It is, however, undecided whether consanguinity in itself is a remote cause of deaf-mutism."

[3] J. Kerr Love, *Deaf Mutism*, pp. 108 sq.

M. Sanson—are also of opinion that, if there exists a pathological taint in one of the parents, that tendency is raised to the highest degree, or at least doubled, by procreation with a member of the same family in whom the taint exists in a latent or overt form; and their view is thus no different from that expressed by the upholders of the doctrine. But that conclusion, which on theoretical grounds appears reasonable, is seen, when facts are examined, not to apply in so simple a manner as might 'a priori' be imagined, and is, as regards deaf-mutism, far from being an established fact. Many authorities have denied that the condition is hereditary at all;[1] and all are agreed that it is not hereditary in the usual sense of the word, since the condition is scarcely ever transmitted from one generation to the succeeding one. "It is rare," says Dr. Sedgwick, "to find instances of the immediate parents being deaf and dumb, for even with the aid of 'breeding-in' this defect fails as a rule to show itself in the direct line of descent, and among the numerous examples or records of intermarriage between deaf-mutes a very small percentage of the resulting offspring shares the parents' defect. All statistical reports on the deaf and dumb agree in confirming this remarkable fact."[2] In the London Institution for Deaf-mutes, out of 148 patients, not one had deaf and dumb parents.[3] Kramer knew of no case of deaf and dumb parents having a dumb child.[4] A few instances are now known, but they are extremely rare.[5]

It is also comparatively rare, though perhaps not in the same degree, to find deaf-mutes in the direct ancestry of deaf-mutes; Wilhelmi, Mygge, and Hartmann each only knew of two such instances.[6] But, further, a fact which may appear very strange, flatly opposed as it is to the reasonable assumption on which partisans and opponents are generally agreed, is clearly exhibited by the extensive American statistics, and also in a lesser degree, because

[1] W. Kramer, *Die Erkentniss und Heilung der Ohrenkrankheiten*, p. 384; F. L. Meissner, *Taubstummheit und Taubstummenbildung*, p. 92; E. Schmalz, *Ueber die Taubstummen und ihre Bildung*, p. 13; Lent, *Statistik der Taubstummen des Regierungsbezirk Köln*, p. 21; W. Sedgwick, "On Sexual Limitation in Hereditary Disease," *British and Foreign Medico-Chirurgical Review*, xxviii, pp. 201 sqq.; A. Bliss, "A Contribution to the Study of Deaf-Mutism," *The Medical News*, p. 148.

[2] W. Sedgwick, "On Sexual Limitation in Hereditary Disease," *The British and Foreign Medico-Chirurgical Review*, xxviii, p. 201.

[3] J. Adams, *A Treatise on the Supposed Hereditary Properties of Disease*, p. 86.

[4] W. Kramer, *Die Erkentniss und Heilung der Ohrenkrankheiten*, p. 384.

[5] A. Hartmann, *Deafmutism*, p. 54; H. Mygind, *op. cit.*, pp. 46 sq.; E. A. Fay, *Marriages of the Deaf in America*, pp. 47 sqq.

[6] B. F. Wilhelmi, *Statistik der Taubstummen des Regierungsbezirkes Magdeburg*, p. 72; J. Mygge, *Om Aegsteskaber mellem Blodeslaegtede*, p. 275; A. Hartmann, *Deafmutism*, pp. 53 sq.

they deal with smaller numbers, by the European. Of the children who are born of deaf parents a far smaller proportion are deaf where both parents are deaf than when one only is deaf.[1] The tendency, far from being summated, is, on the contrary, neutralised by being represented in both parents, " excess," as Sedgwick put it, " having reversed the action of some natural law of development." [2] Darwin regarded the fact as " simply unintelligible." [3] In the present state of our knowledge there are several ways in which it might be accounted for. There being a decided tendency for the condition not to be transmitted directly to the offspring, that tendency would naturally be increased where both parents are deaf. It is, of course, theoretically possible that, as in some other conditions, such as the liability to excessive bleeding, the hereditary tendency, supposing it to exist, should manifest itself in alternate generations or in some other way; but against that hypothesis there exists no evidence showing such an alternation of generations, nor any form of direct transmission in deaf-mutism.[4] A far more probable explanation is that the condition, being for the most part due to infectious and toxic causes, summation by marriage increases the habituation and resistance of the organism, in the same manner as protective vaccination, by supplying a larger amount of ' anti-bodies.' Deaf-mutism is commonly found among the brothers or sisters of the same family, and in members of collateral branches.[5] Such an incidence might, of course, be due to exposure to similar conditions.

[1] E. A. Fay, *op. cit.*, pp. 33 sqq.; Howard, in J. Kerr Love, *op. cit.*, pp. 83 sqq.

[2] W. Sedgwick, " On Sexual Limitation in Hereditary Disease," *British and Foreign Medico-Chirurgical Review*, xxviii, p. 204.

[3] C. Darwin, *The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication*, vol. i, p. 465.

[4] Dr. J. Kerr Love thinks that he can detect in the irregular manifestation of effects of supposed heredity in deaf-mutism a ' Mendelian ' character, and he has repeatedly exhibited, in illustration of his hypothesis, an ' ideal ' and incomplete family tree of an Ayrshire family. But its likeness to the genealogical tree of Mendelian peas is of an impressionistic rather than idealistic character (J. Kerr Love, " The Origin of Sporadic Congenital Deafness," *The Journal of Laryngology, Rhinology and Otology*, xxxv (1920), pp. 263 sqq.; Id., " Deafness and Mendelism: an Essay in Eugenics," *Maternity and Child Welfare*, v (1921), pp. 66 sq. Cf. H. Lundborg, " Über die Erblichkeitsverhältnisse der konstitutionellen (hereditären) Taubstummheit und einige Worte über die Bedeutung der Erblichkeitsforshung für Krankheitslehre," *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschafts- Biologie*, ix (1912). It is, however, not much inferior in significance to other attempts to exhibit so-called Mendelian heredity in man. One must entirely agree with Mr. Laski that " It is not too much to say that the endeavour to make man a complex of sharply defined unit characters has failed, and failed completely " (H. J. Laski, " A Mendelian View of Racial Heredity," *Biometrika*, viii, p. 424).

[5] A. Hartmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 55 sqq.; H. Mygind, *op. cit.*, pp. 51 sqq.

While statistics are inconclusive and ambiguous as regards heredity, they show a constant and pronounced relation as regards conditions in the environment. Thus there is a marked excess in the total number of cases in regions of high altitudes. There are more than twice as many deaf-mutes in Switzerland than in any other country where census figures are collected, and the lowest incidence known is that of Holland and Belgium, other countries showing intermediate rates of incidence according as they are flat or mountainous. The same distribution holds good in detail as regards various districts, the higher parts of Switzerland producing more cases than the lower, the mountainous parts of France more than the plains, northern Spain more than the southern plains, the Austrian Alps numerous cases, the plains of the Danube few, and so forth in all cases.[1] The same relation is shown with the most striking exactitude in India, the largest proportion of cases occurring in the Himalayan provinces and the fewest in the great plains.[2] It has also been clearly shown that deaf-mutism is a condition associated almost exclusively with poverty, overcrowding, insanitary conditions, and neglect.[3] When, in conjunction with those facts, it is borne in mind that the true pathology of supposed congenital deaf-mutism is not known, that it appears to be produced by inflammatory conditions, by infections, by tubercle, by syphilis, it may be doubted whether heredity plays any other part in the causation of the condition than that of a remote predisposing factor.

It is on the statistics of deaf-mutism that reliance has chiefly been placed in attempts to substantiate by the evidence of facts the doctrine concerning the evil effects of consanguineous unions—and that must be my excuse for dwelling, however briefly and inadequately, upon the somewhat complex and wearisome subject. Since the evidence put forward in regard to other supposed evil effects, such as idiocy, is even more slender and insignificant, it may suffice to cite the conclusions of some of the foremost authorities on the subject. "One of the most common beliefs in reference to idiocy," writes Sir George Savage, "is that consanguineous marriages are among the most common causes of the production of the condition. In the popular mind, the marriage of cousins is sure to

[1] A. Hartmann, *Deafmutism*, pp. 44 sqq.; H. Mygind, *op. cit.*, pp. 32 sqq.; V. Hammerschlag, *op. cit.*, pp. 166 sq. H. Schmaltz has criticised the manifest testimony of the facts so far as regards the small district of Saxony, but his criticisms are directed against the theory of Escherich, who interpreted them in terms of geological formation, and not of atmospheric pressure and altitude (H. Schmaltz, *Die Taubstummen im Königreich Sachsen*, pp. 178 sqq.).

[2] E. A. Gait, in *Census of India*, 1911, vol. i, "India," Report, pp. 349 sq.

[3] A. Hartmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 65 sqq.; H. Mygind, *op. cit.*, pp. 37 sqq.; J. Langdon Down, *On the Education and Training of the Feeble in Mind*, p. 6.

produce idiocy. But I am quite of the opinion of Mr. Huth, who most carefully studied the whole question, that consanguinity alone has little to do with the production of idiots. If the stock be healthy in mind and body, there is no extra risk in the marriage of cousins." [1] Dr. S. Langdon Down, who had an unrivalled experience, both clinical and theoretical, not only of all forms of idiocy, but also of deaf-mutism, used to state his opinion that the human race might be greatly improved by encouraging the marriages of selected cousins.[2] Dr. A. F. Tredgold, who has established his reputation as the highest and most learned special authority on mental debility and idiocy, states his conclusions as follows: "I consider that the statement that consanguinity in itself is an important cause of amentia to be one not supported by facts. In my own series of cases I found that only 5 per cent. of defectives were the offspring of blood-relations, and in all of these a pronounced neuropathic heredity was present. A similarly small percentage is revealed by several other enquirers. Thus Beach and Shuttleworth found consanguinity in 4·2 per cent., Down in 7 per cent., Kerlin in 7 per cent., and, in fact, the result of careful research is decidedly to discount the factor as a cause of amentia." [3]

In spite of the sharp difference of opinion between those who still uphold the old doctrine of the evils of consanguineous unions and their opponents, both appear at the present day to be agreed that consanguinity is not in itself a direct cause of evil effects, but both are also equally disposed to regard consanguineous unions as attended with a certain amount of risk in some cases, in view of the theoretical presumption that pathological tendencies, or 'taints,' presumably present in both parents may be accentuated and increased. Even that theoretical consideration—which is not the original thesis which the defenders of the doctrine set out to justify [4]—is very disputable. By far the larger number of diseases are the effect of inflammatory conditions produced by micro-organisms. The main factor in

[1] G. H. Savage, *Insanity and Allied Neuroses*, p. 440.

[2] S. Langdon Down, cited by A. F. Tredgold, *Mental Deficiency*, p. 53.

[3] A. F. Tredgold, *loc. cit.*

[4] The doughty Major Boudin would hear nothing about heredity. For him, as for most of the early advocates of the old doctrine, it was the fact of consanguinity *per se* which brought down upon the offspring the nemesis attending the breach of the law, and the supposed evil effects had nothing to do with any phenomenon of heredity. He has passages of high-flown rhetoric expressing his utter scorn of any reference to the laws of heredity. "Here are two perfectly sound and vigorous individuals," he would say, "yet, because they are blood-relations their offspring will be monsters or idiots. Let no one dare to utter the word 'heredity.'" The fact that family heredity may result in quite a number of alternatives was, of course, not realised in his day.

the liability to such infection, besides exposure to it, is the unhabituated condition of the tissues and fluids of the body, a liability which, as a general rule, diminishes progressively with the degree of habituation, the chemical reactions of the organism being modified by the injurious agency in an adaptive direction.[1] Reproduction with an individual in the like condition cannot, so far as we know, increase the degree of vulnerability in the offspring; but, on the other hand, it can, and does, greatly enhance the resisting power, by adding to the stock of transmitted antitoxic and protective substances. As regards constitutional tendencies, it does not follow from our imperfect knowledge of the laws of hereditary transmission that they are necessarily 'summated,' and I know of no evidence showing such summation. The presence of a character in the same degree in both parents results in the transmission of that character in that degree, and not in a double degree. Longevity, for example, is hereditarily transmitted, and the expectation of life of a person is great if all his ancestors have lived to 80 or 90; but it does not follow that by marrying another person with the same hereditary tendency as regards longevity, their offspring will live to 160 or 180. If, on the other hand, the long-lived man marries a woman of short hereditary longevity, the chances are that the offspring will benefit by the longeval tendency and will not suffer from the contrary heredity; because such longevity, being a more normal character and established longer in heredity, is prepotent over the less favourable one. The dominant tendency of all heredity is towards the normal type, that is to say, the type which has become most firmly established, and in which the force of heredity is consequently greatest. Thus it is that every abnormality or defect, whether present in the heredity of one or both parents, tends, by the swing of heredity towards the average, to disappear. In domesticated animals which have for thousands of years been subjected to the modifying action of artificial breeding and conditions, the slightest neglect to maintain those conditions at once results in reversion to the original

[1] The one conspicuous exception to that rule among common diseases is tuberculosis. With this infection the general sapping of the constitution counts for more than the immunity created by habituation; and such is the transmissible character of that weakening that it gives rise to the appearance that tuberculosis itself is inherited. Nevertheless, I think that a certain amount of habituation and increased resistance takes place here as elsewhere, although its effects are so neutralised as not to be apparent in the course of a few generations. Great as is the liability of European races to tuberculosis, the ravages of the disease are far more marked when it is introduced among savage races, as, for example, among the Polynesians and the Australians. This would appear to indicate that Europeans have developed a certain amount of resistance to the disease which might conceivably lead in time to a pronounced diminution of its prevalence.

natural type, independently of any crossing or inbreeding. Inbreeding, all authorities agree, cannot create a character.[1] Breeders do not produce new characters by inbreeding, but by selection; all that inbreeding can do is to maintain the result, and even this it cannot accomplish unless it is accompanied by continued selection. If the inbreeding and the selection are not kept up, the result is lost, and the race at once tends back to the normal of the species. What is true of abnormalities artificially induced is equally true of defects or abnormalities accidentally produced by the environment. In the human race such abnormalities—as, for instance, an additional finger—which have appeared in a certain stock, have in time disappeared of themselves in spite of the close inbreeding of the race.[2]

The evil effects of heredity are most conspicuous as regards constitutional defects which have their seat in the nervous system, and these include deformities which are the product of trophic faults of development and most of the conditions which are particularly referred to in connection with consanguineous unions. There is, however, no ground for thinking that summation or accentuation takes place here any more than it does in regard to any other character. What is supposed to be increased by the presence of the tendency in both parents is not the defect itself, but the chance of its appearance in a greater proportion of the progeny. Other things being equal, a larger number of the offspring, not necessarily the immediate offspring, are thought to be likely to present a defect which is present in a larger proportion of their ancestry. As regards the liability for a tendency to nervous disorder to assume a more pronounced form in the offspring, my own impression is that such a liability is considerably greater where the two parents are dissimilar than where they are similar in their constitution and heredity; for in addition to the tendency itself there is then superadded the unstabilising effect of the clash of two unharmonious heredities. I believe that the experience of medical men will confirm my view that a sudden accentuation of a slight nervous instability into a pronounced neurosis in the offspring is observed to take place as commonly where one of the parents is perfectly free from any such taint in both his personal and family history as where both parents are affected, if not indeed decidedly more often. We do not possess, so far as I am aware, any exact data on the subject; but, since the whole dispute as to the supposed effects of consanguinity resolves itself into the question of the summation of like heredities, I commend to investigators an enquiry which, owing to its dealing

[1] A. H. Huth, *The Marriage of Near Kin*, pp. 256 sq.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 236 sq.

with much more abundant and varied material, is likely to prove more instructive than the manipulation of figures relating to consanguine marriages.

The belief that the offspring of parents consanguineously related will inevitably be stricken with afflictions of a character specially affecting the mind, or the senses, or by some gross deformity of the bodily form, thus clearly pointing to the 'hand of God,' is much older than any appeal to experience or any attempt to support that belief by scientific evidence. It long preceded any statistics, enquiries, or researches, and was not induced from such. Several advocates of the belief, who have been disappointed in the results of such enquiries, have ultimately fallen back upon the true basis of the belief, which is of a religious and not of a scientific character. M. Devay, the most vehement protagonist of the doctrine, who produced a whole literature of wild statements and statistics which have been disowned by upholders of the doctrine, relies, after all, for the main force of his argument against consanguineous marriages, not upon those statistics, but upon the fact that those marriages are condemned by the Roman Catholic Church. He considers the remedy for those supposed evils not to be the concern of lay authorities or of the civil legislature, but of the Church; and he concludes with a characteristic quotation to the same effect from that prince of reactionaries Comte J. de Maistre.[1] Dr. Menière, the foremost authority of his day on diseases of the ear, in declaring his faith in the importance of consanguinity of the parents in the causation of deaf-mutism, adduces no fact in confirmation of his assertion except the sinfulness of such marriages in the eyes of the Catholic Church.[2] Some who are dissatisfied with the inconclusiveness of statistical evidence have been chiefly impressed by the report that deaf-mutism is found to be more common among members of the Jewish faith, who practise intermarriage more than Christians, and was said, although incorrectly, to be more prevalent among Protestants than among Catholics, who are more strict in the extension and observance of forbidden degrees.[3] "These statements," says Dr. Mygind, "are, however, founded on very slight statistical basis. It is, of course, highly improbable that the Jewish faith has anything to do with the frequency of deaf-mutes among its professors."[4] More recent and fuller census statistics

[1] F. Devay, *Du danger des mariages consanguins sous le rapport sanitaire*, pp. 67 sqq. Cf. J. de Maistre, *Du Pape*, vol. i, pp. 227 sq.

[2] P. Menière, "Recherches sur l'origine de la surdimutité," *Gazette Médicale de Paris*, xvie année, vol. i, p. 255.

[3] A. Hartmann, *Deafmutism*, p. 48; Lent, *Statistik der Taubstummen des Regierungsbezirks Köln*, p. 11. Other authorities are mentioned by Mygind as below.

[4] H. Mygind, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

confirm, however, the fact that deafness, not only congenital, but also acquired, is more prevalent among Jews than among the Christian population. But there are abundant reasons for this greater liability of the Jewish race to this and a number of other affections.[1]

The doctrine that union between blood-relatives is attended with awful effects in the offspring is firmly held not only by the uncultured classes in Europe, but by almost all savages the world over. The mountaineers of Albania endorse the opinion of our aural surgeons that incest would inevitably result in deaf-mutism.[2] The Aleuts are strong believers in the production of malformations by inbreeding; they assert that the offspring of incestuous unions would have tusks like a walrus, and other monstrous deformities.[3] The Kaffirs of South Africa are in agreement with some of the older authorities on alienism who held that consanguine marriages are the cause of idiocy.[4]

[1] The German census of 1902 showed a proportion of 136 deaf-mutes per 100,000 among Jews, as against 92 per 100,000 among Catholics, and 83 among Protestants. Deafness from inflammatory causes acquired during infancy was estimated at 79·2 per cent. for Jews, 77·5 for Protestants, and 77 for Catholics (M. Fishberg, *The Jews*, p. 336). There is no doubt as to the greater frequency of insanity, idiocy, and indeed all neuroses among the Jews. A curious and very severe form of idiocy, or rather of congenital cerebral degeneration, known as amaurotic idiocy, or the 'Tay-Sachs disease,' to which attention has been drawn of late years, has been found almost exclusively among members of the Jewish race, and was at first thought to be entirely confined to that race (E. C. Kingdom and J. S. Risien Russell, "Infantile Cerebral Degeneration," *Transactions of the Medico-Chirurgical Society*, lxxx, pp.34 sqq.). It is not difficult to account for the greater liability to nervous instability of the Jews. Like all other members of the Semitic race, the Jewish race is highly emotional. Its history is one long tale of thwarted aspirations and ambitions, first as a weak confederacy surrounded by powerful neighbours, afterwards as a persecuted race. Such strain of adverse circumstances tells on a people, especially a high-spirited people, in the same way as it tells on individuals. The Jews are almost exclusively mental, and not manual, workers; and the incidence of neuroses is always much greater in the former than in the latter. On the other hand, it is scarcely necessary to dwell on the great vitality and fertility of the Jews. That vitality and fertility have been shown to be greater in the case of cousin-marriages among English Jews; while mixed marriages between Jews and Christians are relatively sterile (J. Jacobs, "Studies in Jewish Statistics," *The Jewish Chronicle*, N.S., No. 720, 1883, p. 10; Id., "On the Racial Characteristics of Modern Jews," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xv, p. 28; Adler, in discussion on the above, *ibid.*, p. 60).

[2] E. Durham, "High Albania and its Customs in 1908," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl, p. 458.

[3] I. Petroff, "Report on the Population, etc., of Alaska," *Tenth Census of the United States, General Reports*, vol. viii, p. 155.

[4] G. McCall Theal, *The Yellow and Dark-skinned People of Africa South of the Zambesi*, p. 219.

The Basoga of Uganda go much farther than our breeders in condemning in-and-in breeding; they are so scandalised at the notion of incest being committed by their cattle, or rather they are so afraid of the possible consequences, that a bull and cow who are found guilty of the crime are ignominiously tied up all night to a tree, until the chief, overlooking the risk, appropriates the animals as his perquisite.[1] Not only are all manner of diseases in the offspring ascribed by savages to disregard of the prohibition against incest,[2] but the guilty parents themselves are thought to be equally liable to be visited with afflictions.[3] The like misfortunes may also befall all their relatives or even the whole tribe.[4] In Celebes such unions are believed to produce failure of the crops;[5] the Galelarese regard them as the cause of earthquakes and volcanic eruptions;[6] and in Mindanao they are supposed to cause floods.[7] Those are the usual effects which are liable to follow the infringement of any tabu. The modes of inbreeding which give rise to them vary according

[1] H. H. Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate*, pp. 718 sq. There are, however, skilful breeders in Africa who entertain no such superstitions. Livingstone admired a fine herd of cattle in the Muata Jamvo country which was all bred from a single pair (D. Livingstone, *Missionary Travels and Researches*, p. 321).

[2] L. Fison and A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, p. 25; J. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, p. 28; J. Shooter, *The Kafirs of Natal*, p. 45, M. A. Condon, "Contribution to the Ethnography of the Basoga-Batamba, Uganda Protectorate," *Anthropos*, vi, p. 378; E. Dannert, *Zum Rechte der Herero*, pp. 33 sq.; C. W. Hobley, "Kikuyu Customs and Beliefs," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl, p. 438; J. Shakespear, *The Lushei Kuki Clans*, p. 154; E. Best, "Maori Marriage Customs," *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute*, xxxvi, p. 31; H. Rink, *Tales and Traditions of the Eskimo*, p. 391.

[3] H. O'Sullivan, "Dinka Laws and Customs," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl, p. 187; J. Roscoe, *The Baganda*, pp. 128 sq.; C. H. Harper, "Notes on the Totemism of the Gold Coast," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxvi, pp. 182 sq.; G. A. Wilken, *De verspreide Geschriften*, vol. ii, p. 225; B. Danks, "Marriage Customs of the New Britain Group," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xviii, pp. 282 sq.

[4] H. Low, *Sarawak*, p. 301; A. and G. Grandidier, *Histoire physique, naturelle et politique de Madagascar*, vol. iv, part i, p. 149 sq.

[5] G. A. Wilken, "Die Ehe zwischen Blutsverwandten," *Globus*, lix, p. 22; H. Ling Roth, "The Natives of Borneo, edited from Papers of the late Brooke Low," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxi, pp. 113 sq.; B. F. Matthes, "Over de adas of gewoonten der Makassaren en Boegineezen," *Verslagen en Mededeelingen van het Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen*, 3e Serie, ii, p. 182; J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, vol. ii, pp. 112 sq.

[6] M. J. van Baarda, "Fabelen, verhalen en overleveringen der Galelareezen," *Bijdragen tot taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch Indië*, xlv, p. 514.

[7] Fay-Cooper Cole, "The Wild Tribes of Davas District, Mindanao," *Field Museum of Natural History, Anthropological Series*, xii, p. 98.

to the particular customs of the peoples. Thus the Murung of Borneo have peculiar notions of the prohibited degrees: marriages between brothers and sisters are permissible, and accordingly the people are very positive that the offspring of those unions are remarkably strong and healthy. On the other hand, they regard with horror marriage between cousins or with a mother's sister, or a wife's mother, and they have no doubt that the offspring of such unions would be wretchedly feeble and unhealthy.[1] With the Bhotias, the prohibition against cousin-marriage refers to the father's side only; they are convinced that the offspring of such marriages would be afflicted with all manner of congenital diseases, while, on the other hand, the offspring of cousins on the mother's side would be perfectly healthy.[2] Similarly, the Herero consider that if the children of two brothers or of two sisters were to marry, their offspring would be so deficient in vitality that it could hardly live; but no evil effects could result from the union of the children of a brother and a sister.[3] Among some people, again, all marriages between close relatives are regarded as particularly lucky. Thus, for instance, the Kalangs of Java believe that incestuous unions between mother and son are blessed with success and prosperity.[4] The peasants of Archangel are convinced that marriages between blood-relatives are "blessed with a rapid increase of children."[5] Among the tribes of British Central Africa there is a curious notion that a man who commits incest with his sister or his mother is thereby rendered bullet-proof.[6]

The popular belief in the evil effects of inbreeding and of consanguineous marriages is identical with the notions held by most savages. The doctrine which, with the rise of scientific methods, has assumed the form of a scientific hypothesis, and has been discussed and investigated by biologists and medical authorities, is far older than any conception of those methods, and appears to be, in fact, the survival of a superstition transmitted by traditional heredity from the most primitive stages of culture.[7]

[1] C. Lumholtz, *Through Central Borneo*, vol. i, p. 138.

[2] E. A. Gait, in *Census of India*, 1911, vol. i, pp. 252 sq.

[3] J. Kohler, "Das Recht der Herero," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*, xiv, pp. 300 sq.

[4] E. Ketjen, "De Kalangers," *Tijdschrift voor Indische taal-, land- en volkenkende*, xxiv, p. 427.

[5] M. Kowalewski, "Marriage Among the Early Slavs," *Folk-lore*, i, p. 469.

[6] H. S. Stannus, "Notes on Some Tribes of British Central Africa," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl, p. 307. The notion is doubtless a form of the conception of the tabued person as 'sacred' (cf. below, vol. ii, pp. 360 sq.).

[7] "Consanguineous marriage will doubtless continue for many years in a fog of superstition, but the time is past, it seems to me, when anyone can

Theories concerning the Origin of Exogamy.

The older theorists and travellers who noted the customs of exogamous marriage so general among primitive peoples, and the horror with which incestuous relations are regarded by them, had no difficulty in accounting for those customs and beliefs. They unanimously expressed the view that, the evil effects accruing from the union of persons related by blood having obtruded themselves on the notice of the savages, the wise men among them had taken counsel about the matter and had appointed that such unions should in future be strictly prohibited. Sir Henry Maine, in elucidating the history of laws and customs, accounted in this manner for the origin of incest prohibitions and exogamous marriage customs.[1] Lewis Morgan himself placed so much confidence in the accounts of medical statisticians current in his time that he perceived nothing humorous in such a supposition.[2] Many uncultured savages, when questioned on the subject, give, indeed, a similar account of the origin of the custom and tabus, as they do, for that matter, of any custom or tabu of which they have forgotten the meaning. Thus the Australian Dieri state that sexual unions were at one time promiscuous, but that the awful effects became so manifest that a council of the elders was called to deliberate on the matter, and that, on consulting one of their oracles, they were directed to establish their present system of marriage classes.[3] The Fanti of the Gold Coast,[4] and the Achewa of Nyasaland offer similar accounts.[5]

It may be noted in this connection that, whereas the evidence adduced as regards the injurious effects of consanguinity in the parents is such as has been seen, there exists clear and definite evidence that extreme youth in the parents, especially the mother, results almost invariably in offspring which is undersized and of poor vitality and development.[6] Yet with almost all uncivilised

question the facts from the genetic point of view" (P. Popenoe, "Consanguineous Marriage," *The Journal of Heredity*, iv, p. 345).

[1] H. Maine, *Dissertations on Early Law and Custom*, p. 228.

[2] L. H. Morgan, *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity in the Human Family*, pp. 484 sq.

[3] J. D. Woods, *The Native Tribes of South Australia*, pp. 260 sq.

[4] R. M. Connolly, "Social Life in Fanti-land," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxvi, p. 132.

[5] R. S. Rattray, *Some Folk-Lore Stories and Songs in Chinyanja*, pp. 175 sq.

[6] J. Matthew Duncan, *Fecundity, Fertility, Sterility, and Allied Topics*, pp. 76 sqq.; A. Marro, "The Influence of the Age of Parents upon the Psycho-physical Characters of the Children," *Problems in Eugenics*,

peoples young girls become mothers as soon as they are able to procreate at all; and the very real and manifest evils of the practice to which the physical decay of many primitive peoples is due have scarcely anywhere led to a rule, protest, or prejudice against it.

The supposition that customs and ideas, regarded by the majority of uncultured savage tribes as of the utmost importance, have had their origin in the observation by those savages of alleged phenomena of heredity which modern statistical enquiries and repeated efforts at scientific demonstration have failed to render manifest, has now been generally abandoned as extravagant. Dr. Westermarck has, however, endeavoured to retain the conception of a real connection between those customs and the popular superstition by means of an hypothesis even more daring. Notwithstanding his confessed inability to represent the supposed grounds for that belief as otherwise than inconclusive, he assures us that he cannot help thinking that, after all, "inbreeding generally is, in some way or other, more or less detrimental." And he suggests that the peoples who failed to observe the principles of exogamy and incest-avoidance were exterminated by the inexorable operation of those "generally, in some way or other, more or less" injurious results.[1] The practice of exogamy itself Dr. Westermarck ascribes to the smaller sexual attraction of habitual companions; and he suggests that indifference towards the latter has been brought about by natural selection acting by way of those injurious effects which "generally, in some way or other, more or less," visit upon the offspring the infraction of the rules as to prohibited degrees.

M. Durkheim has suggested that those ideas arose in connection with the superstition against shedding the blood of the group. This is regarded by primitive peoples as a loss of the group's soul-substance, and even an individual accidentally wounding himself is, among some tribes, held liable to pay compensation to his relatives. Hence, M. Durkheim argues, defloration of a female of one's own group must be regarded with horror.[2] The hypothesis is in entire accordance with savage ideas. Marriage in primitive societies does not, however, imply defloration; and in the communistic rites and festivals of promiscuity which usually precede marriage among primitive peoples, prenuptial defloration is per-

pp. 121 sqq. The fact had been noted in an exaggerated way in the time of Aristotle (Aristotle, *Historia animalium*, v. 12. 1).

[1] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. ii, p. 236.

[2] E. Durkheim, "La prohibition de l'inceste et ses origines," *L'Année Sociologique*, i, pp. 47 sqq.

formed by those very members of the group whose relations with the females concerned would at other times be considered incestuous.[1]

The most concrete theory of the origin of exogamy is still that which was indirectly suggested by Darwin, that is, that the emigration of young males is due to the overbearing jealousy of the old males. That is what is supposed to happen in every animal herd, and the same thing is reported of the group of primates. But such a procedure, even if its occurrence be real, accounts neither for exogamy nor for the abhorrence of incest. The jealous tyranny of the male parent, or of the older males, would operate to the same degree, and rather more surely, against strange males from another group as against their own male offspring; and young males would thus never obtain wives in a strange group. They could only do so by fighting the old males, whether their own fathers or others, and would in that struggle have the same chance of obtaining possession of their sisters as of other females. The form of group which such a process represents is the herd, in which feminine instincts are atrophied and the sexual relations, whether of the older males and their female offspring or of successful young rivals, are incestuous.[2]

Several theories have been advanced with a view to explaining the prohibition against incest by the relatively low sexual attraction of a household associate as compared with a stranger. Jeremy Bentham long ago remarked that " It is very rare that the passion of love is developed within the circle of individuals to whom marriage ought to be forbidden. There needs to give birth to that sentiment a certain degree of surprise, and sudden effect of novelty. Individuals accustomed to see each other from an age which is capable neither of conceiving desire nor of inspiring it, will see each other with the same eyes to the end of

[1] See below, vol. iii, pp. 317 sqq.

[2] The same objections apply in an even greater degree to Messrs. Atkinson and Lang's elaboration of the view (J. J. Atkinson and A. Lang, *Primal Law*, London, 1903). They regard the primitive human group as a patriarchal group composed of patriarch, wives, and offspring, the young males being driven away by patriarchal proprietary jealousy. They further suggest a directly opposite tendency in the patriarch to limit his own claims in view of the advantages from the accession of strange young males. There appears no reason why, the young males of the group having been driven away, strange males from another group should be admitted; or why, these being valued as an accession to the strength of the group, that group should first be weakened by expelling the males who originally form part of it. Nor is sober imagination equal to following the flight of Dr. Róheim's when he describes how the young males, after eating their father and marrying their mothers and sisters, instituted the prohibition of incest in a mood of repentance (G. Róheim, *Australian Totemism*).

life." [1] Dr. Havelock Ellis is of opinion that "The explanation of the abhorrence of incest is really exceedingly simple. . . . The normal failure of the pairing instinct (Dr. Ellis probably means the sexual impulse) to manifest itself in the case of brothers and sisters, or boys and girls brought up together from infancy, is a merely negative phenomenon due to inevitable absence under those circumstances of the conditions which evoke the pairing impulse. . . . Between those who have been brought up together from childhood all the sensory stimuli of vision, hearing, and touch have been dulled by use, trained to the level of calm affection, and deprived of their potency to arouse the erethistic excitement which produces sexual tumescence." [2] Dr. Westermarck also derives the horror of incest from the lower stimulating effect of a household companion of childhood on the male sexual impulses, but, as has been seen, he does not, apparently, consider that explanation sufficient to account for the existing social facts and sentiments.[3]

The relatively lower stimulating value of the habitual associate as compared with the stranger on the sexual impulses of the male, which is but an instance of the physiological law, known as Weber's law, that stimuli vary inversely with the frequency of their incidence, has no bearing upon the mating instinct. That instinct has, on the contrary, its chief foundation in habitual association; and the check exercised on sexual stimulation by association is no greater than that exercised by the mating instinct itself. That there is not even in the existing conditions of civilised society and culture, from which the psychological data with which we are dealing have been too exclusively drawn, any aversion to sexual relations between persons who have lived closely together from early youth is amply evidenced; such companionship from childhood upwards, or any sort of non-sexual companionship, far from being a bar to sexual relations, commonly leads to those relations. A man's female companion of childhood quite often becomes his wife, and those companionships which remain for a long time 'platonic' almost invariably end in marriage. Cousin-marriages in our society are commonly the result of such association. Love between associates of childhood has been the theme of countless romances, from 'Daphnis and Chloë,' 'Aucassin et Nicolette,' to 'Paul et Virginie,' and 'Locksley Hall.' The psychological facts which have given

[1] J. Bentham, *Theory of Legislation*, p. 220.

[2] H. Havelock Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, vol. iv, pp. 205 sq.

[3] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. ii, pp. 192 sqq.; *The Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*, vol. ii, pp. 368–371.

rise to the notion that common upbringing is unfavourable to sexual attraction are that in relations with companions of the other sex, especially if established before the awakening of the sexual instincts, the sentiment of affection, such as is created by use and wont, preponderates over the male sexual instincts, and that the two impulses are, as has been seen, antagonistic. The companion who is regarded with pure affection or with attachment as part of one's habitual surroundings is thus less liable to become an object of simple sexual desire than the stranger. She is loved and married from affection and established companionship, and the masculine impulse is a superadded ingredient only of the sentiment with which she is regarded. Those unions are hence viewed, not only without any suggestion of horror, but as the most desirable and suitable. And such, in fact, they are, for it is on companionship and affection, and not on sexual desire, that the success of permanent sexual association depends; and that association to be permanently possible must arise, in the first instance, from such companionship and not, as the theories of Dr. Ellis and Dr. Westermarck would demand, from 'erethism.' The mating instinct, which Dr. Ellis confounds with the sexual impulse, where it exists in animals as well as in human beings, depends precisely upon the checking and subordination of the male's sexual impulse by the tenderness that is derivative of maternal instincts and which is both the cause and the effect of association. The opposition between those two constituents is no more absolute in the companionship of housemates than it is wherever the mating instinct combines with the male sexual impulse. The check imposed upon that impulse does not abolish it; it neither prevents the mating of the bird nor the consummation of a sexual union arising from companionship and attachment. The psychological situation is the same as in 'platonic' friendships, which are proverbially labile and prone to lead to the sexual relation. The sexual impulse of the male necessarily fastens upon the female who is most readily available and with whom he is already thrown into closest relations, and it can only be diverted from that immediately available object by equal opportunities of experiencing the attractions of the 'strange woman'; it will not discard the available object to hold itself in reserve until other attractions operate on it. Where these are forthcoming in abundance, non-sexual companionship and affection are the less likely to become sexual; where, on the other hand, these are unopposed, they inevitably become transformed into the sexual relation.

The same relation of the mating instinct to habitual association holds good in uncultured societies. Among primitive races in every part of the world it is a common practice to betroth

young children to one another, often before they are born.[1] Those children commonly grow up together from infancy like brothers and sisters in the same household; yet the enormous prevalence of the custom bears witness to the fact that such companionship from childhood upwards forms no bar to their sexual union; and it appears indeed that such marriages are, among primitive races, attended with the greatest success in respect of happiness, constancy, and affection. Thus among the tribes of the upper Congo "it is rare," we are told, "for children that grow up together to fail to marry and to dislike one another."[2] The happy native couples are those who are married very young; the husband will say proudly of his wife: "Did we not grow up together? Did I not see her through her puberty ceremonies? Are we not just twin children?"[3] Among the native races of Borneo "intercourse between a youth and his sister-by-adoption (or vice versa) is not regarded as any bar to marriage." "We know," say Drs. Hose and McDougall, "at least one instance of marriage between two young Kenyahs brought up together as adopted brother and sister. This is, of course, difficult to reconcile with Professor Westermarck's well-known theory of the ground of the almost universal feeling against incest. . . . But medical experience of slum practice in European towns can supply similar evidence in large quantity. . . . It seems to us that the feeling with which incest is regarded is an example of a feeling or sentiment engendered in each generation by law and tradition, rather than a spontaneous reaction of individuals based on some special instinct or innate tendency. The occurrence of incest between brothers and sisters, and the strong feeling of the Sea Dayaks against incest between nephew and aunt (who often are members of distinct communities) are facts which seem to us fatal to Professor Westermarck's theory, as well as to point strongly to the view that the sentiment has a purely conventional or customary source."[4] Lane remarked that among the Egyptians marriages between cousins who had been brought up together like brothers and sisters were generally happy and durable, in contrast with the general rule that matrimonial unions between strangers were so unsatisfactory and so transient that there was scarcely a man who had not divorced at least one wife, while some

[1] See below, pp. 532 sqq.

[2] H. H. Johnston, *British Central Africa*, p. 413.

[3] D. Campbell, *In the Heart of Bantu Land*, p. 156.

[4] C. Hose and W. McDougall, *The Pagan Tribes of Borneo*, vol. ii, pp. 196 sq. and note. Cf. C. Schwaner, "Aanteekenigen betreffende eenige maatschappelijke instelligen en gebruiken der Dajaks van Doesson, Moeroeng en Siang," *Tijdschrift voor Indische taal-, land- en volkenkunde*, i. pp. 211 sq.

had changed partners as often as twenty or thirty times in two years.[1] Among the Chukchi of Siberia, as in every other part of the world, children are often united in marriage from infancy. "The children grow up playing together. When a little older, they tend the herd together. Of course the ties between them grow to be very strong, often stronger than death; when one dies the other also dies from grief or commits suicide."[2] The expression, "the companion of her youth," is used in the Bible as a synonym for 'husband.'[3]

The illusion that the horror of incest is a natural instinct arises chiefly in the conditions of our own society from the circumstance that the prohibition coincides with the lessened sexual stimulus of habitual associates. Sexuality is, in the associate, checked by tenderness and affection, as it is in all intersexual relations which arise out of companionship and not solely out of the sexual impulses; but in the one case the transition from the one order of feelings to the other is accomplished without check, whereas where the prohibition applies the mind is not allowed even to approach that stage of transition. Consequently the prohibition which bars the transition long before it is even contemplated seems to be but an expression of the natural attitude in which the instincts have remained, and to be superfluous. That prohibition thus assumes the appearance of a natural instinct and the non-sexual attitude towards the habitual associate is readily identified with it.

But those sentiments which differentiate companionship between the sexes from sexual relations are for the most part the products of high culture where companionship is susceptible of varied values and sexual attraction is subject to discriminations; to ascribe them to savage man is a psychological anachronism. Companionship between the sexes means primitively sexual companionship, and the sexual appetites of primitive man are almost entirely devoid of discrimination, and are fully satisfied by objects which would excite in us as much repugnance and horror as the offal and filth which he relishes as food.[4] Sexual selection and the discrimination of the qualities that govern it play scarcely any part in either the sexual relations of uncultured peoples or in their marriage associations. The latter are, as an almost universal rule, predetermined by quite other circumstances and considerations, and the sexual instincts of primitive males are unaffected by relative values of attractiveness far grosser and more concrete than those between associate

[1] E. W. Lane, *An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, vol. i, pp. 247, 251.

[2] W. Bogoras, *The Chukchee*, p. 577.

[3] *Proverbs*, ii. 17.

[4] See below, vol. ii, pp. 158, 398.

and stranger. The purely relative effects of habitual association upon the sexual instincts have, in point of fact, no more bearing upon the operation of those instincts in savage humanity than among animals. The Australian native ravishes every woman whom opportunity places in his power; the only check on his conduct in this respect is his dread of infringing a tabu, and he previously enquires whether she belongs to a forbidden class.[1] Far from being enforced by the operation of spontaneous instincts, the observance of the prohibition against incest is in most uncultured societies secured by the most elaborate separation of brothers and sisters, who often are not so much as permitted to converse with one another.[2]

Mr. Walter Heape, perceiving that the smaller stimulating sexual value of the companion is inadequate in itself to act as a check on the male impulse, emphasises instead the converse heightened attraction of the stranger, and suggests that "the origin of exogamy is to be found in the instinctive sexual impulse of the male to find a mate who will stimulate him sexually and ensure for him the greatest amount of sexual gratification."[3] But such subtle refinements in epicureanism appear more suggestive of the psychology of a rake than of an unsophisticated savage. Mr. Heape, who is a distinguished physiologist and biologist, is under the impression that it is, on the

[1] See below, pp. 313, 730.

[2] A. L. P. Cameron, "Notes on a Tribe speaking the Boontha-Murra Language," *Science of Man*, vii, p. 91; W. E. Roth, "North Queensland Ethnography, Bulletin No. 11," *Records of the Australian Museum*, vii, p. 78; D. M. Bates, "The Marriage Laws and some Customs of the West Australian Aborigines," *Victorian Geographical Journal*, xxiii–iv, p. 51; R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians*, p. 232; R. Parkinson, *Dreissig Jahre in der Südsee*, pp. 67 sq.; T. Williams, *Fiji and the Fijians*, vol. i, p. 136; W. H. R. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society*, vol. i, p. 25; V. de Rochas, *La Nouvelle Calédonie*, p. 239; W. W. Gill, *Life in the Southern Islands*, pp. 46 sq.; J. B. van Hasselt, "Die Noeforezen," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, viii, pp. 180 sq.; J. Kubary, "Die Bewohner der Mortlock Inseln," *Mittheilungen der Geographischen Gesellschaft in Hamburg*, 1878–79, p. 252; J. Arago, *Narrative of a Voyage round the World*, vol. ii, p. 17; M. Joustra, "Het leven, de zeden en gewoonten der Bataks," *Mededeelingen van wege het Nederlandsche Zendelinggenootschap*, xlvi, pp. 391 sq.; H. Low, *Sarawak*, p. 300; S. Mateer, *Native Life in Travancore*, p. 144; M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, p. 91; W. G. Sumner, "The Yakuts," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxi, p. 90; P. Labbé, *Un bagne russe. L'île de Sakhaline*, p. 167; A. van Gennep, *Tabou et totémisme à Madagascar*, p. 164; S. Powers, *Native Tribes of California*, p. 412; I. Petroff, "Report on the Population, etc., of Alaska," *Tenth Census of the United States, Reports*, vol. viii, p. 159; G. B. Grinell, *The Cheyenne Indians*, vol. i, p. 155; A. L. Kroeber, "The Arapaho," *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*, xviii, p. 11; A. M. Stephen, "The Navajo," *The American Anthropologist*, vi, p. 358.

[3] W. Heape, *Sex Antagonism*, p. 194.

contrary, a biological fact. That impression arises, I venture to suggest, from a misapprehension. He mentions the observation that a buck rabbit, when a strange doe is introduced into his family circle, will devote his attention to her to the neglect of other females.[1] Many similar instances might be adduced from the whole animal kingdom. Seals, for instance, when forming their 'harem,' will attend to a new-comer, while the females which are already established in the male's territory (and which, be it noted, are, before their delivery, not yet sexual or 'habitual companions') are entirely overlooked, and pass unobserved to other males.[2] But those phenomena are not illustrations of the greater attraction of the stranger, but of the male's instinct to impregnate as many females as possible; the new arrival is sought, not because she is a stranger, but because she is an addition. Male animals are not in the habit of ignoring unimpregnated females in whose company they find themselves, to roam in search of "the greatest amount of sexual gratification." They welcome more females as they welcome more food, but the dog who dropped the substance of a bone to run after the shadow was admittedly a creature of fable.

Those theories suffer alike from the fundamental objection that they seek to prove too much; for if the avoidance of incest were a necessary effect of fundamental and inherent physiological and biological causes, and if, as Dr. Westermarck in addition supposes, they were subject to natural selection, those causes must necessarily have operated throughout the animal kingdom no less than in the human race. Dr. Ellis has offered no explanation of the manner in which sexual tumescence is brought about in antelopes who pair with their twin sisters, in the absence of the conditions which he represents as indispensable to the much more sensitive human organism; Dr. Westermarck, who makes the assertion that mice, rats, and rabbits have been 'proved' to be injuriously affected by inbreeding, fails to account for the fact that those animal races, so seriously handicapped by their inveterate habits of extreme promiscuity, have not been long since wiped off the face of the earth; and Mr. Heape does not say why the buck rabbit, who is so susceptible to the fascination of the strange female, is yet incorrigibly endogamous.

Derivation of the Rule of Exogamy from the Constitution of the Maternal Group.

It is not too much to say that not one of the various hypotheses that have been suggested to account for the rule of exogamy,

[1] W. Heape, *op. cit.*, p. 187. [2] See above, p. 184.

the most fundamental principle in the organisation of primitive societies, affords an explanation of that rule and is not open to objections which are fatal. Those theories have one feature in common; they have reference exclusively to the operation of the sexual instincts of the male, and they assume a social state in which those instincts are dominant and which is patriarchal in its constitution.

As soon as we regard the problem from the point of view of the postulate that the constitution of primitive human groups was not patriarchal, but matriarchal, it at once presents a different aspect. For the observance of the rule of exogamy is an essential condition of the preservation of that maternal character of the group. If the women left their family to join their husbands, that family would cease to be a maternal group; if the men were the sexual mates as well as the brothers of the women, patriarchal succession would be established, and their authority and rivalry would bring about patriarchal dominance also.

The mothers are the basis and the bond of the primitive social group. The only relation which is originally taken into account in the conceptions and sentiments of the members of such a group is the maternal relation. Kinship and descent are reckoned exclusively through the women; the relationship through the father is not taken into consideration, but only the relationship to the mother. In a group thus constituted, to permit the women to follow strange men, to sever their connection with the group and to become scattered amongst diverse other groups, would be to break up the social unit, and would be opposed to all the sentiments and conceptions which constitute its existence as a social entity. There are, accordingly, as we shall see, few things to which primitive peoples who have retained the matriarchal constitution are so profoundly averse as to allowing any of their girls or women to leave the group. The males, on the other hand, are not, as regards the direct relation of primitive natural kinship, integral and vital parts of the group; they cannot increase it and procreate it, since kinship is not reckoned through them. They are necessary to the protection and economic subsistence of the group, and the accession of more males is highly valued. But they are not essential to the continuity and constitution of the social group itself, which consists of the succession of mothers and daughters, and in which all males are but offshoots of the main female stem of which the group, as a stable social unit, consists. Such a maternal group can continue as a self-existent unit only so long as the women who constitute it remain together and undivided. Whether the men in that group are actual brothers and sons of the women of the group does not affect its constitution.

Those features of primitive social organisation are the most fundamental and familiar notions concerning the structure of human society amongst all the peoples who have preserved a matriarchal form of social organisation, and respect for the observance of those principles is the foundation of their social life. They do not of themselves impose upon the men the necessity of mating outside the group; but the distinction between the permanence of the women within that group and the freedom of the men being established, there are many causes tending to the use of that freedom on the part of the men. The rules which govern the constitution of the maternal group are far more than a social convention and a sentiment of conformity to established rules. They are in harmony with, and scarcely distinct from, the spontaneous instincts and dispositions which are the source of that social constitution. Young girls at the age at which sexual unions usually take place amongst primitive peoples are profoundly averse to leaving the familiar group of their mothers and sisters and to going amongst strangers; such a transfer, when it takes place, invariably gives rise to desperate resistance, to tears and lamentations on their part, which are not by any means always conventional. There is no such conservative attachment and dread of changed social surroundings in the male. His disposition and instincts impel him, on the contrary, to wander in search of change, of food, of adventure. While girls are in all primitive societies tied, so to speak, to their mothers' apron-strings, the boys start off on expeditions almost as soon as they are able to walk. There is no occasion to have recourse to the supposed superior attraction of strange females, a refinement of discrimination which is quite inapplicable to the indiscriminate sexual instincts of primitive man. As a hunter, as a natural wanderer, the unattached male is by disposition a confirmed and restless rover. So long as his needs are adequately provided for he cares little where his home is; he is ready to change it whenever he sees a prospect of a better, or for no other reason than love of change. He is not a home-maker; in many primitive communities the home, hut, tent, or shelter is the dwelling-place of the women and children only; the men sleep wherever they happen to be, under some tree or ledge.[1] It is the woman who is the maker of the home and the home-dweller. The biological instinct which impels all creatures to wander afield in search of food and opportunities is, in the mammalian female, checked by the demands of her maternal functions, of the care for offspring. The male's restless disposition is a consequence of the absence or more rudimentary development of those feminine instincts. Those

[1] See below, p. 374.

instincts constitute the natural foundation of the maternal group which has been the primitive germ of human society, and is the basis of all the social conceptions of those uncultured peoples amongst whom that primitive constitution has been preserved. For the woman to separate herself from her home, from the group which her instincts have founded, is as abhorrent and unnatural as it is natural for the man to wander and explore.

Those conditions make naturally for the association of males from neighbouring groups with females who remain in their own group. They do not imply the prohibition of sexual intercourse or association between the males and the females of the same group, a prohibition which constitutes the rule against incest. But a habit, hardened into a traditionally established rule that males shall seek their sexual partners in another group will, in accordance with every law that governs the development of social rules and customs, give rise to a corresponding rule that they shall not seek their sexual partners in the group to which they themselves belong.

That prohibition is reinforced by another manifestation of the maternal instincts which determine the constitution of the primitive human group. The unparalleled development of those instincts to which the biological conditions of early human development have been due implies as a correlate a corresponding tendency to jealousy in their exercise. The animal maternal instinct is a sense of ownership; the animal mother is impelled to guard her offspring even from the sight of another being. In the animal family the bonds between mother and male offspring are severed by the mother herself before the young males reach sexual maturity; her maternal instincts cease to operate. But that is not so in the human family; the males attain functional sexual maturity before their dependence upon the family-group, and upon the mother, has come to an end. It has been seen that in animals "the young could keep on indefinitely deriving sustenance and comfort from their mother if allowed"; [1] it is the necessity for forming new sexual unions at the rutting season which impels the mother to drive off her offspring. In the continuous and permanent human group that necessity does not arise; hence the operation of maternal instincts continues; the sense of ownership and the jealous care on the part of the mother last after the actual needs of infancy are over, and when the male offspring has reached sexual development. The severing of those bonds does not tend to be effected, as in animals, by the mother, but by the son. It is not the mother who drives

[1] See above, p. 147.

off her male offspring, but the son who, when sexual development takes place, tends to transfer his allegiance to another female. That transfer of the son's attachment and dependence to another woman is a direct blow to the instincts of the mother which, so long as they continue to operate, tend to maintain her claims, authority and guardianship over her offspring. It means the loss of the influence which the mother seeks to retain. The instinct which fostered the primitive family must of necessity have in the same degree placed the sternest obstacle in the way of the mating of the sons; it directly opposes that change of relation and is strongly antagonistic to the sons mating at all. And since in the primitive group there is no object to which the young male grown to sexual maturity can turn except his sisters, it is any disposition to such a relation that will draw upon it the full force of the mother's opposition.

If we are to enter into the point of view of the primitive mind we must remember that we are dealing with psychological conditions which differ very considerably from our own, as is amply evidenced by the strangeness and uncouthness of their products when viewed in the light of our notions and habits of thought. In the civilised mother maternal jealousy is counteracted and repressed by obvious considerations. It is manifestly unreasonable and futile. The affectionate mother whose sentiments are centred in her son may suffer by another woman claiming even a part of those affections and that allegiance which she regards as her most precious right. But the feeling is repressed as wholly unreasonable; such a thing must happen, the son will leave his mother and follow his wife, and the mother bows to the inevitable. She consoles herself by the thought that her loss is necessary to her son's happiness. she blames her secret wishes as selfish, she will take an anxious interest in his choice of a mate or, better still, choose one for him, and will, with a mother's self-sacrifice, endeavour to bestow her affection on the woman that robs her of her son. She is wholly reconciled to her loss by the prospect of offspring. Yet in spite of those rational considerations which repress the mother's instinct, it is within the observation of everyone that where that instinct is strongly developed pretexts will be produced in the mind of the mother for opposing the transference of her son's affection and allegiance to another woman. She will find no woman 'good enough' for her son; she will conceive an aversion for any woman for whom he may show a liking. And extreme cases are not uncommon where the operation of that powerful primary maternal instinct invincibly opposes any attempt of the son to marry at all.

In the primitive human, yet still animal, mother none of

the repressing and checking factors exists. Her impulses are wholly unreasonable. They are not affected by rational considerations or foresight. The impulse is strong in proportion to those claims on the offspring which are the condition of the primitive permanent family; and nothing stands in the way of its full play. The primitive, semi-human mother was not the gentle creature of which the name calls up the picture, but a fierce enough wild animal. Her maternal instincts did not take purely the form of that patient, self-sacrificing affection which we associate with mother-love; they were uncontrolled and violent. Ready as she might be for the uttermost self-sacrifice in defence of her offspring, her instincts when thwarted manifested themselves in fierce rage that made her an object of terror. The authority claimed over her sons, and to which there could have been no more direct blow than the transference of their allegiance to another woman, must of necessity have opposed the union of her sons with females within the group. That one of her sons should transfer his allegiance from herself to one of his sisters was a horrible thought, not because of any innate idea of incest, but because to the jealous love of the mother it would have been the most offensive of blows. To the young male, terror-stricken by the anger of a despotic mother, no other course was open than to find surreptitiously the means of satisfying his most imperative impulses and to wander away from the family group in search of a female.

Among monkeys the mother exercises a strict and jealous supervision over her offspring. "Now and then," says Mr. Stevenson-Hamilton of the baboon, "a mother finds it necessary to chastise her offspring, or to wreak vengeance upon one or other of the unattached hobbledehoys who, she guesses, meditate imposing upon or injuring it."[1] Darwin describes the "great indignation" of a female baboon when the young whom she had adopted were teased by other young monkeys.[2] I have more than once observed that strict supervision exercised by the mother over her offspring in families of monkeys. Not only does she jealousy guard them against outside interference, but she carefully regulates their behaviour towards one another; any horse-play, when it becomes too rough, is at once sharply checked, the young that is being teased or roughly handled by its brothers being at once taken by its mother under her protection, and the offender sharply rebuked with much display of teeth and some smart slaps. It would be impossible in those conditions for incestuous intercourse to take place between the males and females

[1] J. Stevenson-Hamilton, *Animal Life in Africa*, p. 262.
[2] C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, vol. i, p. 107.

of one brood under the eye of their mother. Any such attempt, which would be regarded by the young female as violence, would infallibly bring the mother to her assistance. The remarkable practice said to be observed among certain gibbons, when they are on the move, of the father carrying the male young, while the mother takes charge of the females,[1] may not be unconnected with the maternal desire to guard against too great an intimacy between them, and to separate the sexes. If there is no incest prohibition among animals, that is perhaps due rather to the absence of the conditions which have given occasion to it in the permanent human family than to absence of the impulses which have imposed it. The human family-group is the only one where, owing to the prolongation of immaturity far beyond what occurs in other mammals and the continuance of the older offspring under the mother's supervision, the maternal instinct has the opportunity of manifesting itself in such fashion.

In organised human society again that maternal jealousy has naturally little opportunity of operating; sexual relations being already regulated by tradition. If any trace of the pre-rational instinct should manifest itself, it is not a trait that is likely to attract the attention of observers, and that we are likely to find mentioned in their reports. I find, nevertheless, the following observation in an account of the natives of New Britain, who are in their customs among the most brutal and callous of savages: "Sometimes fond old mothers are desirous of keeping their sons with them as long as possible. In order to do so they will purchase a little child five or six years old for their son, and he must wait until she is old enough to be married to him. Ya Vika purchased a child about six years of age for her son Petero; he will doubtless wait until the girl has reached eleven or twelve years of age."[2] Among the Sakai of the forests of the Malay Peninsula, the strongest bond of affection known, says Signor Cerruti, is that between mother and son, and the latter is regarded by his mother with the utmost jealousy.[3] I have used what opportunities I have had of enquiring concerning that maternal jealousy, both among uncultured races and among the rural populations of Europe whose mentality is in many respects identical with that of primitive races, and I have always received from primitive mothers emphatic assurances as to the reality and force of the sentiment. One very intelligent Dutch peasant woman said that it was the strongest feeling of all mothers

[1] A. E. Brehm, *Thierleben*, vol. i, p. 97.

[2] B. Danks, "Marriage Customs of the New Britain Group," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xviii, p. 288.

[3] G. Cerruti, *Nel Paese dei Veleni, Fra i Sakai*, p. 159.

in regard to their sons. "Mothers," she said, "are more jealous in regard to their favourite son than wives as regards their husbands, just as the mother's love is greater than that of the wife. Of course it is no use, and we say nothing. But if mothers had their own way their sons would never marry—at least not for a long time."

But in primitive humanity there is no question of deferring the satisfaction of the sexual instincts. It is as soon as the young males reach the age of puberty, if not even before, that the causes establishing the incest prohibition must come into operation. The veto against incestuous relations must of necessity have originated, not in reference to grown men and women, but in reference to mere children; it was, from the nature of the case, in its original form a matter not of tribal legislation, but of maternal discipline. At the time that the sexual instincts are awakened in the young savage in a segregated group, it is chiefly in regard to the younger sisters that any veto against incestuous relations must arise, for elder sisters in all savage societies share, as regards their younger brothers, the maternal authority. Everywhere in primitive society a sharp distinction is drawn between elder and younger sisters; the two belong to different classes of kinship, and the relation bears a different name.[1] The Nayars of the Malabar coast "have an extraordinary respect for their mother. . . . In like manner they honour their elder sisters, who stand with them on the same level as their mother. But with the younger sisters they never stay together in the same room, and they observe the utmost reserve. For they say dangerous situations might else arise, the younger sisters being thoughtless. As for the elder sisters, their respect for them excludes any thought of the kind."[2] In Tonga the elder sisters are likewise treated with extraordinary deference, and a chief will show his respect by not even daring to enter the house of his elder sister.[3] Such views may be said to represent the attitude of all primitive societies in that respect. Thus among the natives of Central Australia, a man may not speak to his younger sisters, but there is no restriction as to his speaking freely to his elder sisters.[4] But if it is chiefly

[1] E.g., L. H. Morgan, *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family*, pp. 161, 211, 220 sqq., 293, 314, and *passim*.

[2] Duarte Barbosa, in G. B. Ramusio, *Navigationi et Viaggi*, vol. i, fol. 342.

[3] W. Mariner, *An Account of the Natives of the Tonga Islands*, vol. ii, p. 135.

[4] F. J. Gillen, "Notes on some Manners and Customs of the Aborigines of the McDonell Ranges belonging to the Arunta Tribe," in *Report of the Work of the Horn Expedition to Central Australia*, vol. iv, pp. 164, 166. Cf. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 88.

in regard to younger sisters that any call to establish the prohibition of incest by a formal veto would in the first instance arise, such a veto would almost automatically be imposed. For at the time that the young males reach the age of puberty their younger sisters are still immature and under the close care of their mother; they would regard any sexual attempt as an assault, and it would thus be practically impossible for such relations to take place between sons at puberty and their younger sisters without the sanction of the mother. The situation would, in fact, be identical with that noted in families of monkeys, but with these important differences, that both infancy and the operation of the maternal instincts are much more prolonged in the human family, and that the prohibition, instead of being an incidental interference, would be a formulated veto, expressed, doubtless, as a curse on him that should dare to infringe it. It would thus be, not merely a temporary check, but a prohibition established in individual memory, and subsequently in traditional heredity. The curse of a mother was regarded by our barbaric ancestors as the only curse of which the effects could never be avoided.[1]

The incest prohibition applies primarily to relations between brothers and sisters. In the simplest forms of deliberate exogamic devices, such as they are found among the Dieri and other tribes of south-eastern Australia, which are divided into two intermarrying classes, while that organisation prevents marriage between brothers and sisters, it does not oppose any artificial obstacle to incest between parents and children.[2] According to the Rev. James Chalmers, in the island of Kiwai, off the coast of New Guinea, a father may take his own daughter to wife, although unions between brothers and sisters are regarded with as much abhorrence as anywhere.[3] Similarly, in some of the Solomon Islands unions between father and daughter are regarded as quite legitimate, while the strictest prohibition exists in regard to even ordinary social intercourse between brother and sister.[4] Among the Kalangs, the aboriginal inhabitants of Java, union between mother and son is looked upon as commendable and lucky.[5] Nevertheless, sexual union between sons and mothers is generally viewed with as much abhorrence, not only by civilised man, but by nearly all savage races, as relations between brothers and sisters. But when

[1] J. Grimm, *Teutonic Mythology*, p. 1690.

[2] A. W. Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, pp. 90 sq., 187 sq.

[3] J. Chalmers, "Notes on the Natives of Kiwai Island, Fly River, British New Guinea," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxiii, p. 124.

[4] R. Parkinson, *Zur Ethnographie der nordwestlichen Solomo Inseln*, p. 6.

[5] E. Ketjen, "De Kalangers," *Tijdschrift voor indische taal-, land- en volkenkunde*, xxiv, p. 427.

the character of the mother in the primitive human group is apprehended, it is easy to understand that the awe and dread attaching to the maternal head of the family who imposed her veto against relations between brothers and sisters should render it even less likely that she should herself be a possible object of incestuous advances. Her instincts would equally oppose relations between father and daughters.

The rules which are indispensable in order that the form of the group which the maternal instincts have created should be preserved are thus confirmed by the natural operation of those instincts. Those effects are consolidated and reinforced by tradition, so that it is often hard to distinguish between the results of the latter and those of natural instincts. "I shall never forget," says the Rev. John Bulmer, referring to the aborigines of the Lower Murray, "the deep distress of a woman when told that her brother wished to marry a girl of his own tribe. She thought he would be sure to have something dreadful happen to him. She urged him in my presence not to marry the single girl of the tribe."[1] Her opposition was doubtless an expression of the traditional importance ascribed by all Australian natives to the rule of exogamy; but since no infraction of that rule, by marrying into the same class, would be even contemplated, much less openly discussed, by any Australian native, the woman's aversion to the proposed match had an even wider scope than the strict law of the tribe.

When considering the social results of human instincts and impulses it should be borne in mind that it is with average effects that we are dealing. The result is the expression, not of the uniform and invariable operation of every human mind in the same manner, but of a dominating tendency giving rise to a statistical average. It is most unlikely that in every primitive human group the males sought their sexual partners elsewhere and that relations with females of the group were opposed by maternal jealousy. A considerable number of instances are known of tribes where incestuous relations habitually take place and are allowed, and such instances have doubtless abounded in the most primitive societies. The ultimate social result is the accumulated effect of dominating tendencies. Upon the operation of those tendencies has depended the preservation of the conditions that are essential for early human development, and which would be destroyed by the breaking up of the maternal group and the formation of an indiscriminate herd. All cultural advance in the early stages of social development has also been dependent upon

[1] J. Bulmer, "Some Account of the Aborigines of the Lower Murray, Wimmera, Gippsland, and Maneroon," *Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society of Australasia (Victoria Branch)*, v, p. 24.

the preservation of the matriarchal type of social organisation. Those groups in which that organisation was broken up by the non-observance of the rule of exogamy would consequently fail in their development, and be eliminated by a process of natural selection in favour of their more advanced neighbours.

The original factors which have established the rule of exogamy and the sentiment attaching to its observance have of necessity been greatly reinforced by subsequent social development. If that rule was the most primitive regulation imposed on sexual relations, every subsequent regulation must, in taking account of it, have consolidated it into an established principle. Primitive marriage regulations probably arose out of the difficulties which in primitive society attend social relations between members of different groups. Those difficulties were, there is reason to believe, overcome by deliberate agreements between the groups which thus became intermarrying groups. Such deliberate agreements and regulations establish the rule of exogamy as a fixed institution and a part of tribal organisation. But no deliberate and foreseeing arrangements, however important their influence, can be regarded as the original sources of a law on which the primordial development of all human society has been founded. While that law is not directly dictated by any primitive instinct, it is as the outcome of instinct and not of conscious device that it has arisen.

The Mother-in-law.

Intimately connected with the rule of exogamy, which is represented in our own society by so deep and strong a feeling as the horror of incest, is a sentiment and set of regulations which are no less widespread and of no less importance in primitive society, but which appear to us so grotesque that we can scarcely contemplate them without a smile. The well-known attitude of the savage towards his mother-in-law is to him anything but a laughing matter. It is one of the most constant rules in savage society that a man may not speak to, and generally may not even look upon, the mother of his wife, and the breach of this rule is regarded with as much horror as the breach of the rules against incestuous union. A few examples will serve to recall the character of that sentiment and tradition.

In Australia, among the northern tribes, a man is warned of the approach of his mother-in-law by the sound of a bull-roarer;[1] and a native is said to have nearly died of fright because the shadow of his mother-in-law fell on his legs while he lay asleep.[2] "It

[1] J. G. Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, vol. i, p. 565.

[2] Id., *The Golden Bough*, vol. iii, p. 83, on the authority of Miss Mary E. B. Howitt.

was formerly death for a man to speak to his mother-in-law; however, in later times, the wretch who had committed this heinous crime was suffered to live, but he was severely reprimanded and banished from the camp."[1] In Tasmania a native, being concerned about the attentions which a younger man was paying to his wife, hit upon the plan of betrothing his newly born daughter to the suspected rival; from that moment it became quite impossible for the latter to even look at his future mother-in-law.[2] In New Britain "a man must not speak to his mother-in-law. He not only must not speak to her, but must avoid her path; if he meets her suddenly he must hide, or if he has no time to hide his body, he must hide his face. What calamities would result from a man accidentally speaking to his mother-in-law, no native imagination has yet been found equal to conceive. Suicide of one or of both would probably be the only course."[3] In the Banks Islands "a man would not follow his mother-in-law along the beach nor she him, until the tide had washed out the footsteps of the first traveller from the sand."[4] The missionary van Hasselt relates that in Doreh, in New Guinea, where he conducted a school for native children, a little boy of six suddenly fell to the floor during a lesson, "like a log of wood," and hid under the table. The reason, it was discovered, was that he had seen the mother-in-law of his brother pass the school.[5] The rule is as rigorous in Africa as in Australia and Melanesia. Thus among the Masai, if a man "enters his mother-in-law's hut, she retires into the inner compartment and sits on the bed while he remains in the outer compartment. Thus separated they may converse with each other."[6] Generally, however, all speech between a man and his mother-in-law is strictly forbidden, and they may not look upon one another, but cover their faces when accidentally meeting.[7] A missionary was once holding among the Ovaherero

[1] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 267.

[2] J. Bonwick, *Daily Life and Origin of the Tasmanians*, p. 80.

[3] H. H. Romilly, "The Islands of the New Britain Group," *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society*, N.S., ix, p. 9.

[4] R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians*, p. 43.

[5] J B. van Hasselt, "Die Noeforezen," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, viii, p. 180.

[6] A. C. Hollis, "A Note on the Masai System of Relationship and other Matters connected therewith," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, vi, p. 481.

[7] J. Maclean, *A Compendium of Kafir Laws and Customs*, p. 93; G. Fritsch, *Die Eingeborenen Süd-Afrika's*, p. 114; D. Kidd, *The Essential Kafir*, pp. 241 sqq.; L. Albertis, *Die Kaffer aan de zuidkust van Afrika*, p. 136; J. Shooter, *The Kafirs of Natal and the Zulu Country*, p. 46; H. A. Junod, *The Life of a South African Tribe*, vol. i, pp. 230 sqq.; Id., *Les Ba-Ronga*, p. 79; C. Gouldsbury and H. Sheane, *The Great Plateau*

a great religious meeting which was attended by the chief and a large concourse of the people, among whom was the prospective son-in-law of the chief. It unexpectedly happened that the mother of the bride also made her appearance at the meeting. Immediately the young man fell flat on his face, and a number of anxious friends hastened to cover him completely with rugs and skins. There he lay perspiring and well-nigh suffocated during the whole of the proceedings, until the departure of the lady at the termination of the function at last released him.[1] Among the Baholoholo of the Congo, the ceremonial avoidance of a man's mother-in-law continues to be observed even after the death of his wife.[2] The Indians of Yukatan believed that if a man were to meet his mother-in-law he could never beget children.[3] Throughout North America, "none of their customs is more tenacious of life than this, and no family law more binding."[4] When travelling, or in an open camp, "the mother-in-law was afraid to raise her head or open her eyes, lest they should meet the interdicted object."[5] "One of the funniest incidents I can remember," says Captain Bourke, "was seeing a very desperate Chiricahua Apache, named Ka-e-tenny, who was regarded as one of the boldest and bravest men in the whole nation, trying to avoid running face to face against his mother-in-law. He hung to stones, from which, had he fallen, he would have been dashed to pieces, or certainly have broken several of his limbs."[6] In primitive society those rules of mother-

of Northern Rhodesia, p. 259; J. Irle, *Die Herero*, p. 106; M. Cole, "Notes on the Wagogo of German East Africa," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxii, p. 307; A. Werner, *The Natives of British Central Africa*, p. 132; C. W. Hobley, *Ethnology of the A-Kamba and other East African Tribes*, p. 103; L. Decle, *Three Years in Savage Africa*, p. 490; H. H. Johnston, *British Central Africa*, p. 415; Id., *The Uganda Protectorate*, p. 688; E. Hurel, "Religion et vie domestique des Bakarewe," *Anthropos*, vi, p. 287; J. Roscoe, *The Baganda*, p. 129; H. S. Stannus, "Notes on some Tribes of British Central Africa," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl, p. 307; J. H. Weeks, *Among Congo Cannibals*, pp. 130 sq.; Id., "Notes on some Customs of the Lower Congo People," *Folk-lore*, xx, p. 310; E. Torday and T. A. Joyce, "Notes on the Ethnography of the Ba-Huana," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxvi, pp. 285 sq.; M. Lindeman, *Les Upotos*, p. 11.

[1] G. Viehe, reported by W. Coates Palgrave, "Some Customs of the Ovaherero," *Folk-lore Journal* (Cape Town), i, pp. 46 sq.

[2] R. Schmitz, *Les Baholoholo*, p. 183.

[3] E. C. Brasseur de Bourbourg, *Histoire des nations civilisées de l'Amérique centrale*, vol. ii, p. 52.

[4] S. R. Riggs, *Dakota Grammar, Texts, and Ethnography* (*Contributions to North American Ethnology*, vol. ix), p. 204.

[5] J. Gregg, *Commerce of the Prairies*, vol. i, pp. 270 sq.

[6] G. Bourke, *Over the Border with Crooke*, p. 132. Cf. L. Ostermann, "The Navajo Indians of New Mexico and Arizona," *Anthropos*, iii, p. 862.

in-law avoidance are regarded as 'innate' sentiments implanted in human nature, and as a categorical imperative partaking of the character of a natural law of universal validity. The Tlinkit of Alaska, when digging for clams, which have a way of withdrawing rapidly in the sand, say, "Don't go so fast or you will hit your mother-in-law in the face";[1] the Kurnai of Australia call the spiny ant-eater 'the mother-in-law of thunder' because in a thunderstorm it endeavours to hide itself by burrowing in the ground.[2] It is stated of the Baganda, and the remark would appear to be generally applicable, that they attach a greater degree of sanctity to the prohibition referring to the mother-in-law than to the prohibition against incest.[3]

Yet those sentiments and usages of primitive societies are on current views and in terms of our own ideas meaningless absurdities. Of this curious series of customs, "I have met with no interpretation which can be put forward with confidence," says Sir Edward Tylor.[4] "No 'raison d'être' in existing custom has ever been discovered" for the usage.[5] None of the suggestions that have been hazarded throws any more light on the enigma than do facetious references to the unpopularity of the mother-in-law and current jokes on the subject. Those well-worn jokes, it appears probable, are themselves a surviving echo of a sentiment which once occupied a foremost place in the mind of primitive humanity, but which is insusceptible of interpretation except in terms of the earliest conditions of human societies.

The hypothesis of Lord Avebury that the rules of mother-in-law avoidance are connected with the practice of capturing wives, is ruled out of court by the fact that, while those usages are most prevalent where that practice, which is a comparatively late one, does not obtain, and where residence of the husband with the wife's family is the rule, they are rare where the husband takes his wife to his tribe.[6] The supposition would, moreover, not account for the singling out of the wife's mother as the person to be avoided, but would require rather the menfolk of the wife's tribe, and

[1] J. R. Swanton, Social Condition, Beliefs and Linguistic Relationship of the Tlingit Indians," *Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology*, p. 459.

[2] A. W. Howitt, "On Australian Medicine Men," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xvi, p. 35, n.

[3] J. G. Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, vol. iv, p. 156, on the authority of Rev. J. Roscoe.

[4] E. B. Tylor, *Researches into the Early History of Mankind*, 1878, p. 291.

[5] C. S. Burne, "Presidential Address," *Folk-lore*, xxii, p. 25.

[6] E. B. Tylor, "On a Method of Investigating the Development of Institutions, applied to the Laws of Marriage and Descent," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xviii, p. 246.

especially her brothers and her uncles, upon whom fall chiefly the recognised duties of vendetta in such cases, to be the objects of the tabu. Yet, although the rule of avoidance does in several instances extend to other relatives of the wife, and may, as in some Australian tribes, include the whole of her clan,[1] it applies, in the vast majority of instances, to the mother-in-law alone, and, where others are included, to her chiefly. The converse avoidance of her father-in-law by a woman is found for the most part in advanced Oriental nations, such as the Hindus,[2] and the Chinese,[3] where the principles of patriarchal domination are strongly emphasised. The almost universal rule is that there is no restriction of social intercourse between a wife and her husband's relatives. Of the ancient Mexicans we are expressly told that, although a son-in-law was bound to avoid very strictly his mother-in-law, "the wife might freely converse with the family of her husband."[4] Significantly enough, the rules of sentiment which apply to the wife's mother sometimes apply also to her grandmother.[5]

Still less does the problem appear to be helped by the suggestion that the rules of mother-in-law avoidance are primarily intended to insure against the occurrence of improper intercourse between her and her son-in-law. That suggestion, which has been frequently made, would seem to be definitely excluded by certain curious derivative practices found in several tribes. The inconveniences of carrying out strictly those elaborate precautions are so great that some uncultured peoples, as, for instance, the Pawnees,[6] and the Ojibwa,[7] have been led to discard them and to allow them to fall into disuse. Emancipation from those vexatious observances has been in some instances attained in a different manner. Among the Navahos the rules of mother-in-law avoidance are as strict as anywhere; from the time of his marriage a Navaho can never look his mother-in-law in the face, else, he believes, he would grow blind. They cannot meet or sit in the same hut; and shouts warning men and mothers-in-law against accidentally meeting are said to be the commonest sounds in a Navaho camp. Indeed their name for mother-in-law, 'doyishini,' means 'She whom I may not see.'

[1] F. J. Gillen, in *Report of the Horn Scientific Expedition to Central Australia*, Part iv, p. 164.

[2] J. A. Dubois, *Hindu Manners, Customs and Ceremonies*, vol. i, p. 352.

[3] Astley, *A New Collection of Voyages and Travels*, vol. iv, p. 91.

[4] J. de Torquemada, *Veinte i un libros rituales i Monarchia Indiana*, vol. ii, p. 426.

[5] J. O. Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," *Third Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 262.

[6] E. James, *Account of an Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains*, vol. i, p. 233.

[7] *Narrative of the Captivity and Adventures of John Tanner*, p. 146.

Those constant embarrassments are, however, sometimes avoided by a Navaho by the simple expedient of marrying his mother-in-law 'pro forma' before he marries the daughter; having thus made the formidable personage his wife all restrictions and terrors attaching to her status are removed.[1] The Cherokees have hit upon the same plan of eluding mother-in-law observances.[2] Among the Caribs a man might not look upon his mother-in-law and they carefully avoided one another; unless, as was sometimes done, he married both mother and daughter.[3] The same solution has been adopted in an even more thorough manner by the Wagogo and the Wahele of East Africa, with whom it is a rule that a man must cohabit with his future mother-in-law before he is allowed to marry the daughter.[4] It appears fairly clear that the tabus which can be legitimately evaded by marrying one's mother-in-law are not intended to guard against sexual relations with her, and are not the expression of any horror in respect of such relations; and in fact, although in a monogamous society the notion of such relations may be considered indecent, no 'horror of incest' attaches to them.

On the view that the sentiment against incest and the rule of exogamy are direct consequences of the matriarchal character of primitive groups, those customs and sentiments regarding the mother-in-law, which are no less important in primitive society, can scarcely be said to present any problem. The young males must naturally regard the mother of the group to which they resort to satisfy their sexual needs in the same light as they do the mother of their own group. There are, as will be seen later, strong grounds for concluding that such intercourse was primitively clandestine. The husband was but an occasional and secret visitor in his wife's group. It is only the birth of offspring and the vicarious gratification it affords to the maternal instincts of the young wife's mother which reconciles her to the intrusion of the stranger. With a number of peoples the rules and restrictions of intercourse between a man and his mother-in-law cease to apply after a certain period, generally corresponding to the time elapsing before the birth of the first child.[5]

[1] J. G. Bourke, *The Snake Dance of the Moquis*, p. 247.

[2] J. Adair, *History of the American Indians*, p. 190.

[3] La Borde, *Relation des Caraïbes*, p. 596; C. Quand, *Nachricht von Suriname*, p. 251.

[4] R. F. Burton, *The Lake Regions of Central Africa*, vol. i, p. 310; H. Cole, "Notes on the Wagogo of German East Africa," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxii, p. 312.

[5] A. Oldfield, "On the Aborigines of Australia," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society*, iii, p. 251; Ploss-Bartels, *Das Weib*, vol. ii, p. 681; D. Kidd, *The Essential Kafir*, p. 238; A. Werner, *Native Tribes of British*

The mother-in-law restrictions can, moreover, be commuted by conciliating the lady by means of presents. Thus among the Akamba a man may, by making a present of a goat to his mother-in-law, obtain permission to enter her hut and sit by the fire when she is away; by means of a more liberal present, such as an ox or a number of blankets, the ban may be removed altogether.[1] Among the Arapahos, all restrictions are removed if a man presents his mother-in-law with a horse.[2] Among the Dakota tribes, if a warrior brought to his mother-in-law the scalp of a slain enemy and a rifle, the prohibition against intercourse between them was from that moment abolished.[3] That the supposed danger which those rules are, in their first intention, designed to obviate comes from the mother-in-law and not from the son-in-law is further shown by the circumstance that among some peoples, as among the Warramunga tribe of Central Australia, though a man may not go to a camp where his mother-in-law resides, she, on the other hand, and all the wife's relatives, are quite free to visit him in his own camp.[4] Among the Pangwe of Western Africa, on the other hand, the mother-in-law avoids meeting, not only her son-in-law, but all his relatives, male and female.[5] In New Britain a man will go miles out of his way to avoid meeting his mother-in-law; but should he render himself guilty of perjury, the punishment which is regarded as most suitable is that he should go through the painful ordeal of shaking hands with that lady.[6] The idea underlying those observances is also exhibited in the forms which they assume in some instances. Among the Banyoro of East Africa, for example, a man is not obliged to avoid meeting his mother-in-law, but "it

Central Africa, p. 132; H. S. Stannus, "Notes on some Tribes of British Central Africa," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl, p. 307; Majerus, "Brautwerbung und Hochzeit bei den Wabende (Deutsch-Ostafrika)," *Anthropos*, vi, p. 899; C. Gouldsbury and H. Sheane, *The Great Plateau of Northern Rhodesia*, p. 259; R. P. Picarda, "Autour du Mandera. Notes sur l'Ouzigoua, l'Oukwere et l'Oudoe (Zanquebar)," *Les Missions Catholiques*, xviii, p. 286; G. Casati, *Ten Years in Equatoria*, vol. i, p. 69; P. S. Pallas, *Voyages en différentes provinces de l'Empire de Russie*, vol. iv, p. 71; M. Kovalewsky, *Coutume contemporaine et loi ancienne. Droit coutumier ossétien*, p. 169.

[1] G. Lindblom, *The Akamba*, pp. 89 sq. Cf. J. G. Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, vol. ii, p. 424.

[2] A. L. Kroeber, "The Arapahos," *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*, xviii, vol. ii, Part i, pp. 10 sq.

[3] Prinz Maximilian zu Wied, *Reise in das Innere Nord-Amerikas*, vol. ii, p. 132.

[4] B. W. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 160.

[5] G. Tessmann, *Die Pangwe*, p. 256.

[6] G. Brown, in *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society*, N.S., ix, p. 17.

is absolutely essential for the son-in-law to kneel down and remain in a reverential position for some time whenever and wherever he meets her." [1] Again, among the Araucanians of Chili there is no definite rule that a man shall avoid his mother-in-law, but it is a matter of etiquette that on the young couple's return from their honeymoon the bride's mother should pretend to be greatly offended with her son-in-law, giving him the cold shoulder, affecting not to speak to him and to turn her back on him, and adopting generally a sulky attitude for about a year.[2] Among the Ossetes of the Caucasus a man does not enter the house of his parents-in-law for two years after his marriage.[3] But it is scarcely conceivable that the Ossete mother-in-law, who lives in semi-Oriental seclusion, is regarded as standing in danger of receiving improper advances from her son-in-law. In those customs the mother-in-law does not appear in the character of a possible object of unlawful desire, but as an offended personage whom it is needful to conciliate. And, in fact, among the Wakanda of East Africa, the Rev. D. C. R. Scott informs us, " the children endeavour to heal the breach between their father and their grandmother." [4] In one instance at least, namely among the Modoc Indians of California, it would appear that the mother-in-law has good cause to observe scrupulously the usage of avoiding her son-in-law; for, according to Mr. Powers, a Modoc has a recognised right—which, it is to be hoped, is generally waived—to kill his mother-in-law with complete impunity should he happen to meet her.[5] It is difficult to perceive any connection between such a strange form of the usage and the protection of the mother-in-law against possible improper advances.

If my conclusions as to the constitution of the primitive human social group and as to the origin of the rule of exogamy are correct, the incredible sentiments of awe with which primitive man regards his wife's mother present no enigma, but confirm, on the contrary, those conclusions and serve to exhibit better than otherwise could be done the natural authority of which that primitive group was the expression. By the rule of exogamy in its primitive form, the females remaining in their own group and their sexual associates joining them, the head of the group to which a man is attached is not his mother, but his mother-in-law. The awe with which the primitive human mother was regarded, and her natural supremacy in the group of which she was the creator, have passed away before

[1] J. F. Cunningham, *Uganda and its Peoples*, p. 34.

[2] E. R. Smith, *The Araucanians*, p. 214.

[3] M. Kovalewsky, *Coutume contemporaine et loi ancienne. Droit coutumier ossétien*, p. 169.

[4] H. H. Johnston, *British Central Africa*, p. 415.

[5] S. Powers, cited by H. H. Bancroft, *The Native Races of the Pacific States of North America*, vol. i, p. 391.

the rule and power of the male, whether officially established or operating 'de facto' by virtue of his function as hunter and as warrior; even where the original relation of the mother to the family has persisted most unchanged it is a shadow of the natural hegemony which she wielded over the primordial human family. But a memory of the character with which she was invested and of the feelings which she inspired survives in the seemingly absurd sentiments and traditional rules which everywhere among savage races attach to the wife's mother, and which, when their origin is forgotten, are but fantastic and incomprehensible oddities. Sentiments so widespread and so profound that among the uncultured races of five continents "none of their customs is more tenacious of life" and "no family law is more binding," are not mere whimsicalities; in their original significance they were vital and important. Those now meaningless survivals are part of the constitution of the primitive human group into which the animal family developed by preserving, through the rule of exogamy, its fundamental maternal character.

CHAPTER VII

THE MOTHERHOOD

Matrilocal Marriage.

THE arrangement that a woman should, even after her marriage, continue to reside with her mother's family, and that her husband should take up his abode in his mother-in-law's house, is strange to our notions. Montesquieu was considerably amused when he happened to read in a Jesuit missionary's account of the island of Formosa that not only does the wedding breakfast take place, as with ourselves, at the house of the bride's parents, but that "the young man remains there without ever returning to his father's house. Thenceforward the young man regards his father-in-law's house as his own home, and becomes the chief support of the household. And his own father's house is thereafter no more to him than is the case with girls in Europe, who leave their parental home to go and dwell with their husbands." [1] As frequently happens, what is first noted as a strange singularity of a given people turns out on further enquiry to be a custom of almost universal distribution in uncultured societies.

Among the Eskimo of Labrador "the young man goes to the home of the maiden and lives there with her parents, where as man and wife they dwell together, the son-in-law helping to support the family. He does not become his own master until the death of his father-in-law." [2] The same arrangement obtains among the Eskimo of Davis Strait and Cumberland Sound. The husband does not become the master in his house, or rather in that of his wife, until both her parents have died. If he marries a woman belonging to a strange tribe, he must leave his own tribe and become a member of that of his wife.[3] Of the Eskimo of Bering Strait we

[1] J. A. M. de Moyria de Mailla, in *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses*, vol. xviii, p. 441.

[2] J. Maclean, *Canadian Savage Folk*, p. 89. Cf. J. Murdoch, "Ethnological Results of the Point Barrow Expedition," *Ninth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 410.

[3] F. Boas, "The Central Eskimo," *Sixth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 573.

are told that the husband, who goes to live with his wife's family, " transfers filial duty of every kind " from his own people to those of his wife.[1] Among the Aleuts of Kadiak Island " the husband always lives with the parents of the wife, though occasionally he may visit his own relations." [2] It is customary for the husband to discard his own name on entering the married state, and to assume that of his wife.[3]

That the women should remain after marriage in their own home was the general rule among all North American Indians. Among the Iroquois and Huron tribes " marriages are contracted in such a way that the husband and wife never quit their own families and their own home to make one family and one home by themselves. Each remains in his or her home, and the children born of these marriages belong to the women who bore them." [4] " Their marriages," says a Jesuit missionary, " do not establish anything in common between husband and wife except the bed, for each dwells during the day with his or her parents." [5] Of the Algonkin tribes of Canada, Father Charlevoix says: " The woman never leaves her home, of which she is regarded as the mistress and heiress. . . . The children belong to the mother, and acknowledge her only; the father is always as a stranger in regard to them." [6] Among the Canadian tribes of the Great Lakes a man " will remain with, and maintain his father-in-law as long as he lives, while another does the same to his own father." [7] When in the sixteenth century the Cayuga tribes were becoming almost extinct owing to constant warfare, they sent to the Mohawks requesting them to supply them with a number of husbands for their women, so that the race, which

[1] E. W. Nelson, " The Eskimo about Bering Strait," *Eighteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 291.

[2] U. Lisiansky, *A Voyage Round the World*, p. 198.

[3] H. J. Holmberg, " Ethnographische Skizzen über die Völker des russischen Amerika," *Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae*, iv, p. 399.

[4] J. F. Lafitau, *Moeurs des sauvages amériquains*, vol. i, p. 73.

[5] *Relations des Jésuites*, 1657, pp. 34 sq.

[6] P. F. X. de Charlevoix, *Histoire et description générale de la Nouvelle France*, vol. v, pp. 424 sq. Cf. S. Champlain, *Oeuvres*, vol. iv, p. 82; C. Le Clercq, *Nouvelle relation de la Gaspesie*, p. 437; B. de La Potherie, *Histoire de l'Amérique septentrionale*, vol. i, p. 126; Peter Jones, *History of the Ojebway Indians*, p. 179; O. Henry, *Travels and Adventures in the Years 1760–1776*, p. 23; A. de La Hontan, *New Voyages in North America*, vol. ii, p. 457; M. A. Owen, *Folklore of the Musquakie Indians of North America*, p. 76; J. W. Powell, " Wyandot Government," *First Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 63; J. Mooney, " The Cheyenne Indians," *Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association*, i, p. 410.

[7] D. Cameron, " A Sketch of the Customs, Manners, Way of Living of the Natives in the Barren Country about Nipigon," in L. R. Masson, *Les Bourgeois de la Compagnie du Nord-Ouest*, vol. ii, p. 252.

counted its descent through the women only, might not be extinguished.[1]

The Senecas, the most important and by far the most numerous of the confederated tribes known as Iroquois, usually dwelt, before the advent of Europeans, in 'long-houses,' or, as they called them, 'hodensote,' which might be sixty or a hundred feet long, being divided at both sides into compartments, while the fireplace stood in the central passage. The interior economy of those clan-dwellings was under the authority of a matron, who allotted to each one his place and controlled the distribution of the food. Twelve or twenty families lived together in a 'long-house,' "the women taking husbands from other clans." "Usually," says a missionary who saw some surviving specimens of those communities, which disappeared soon after the European occupation, "the female portion ruled the house. The stores were in common; but woe to the luckless husband or lover who was too shiftless to do his share of the providing. No matter how many children, or whatever goods he might have in the house, he might at any time be ordered to pick up his blanket and budge; and after such orders it would not be healthful for him to attempt to disobey; the house would be too hot for him; and, unless saved by the intercession of some aunt or grandmother, he must retreat to his own clan, or, as was often done, go and start a new matrimonial alliance in some other." [2]

Similar usages obtained among the tribes of the plains. Thus among the Sioux "a young man, as soon as he becomes a husband, forsakes his father's tent, to which he seldom returns as an inmate, for women in general have a great ascendancy over their husbands, and they always prefer living amongst those with whom they have been accustomed from childhood." [3] Among the Crees "when a young man marries he resides with his wife's parents, who, however, treat him as a stranger till the birth of his first child; he then attaches himself to them more than to his own parents." [4] Among the Pawnees also a husband took up his residence with his wife's people; if his contributions of produce were not satisfactory, or for any other reason his wife's people got tired of him, he was dismissed.[5] Among the Kansas, Osages and other allied tribes, as soon as the eldest daughter married she became the mistress of

[1] W. M. Beauchamp, in F. W. Hodge, *Handbook of North American Indians North of Mexico*, vol. ii, p. 128.

[2] L. H. Morgan, *Houses and House Life of the American Aborigines* (*Contributions to North American Ethnology*, vol. iv), p. 65.

[3] J. McDonnell, "Some Account of the Red River," in L. R. Masson, *Les Bourgeois du la Compagnie du Nord-Ouest*, vol. i, p. 278.

[4] J. Dunn, *The Oregon Territory and the British North American Fur Trade*, p. 70.

[5] G. A. Dorsey, *The Mythology of the Wichita*, p. 9.

the house, her parents becoming subordinate to her; her sisters, as they grew up, became the wives of the same husband, who took up his residence in the home of his wives.[1] Similar customs were found among the Omahas,[2] Kiowas,[3] Mandans and other Dakotan tribes,[4] and among the Sauk and Foxes of the Mississippi valley.[5] Among the Natchez a powerful chief was usually attended by one or two wives who looked after his establishment, but the majority of his spouses remained with their own relations, and the husband visited them when he pleased.[6] In Florida among the Seminole Indians, "it is the man and not the woman who leaves father and mother and cleaves to his mate." After a time the couple might set up a household of their own where they wished, "except among the husband's relatives."[7]

Among the Haidas of Queen Charlotte Islands, a man is compelled to dwell in his wife's home until his uncle dies.[8] Among the Déné of Alaska, the expression to denote that a man is married to a woman is 'yeraesta,' 'he stays with her.' When a girl marries she erects a hut by the side of her mother's.[9] Among the Ahts, or Nutkas, of Vancouver the great inducement for a man to marry is that he thereby acquires hunting and fishing rights over his wife's property. If the partnership is dissolved, "the property reverts to the woman's sole use, and is a dowry for her next matrimonial experiment." The children remain with the mother.[10] Among the Chinooks a prosperous man often has a large number of wives, "but the wives do not at all times remain together—indeed, this would be utterly impossible—but at different camps where their relations are; so that the husband goes from camp to camp occa-

[1] J. Gregg, *Commerce of the Prairies*, vol. ii, p. 302; J. Owen Dorsey, "Siouan Sociology," *Fifth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 232.

[2] E. James, *Account of an Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains*, vol. i, pp. 209 sq., 211. Cf. J. Owen Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," *Third Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 259.

[3] J. Mooney, "The Calendar History of the Kiowa," *Seventeenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, Part i, p. 233.

[4] Prince Maximilian zu Wied, *Voyages in the Interior of North America*, vol. ii, pp. 349 sq.

[5] M. Marston, "Letter to the Rev. Dr. Jedidah Morse," in E. H. Blair, *The Indian Tribes of the Upper Mississippi Valley and the Region of the Great Lakes*, vol. ii, p. 166; T. Forsyth, "Account of the Manners and Customs of the Sauk and Fox Nations," *ibid.*, p. 214.

[6] Le Petit, in *Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, vol. lviii, p. 143.

[7] Clay MacCauley, "The Seminole Indians of Florida," *Sixth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 496.

[8] C. Harrison, *Ancient Warriors of the North Pacific*, p. 77.

[9] A. G. Morice, "The Western Déné, their Manners and Customs," *Proceedings of the Canadian Institute, Toronto*, IIIᵈ Series, vii, pp. 121 sq.

[10] G. M. Sproat, *Scenes and Studies of Savage Life*, p. 96.

sionally to visit them."[1] Among the Yokut of California "a man on marrying goes to live at his wife's or father-in-law's house"; and among the Patwin "a bride often remains in her father's home, and her husband comes to live with her."[2] Similarly among the Maidu of northern California, "the man usually went to live with the girl's family, if they were members of his own village."[3] "Their marriages," says a Russian observer of the tribes of northern California, "take place without any ceremony. If a young couple take a liking to one another, the youth walks into the girl's hut and takes up his abode there, without so much as asking the permission of her father or mother, and begins at once to cohabit with the young person."[4] Among the Kwakiutl of British Columbia the husband likewise takes up his abode in the home of the bride, but on making a special payment may remove her after three months.[5]

Of the south-western tribes of New Mexico and Arizona, who are known as Pueblo Indians, we have many full and delightful accounts. I cite from that of Tylor: "My own personal knowledge of the maternal community belongs to one of the most picturesque experiences of my life, on a visit made in 1884, under the auspices of the American Bureau of Ethnology, to the Pueblo Indian district on the Californian border. A Pueblo such as that of the Zuñi rises stage above stage, presenting a dreary aspect of mud terraces, and ladders leading up and down to give access to the half-lighted rooms inhabited by the families. In the living- and cooking-room, round the wood-fire, the inmates might be seen sitting assembled in the evening—fathers, mothers and children—so that one might suppose oneself visiting a huge lodging-house of the European sort, till one understood the relationships. Enquiry would show that while in a family dwelling the mothers are related together in the female line, and therefore, of course, belong to the same clan, and their children after them, the fathers are not bound together by such ties, and need not be of the same clan, only they must not be of the same clan as the wives. Though the husband takes up his abode in the wife's family dwelling during her life and his good behaviour, he belongs still to his own

[1] A. Ross, *Adventures of the First Settlers on the Oregon or Columbia River*, pp. 295 sq.

[2] S. Powers, *Tribes of California*, pp. 221, 382.

[3] R. B. Dixon, "The Northern Maidu," *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*, xvii, Part iii, p. 239.

[4] Kostromitonow, in F. P. Wrangell, *Statistische und ethnologische Nachrichten über die Russischen Besitzungen an der Nordwestküste von Amerika*, p. 87.

[5] F. Boas, "First General Report on the Indians of British Columbia," *Report of the Fifty-ninth Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1889), p. 838.

family, perhaps three terraces off, up two rude pole ladders and down a trapdoor. How much milder and kindlier the conditions of these people are than what we associate with the name of savages may well be judged from the idyllic record of life among them by Mr. Cushing. He describes how a Zuñi girl, when she takes a fancy for a young man, conveys a present of the hewe-bread to him as a token, and becomes affianced; how he sews clothes and mocassins for her, and combs her hair out on the terrace in the sun. With the woman rests the security of the marriage ties; and it must be said, in her high honour, that she rarely abuses the privilege; that is, never sends her husband 'to the home of his fathers' unless he richly deserves it." [1]

"The domestic life of the Zuñis," says Mrs. Stevenson, "might well serve as an example for the civilised world. They do not have large families, and the members are deeply attached to one another. The writer has found great enjoyment in her visits to the general living-room in the early evening after the day's labours were over and before the elders were called away to their fraternities or elsewhere. The young mothers would be seen caring for their infants, or perhaps the fathers would be fondling them, for the Zuñi men are very devoted to their children, especially the babies. The grandmother would have one of the younger children in her lap, with perhaps the head of another resting against her shoulder, while the rest would be sitting near or busying themselves about household matters." [2] "The house," says Dr. Kroeber, "belongs to the women born of the family. There they come into the world, pass their lives, and within the walls they die. As they grow up, their brothers leave them, each to abide in the house of his wife. Each woman, too, has her husband, or succession of husbands, sharing her blankets. So generation succeeds generation, the slow stream of mothers and daughters forming a current that carried with it husbands, sons, and grandsons." [3]

[1] E. B. Tylor, "The Matriarchal Family System," *The Nineteenth Century*, July 1896, pp. 88 sq.

[2] M. C. Stevenson, "The Zuñi," *Twenty-third Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology*, p. 293.

[3] A. L. Kroeber, "Zuñi Kin and Clan," *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History*, xviii, Part ii, pp. 47 sq. Cf. F. H. Cushing, "My Adventures in Zuñi," *The Century Magazine*, xxvi (1883), p. 35; Id., "Zuñi Creation Myths," *Thirteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 368; Cosmos Mindeleff, "Aboriginal Remains in Verde Valley," *ibid.*, p. 197; E. L. Hewett, "Archeology of Paijarito Park, New Mexico," *The American Anthropologis*, N.S., vi, pp. 634 sq.; J. W. Fewkes, "The Winter Solstice Altars at Hano Pueblo," *ibid.*, i, p. 260; H. R. Voth, *The Traditions of the Hopis* (*Field Columbian Museum Publications, Anthropological Series*, viii), pp. 67, 96, 133; J. G. Bourke, *The Snake-Dance of the Moquis of Arizona*, p. 135; O. Solberg, "Gebräuche der Mittelmesa-Hopi bei Namgebung, Heirat und Tod," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xxxvii, p. 629;

The Pueblo tribes, which have preserved much of their original organisation, while that of the eastern tribes has long ago been broken up by European conquest, are the most advanced in culture of all North American Indians, and the circumstance has been put forward by some writers in support of the hypothesis that the matriarchal form of society, which is so vividly illustrated by those communities, is not primitive, but is a product of comparatively advanced development. But that matriarchal organisation is also found no less complete, and even more absolute, in the rudest, the most primitive and the most uncultured tribe in the whole North American native race, namely, the Seri of the Californian Gulf. These remarkable people are one of the most instructive of primitive races, and, if I am not mistaken, offer us one of the most accurate representations, not only of primitive matriarchal organisation, but in their whole social constitution, of some of the earliest phases of primitive humanity. They are, in respect of culture, among the rudest savages that we know of. To say that they are in the Stone Age is scarcely accurate, for they do not even fashion stones in any way, but merely pick up a cobble when they require one for crushing bone or severing sinews, and even when provided with knives do not know how to use them, or do not care to do so. No other human tribe is so devoid of material devices. They have no form of agriculture. They do not cook their food, but eat raw and generally putrid meat and offal by tearing it with their teeth and nails. "Among the supplies laid on the top of the hut," relates Dr. McGee, "was a hind leg of a horse some three days dead; most of the larger muscles were already gnawed away, leaving loose ends of fiber and strings of tendon, the condition being such that the remaining flesh might easily have been cut and scraped away by means of a knife; yet whenever a warrior or woman or youth hungered, he or she took down the heavy joint, held the mass at the height of the mouth, and gnawed, sucked, and swallowed, tearing the tissue by jerks of the head."[1] Their strongest tribal characteristic is implacable animosity towards aliens, whether Indian or European; and even their various clans regard one another with hostility and only unite for the purpose of attacking a common foe. Indeed, so fierce is their hostility that it has not been possible to observe them as fully as would be desirable. Part of the tribe live on the mainland of Mexico in the Province of Sonora, but their stronghold is the rugged island

M. C. Stevenson, "The Sia," *Eleventh Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 19.

[1] W. J. McGee, "The Seri Indians," *Seventeenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, Part i, pp. 152 sq. Some of the details concerning their diet are even more revolting. The Seri are koprophagous.

of Tiburon in the Gulf of California, and all attempts to visit them in that fastness have been defeated either by their murdering the would-be observer, or by their scattering and hiding themselves. We are thus, unfortunately, confined to observations concerning the clans on the mainland, and to such information as regards the island clans as it has been possible to obtain from their fellow tribesmen and from interpreters.

The most noticeable fact about their organisation is the prominence of the females. The social unit is the maternal clan, defined practically by the ocular consanguinity of birth from a common line of mothers. Each clan is headed by a clan-mother, and comprises a hierarchy of daughters and grand-daughters, collectively incarnating that purity of the blood which is the pride of the tribe. The indigenous name of the tribe is 'Kunkak,' which means 'womanhood,' or 'motherhood.' Their dwellings are the rudest shelters that can be called huts, and are built of brushwood, supplemented by sponges and the shells of tortoises. Such as they are, they are erected by the women without help from the men or boys, and they belong exclusively to the matrons, though the brothers are entitled to a place within them if they wish, while the husband has neither title nor fixed place, "because he belongs to another house." It was often found difficult to identify the husband in a group, partly because he is as a rule incongruously younger than the mistress, and partly because he generally acts as an outer guard. Moreover, his connection with the house is veiled by the absence of authority over both children and domestic affairs. There is, indeed, some question as to the clear recognition of paternity; certainly the females have no term for 'father.' It is noteworthy that the terminology for kinship is strikingly meagre. The women are the only real workers. The masculine drones limit their activity to fighting and fishing. The matron exercises all authority in the home; but if there is a tumult she may invoke the authority of the clan-mother, and in emergencies the women appeal for executive aid, but not for judicative cooperation, to their brothers. The men take little part in the regulation of personal conduct, but tacitly accept the decision of the mother or clan-mother. Male chiefs are elected, mainly for leadership in war, but they are also supposed to control the weather. Since, however, all magical powers are considered to reside in the women, and the matrons are the 'shamans,' one of the main considerations in the election of a chief is the magical powers of his principal wife. He is a homeless potentate sojourning like the rest of his fellows in such huts as his wives may erect, and wandering with the season at the whim of the women; for all the movements of the tribe and of the clans are determined by the women, who also exercise the formal legislative and judicative functions, and hold

their own councils besides taking part prominently in the tribal councils of war. A man generally marries all the sisters of one family, and there are indications that formerly, when the numbers of the men had not been so reduced by warfare as they are now, all the brothers of a family were also conjugally bound to all the sisters of another. The prospective bridegroom is subjected to the most elaborate tests before he is accepted by the mothers.[1]

The rule that the wife remains after her marriage in her parental home, and that the husband, if he cohabits with her, takes up his residence there, or, as we may call the arrangement, 'matrilocal marriage,' was as general in Central and South America as in the northern portion of the continent. Among the Caribbean races of the West Indian Islands, reports an old observer, "the women never quit their father's house after marriage."[2] The men might have six or seven wives living with their families in various places, and they visited them in turn.[3] In ancient Mexico, among the tribes of Yucatan, the husband joined his wife in her parental home;[4] and at the present day, among the Kekchi Indians of Guatemala, marriage is usually matrilocal.[5] So also among the Bribri of Costa Rica, "the husband went to live with his father-in-law."[6] An old account of the natives of the province of Caracas gives the following description of their marriages: "If an Indian takes a fancy to a girl, he tells her so and then goes to her house. And if she gives him a basin of water to wash himself and something to eat, he understands her meaning, and they go to bed together, without her parents objecting; and they are thus married. This marriage continues for a longer or shorter time, solely according to the wishes of the young woman. If she thinks that her husband is not a good worker, or for any other reason, she dismisses him and takes another, and he another wife."[7] Of the Mozcos of New Granada, an old missionary notes

[1] W. J. McGee, "The Seri Indians," *Seventeenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, Part i, pp. 9–11, 152 sqq., 269–279, and *passim*. The above account is given mostly in Dr. McGee's own words. There is no evidence that the Seri have undergone any considerable degree of degeneration in their cultural status, for there are definite traces of very long settlement in their country which correspond entirely with their present condition. They are supposed to be among the earliest inhabitants of North America. Dr. McGee says "they are autochtonous."

[2] J. B. du Tertre, *Histoire générale des isles de St. Christophe, de la Guadeloupe*, etc., p. 419. Cf. De la Borde, *Relation des Caraïbes*, p. 596.

[3] De la Borde, *op. cit.*, p. 557.

[4] A. de Herrera, *General History of the West Indies*, vol. iv, p. 172.

[5] C. Sapper, "Die Gebräuche und religiosen Anschauungen der Kekchi-Indianer," *Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, viii, p. 203.

[6] A. Skinner, *Notes on the Bribri of Costa Rica*, p. 47.

[7] J. Pimentel, "Relación de esta provincia de Caracas," in G. Latorre, *Relaciones geograficas de Indias*, p. 79.

that "a strange custom established amongst them is that the husband follows his wife wherever she desires to dwell." [1] Matrilocal marriage was customary in Peru under the Inca monarchy.[2]

Of the various tribes of the Orinoco, Father Gilii says: "These savages have an extremely strange custom. The women do not follow their husbands, but it is the husbands who follow their wives. From the moment that a savage takes a wife, he no longer recognises his own home. He remains with his father-in-law, into whose hut he removes his hammock, his bow and arrows, and all his belongings. He hunts for his father-in-law and fishes for him, and is in all things dependent upon him. It is thus the fashion with all the savages that the sons go to other people's homes, and the daughters, on the other hand, remain in theirs." [3] The usage is prevalent at the present day among all the tribes of the upper Orinoco. "The husband frequently lives in his wife's village; if she no longer cares for him, she turns him out of doors." [4] Among the Arawaks of British Guiana the husband, on taking a wife, "immediately transports his possessions to the house of his father-in-law, and there lives and works. The head of the family for whom he is bound to work and whom he obeys is not his own father, but his wife's. When the family of the young couple becomes too large to be conveniently housed underneath the roof of the father-in-law, the young husband builds a house for himself by the side of that of his wife's father." [5]

The Tupi tribes of Brazil, who constituted the bulk of the native population of that country, had the same customs as the Caribs, who were probably identical with them in race. "A son-in-law passed over from his own family to that of his father-in-law, and became a member of it, and he was under the obligation to accompany him in war." [6] The traditional sentiment in that respect among the Tupis of northern Brazil is thus illustrated by an early missionary. A young Tupi maiden having married a Christian convert, the latter desired to remove to a mission farther south in order to assist in the spread of the Gospel. But the young woman would not hear of it. "You know very well," she remonstrated, "that my father's garden requires cultivation, and that he is short of victuals. Do you not know that he has given me to you on condition that you should assist him and provide

[1] Father Cyprien Baraze, in *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses*, vol. viii, p. 87.

[2] A. de Herrera, *General History of the West Indies*, vol. iv, p. 172.

[3] F. S. Gilii, *Saggio di storia americana*, vol. ii, p. 244.

[4] H. Coudreau, *La France équinoxiale*, vol. ii, p. 205.

[5] E. Im Thurn, *Among the Indians of Guiana*, p. 186. Cf. p. 222 (Macusi Indians), W. H. Brett, *The Indian Tribes of Guiana*, p. 353.

[6] F. A. de Varnhagen, *Historia geral do Brasil*, vol. i, p. 129. Cf. M. de Nobrega, "Informação das terras do Brasil," *Revista Trimensal de Historia e Geographia*, vi, p. 94.

for his old age? If you wish to abandon him, I for my part will remain with him." [1] The same customs are observed at the present day among the Carajas, a tribe of the same stock. The women own the houses and all their contents, and also the canoes; their husbands merely "stay with them." [2] Similarly among the tribes of the Bororo "after marriage the man stays in the house of the bride until he has a family of his own, when he builds a house for himself." [3] It appears that in early days it was quite inconceivable to the Bororo that a woman should leave her tribe; rather than part with her, the members of her clan would all follow her if she was taken away. "This nation," says an old Spanish writer, "have a very strange custom, which I do not think will be found in any other nation of the world, and it is this: when the Portuguese take some woman, even if it be quite a young girl, of the Bororo nation, all her relatives come of their own free will to serve the Portuguese who has the girl in his home, and they continue to serve him all their lives as slaves." [4] Among the Chavantes "the bridegroom after betrothal lives with his wife's parents." [5]

The Guaycurus, the most important among the tribes of the interior, in the region of the Gran Chaco, had similar customs. "The man goes to dwell in the house of the woman, leaving behind him in his village his home, family and possessions. If he be a chief or a man of wealth and consequence, he gives his wife his horses, soldiers, and prisoners. As this marriage is only of short duration, there is no community of goods, and after separating, the husband returns to his own family and tribe. In consequence of this mode of marriage, the men of these tribes seldom have any permanent abode, for many marriages are contracted with distant tribes, the men of Albuquerque, for instance, intermarrying with the people of Miranda or with the Cadindos, or in other villages near the country of the Spaniards; and the men from those places also marry with the women of the first-named villages, which marriages are very transient. As the husband always goes to

[1] Yves d'Evreux, *Voyage dans le nord du Brésil*, pp. 82 sq.

[2] F. Krause, *In den Wildnissen Brasiliens*, p. 325; P. Ehrenreich, *Beiträge zur Volkenkunde Brasiliens*, p. 27; G. von Koenigswald, "Die Caraja-Indianer," *Globus*, xciv, p. 237.

[3] V. Frič and P. Radin, "Contribution to the Study of the Bororo Indians," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxvi, p. 390. According to another account the husband continues to dwell in the men's common house until the death of his wife's father, when he succeeds in the latter's place (K. von den Steinen, *Unter den Naturvölkern Zentral-Brasilien*, p. 501).

[4] P. J. Quiroga, "Breve Noticia del viaje que hizo por el rio Paraguay, 1753–54," in *Colección de Documentos Ineditos para la Historia de España*, vol. civ, p. 441.

[5] J. E. Pohl, *Reise in Innern von Brasilien*, vol. ii, p. 195.

live in the home of his wife, there results from this foolish practice a constant cycle of changes of abode, so that no man has a fixed and permanent place of residence. When the men, passing through some remote village, take a wife, the wife whom they have left behind also gets married again; if the husband returns and both are agreeable, they join again, or he finds some other companion." [1] The Guatos of the Araguay river have similarly various wives in different villages, whom they visit in turn.[2] Matrilocal marriage was the general rule among the tribes of the Gran Chaco. Thus among the Mbayas, the husband "abandoned his parents and his belongings and went to reside with the family or his wife." [3] Among the Terenos, "the husband always resides with his wife's family." [4] The same rule is generally observed by the Matacos.[5] Among the Lenguas it is usual for the husband to take up his abode with his wife's family.[6] The custom was observed by the Abipones until a man had a family of his own.[7] Matrilocal marriage is also reported of the Tsoroti,[8] the Bakairi,[9] and the Caingang of southern Argentina.[10] Among the Fuegians, the men "usually live for a long time with the parents of their wives"; and sometimes they continue with them permanently.[11]

In Africa the rule that the women remain after marriage in their own family is found to be strictly observed among both the most primitive and backward peoples and among the most advanced races of that continent. The now almost extinct Bushmen of South Africa led a nomadic life in small groups, or clans. With the consent of one of the older women, a man attached himself to a wandering troop and became the partner of one or more of the women, providing the group into which he was adopted with the products of his chase. When he ceased to do so to their satisfaction,

[1] R. F. de Almeida Serra, "Sobre os Indios Uiacuru's, Guana's, etc.," *Revista Trimensal de Historia e Geographia*, xiii, p. 355. Cf. C. F. Ph. von Martius, *Beiträge zur Ethnologie und Sprachenkunde Amerika's zumal Brasiliens*, vol. i, pp. 107 sq.

[2] M. Schmidt, *Indianenstudien in Zentralbrasiliens*, p. 438.

[3] G. A. Colini, in G. Boggiani, *Viaggi d'un artista nell'America Meridionale. I Caducei (Mbaya o Guaycuru)*, p. 321.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 321 sq.

[5] G. Pelleschi, *Eight Months in the Gran Chaco*, pp. 65 sq., 67.

[6] W. B. Grubb, *Among the Indians of the Parguayan Chaco*, p. 186; G. Kurtze, "Sitten und Gebräuche der Lengua-Indianer," *Mittheilungen der geographischen Gesellschaft (für Thuringen) zu Iena*, xxiii, p. 27.

[7] M. Dobrizhoffer, *An Account of the Abipones*, vol. ii, p. 208.

[8] E. Nordenskiöld, *Indianerleben*, p. 92.

[9] K. von den Steinen, *Unter den Naturvölkern Zentral-Brasilien*, p. 331.

[10] J. B. Ambrosetti, "Die Kaingang in Argentinien," *Globus*, lxxiv, p. 245.

[11] P. Hyades and J. Deniker, in *Mission scientifique du Cap Horn*, vol. vii, p. 378. Cf. C. Spegazzini, "Costumbres de los habitantes de la Tierra de Fuego," *Anales de la Sociedad Cientifica Argentina*, xiv, p. 166.

the association was dissolved, and he joined some other band, where he found new wives.[1] Some remnants of the race survive at the present day on the Kalahari plateau. Their usages in respect to sexual unions are the same as those of their ancestors. A man may on no account marry in the group to which he belongs. It is obligatory for him to join another group to find wives. On doing so, he becomes a member of the group to which his wives belong, and all connection, except for friendly intercourse, is severed between him and the group in which he was born.[2] With the somewhat more advanced and settled Hottentots, the husband took up his residence, at least during the first few years of married life, in the family of his wife.[3] The same rule was observed among the Basutos,[4] and among the Barolong and all other Bechuana tribes.[5] The latter have a proverb: "Happy is she who has borne a daughter; a boy is the son of his mother-in-law."[6] Among the Zulus also, the bridegroom goes to live in the house of his wife, and may remain there five years before he builds a house of his own, and sets up house-keeping for himself.[7] Among the Ovaherero, a man, we are told, "has no home"; he sleeps by turns in the houses of his several wives.[8] Livingstone thus describes the marriage arrangements of the Banyai of the Zambesi region: "When a young man marries he is obliged to come and live at their village. He has to perform certain services for the mother-in-law, such as keeping her well supplied with firewood; and when he comes into her presence he is obliged to sit with his knees in a bent position, as putting his feet towards the old lady would give her great offence. If he becomes tired of living in this state of vasselage and wishes to return to his own family, he is obliged to leave all his children behind—they belong to the wife."[9]

The usage of matrilocal marriage is very general in eastern Africa. In British Central Africa "at marriage the man leaves his father and mother, leaves his own home and country, and goes to stay with his wife."[10] With all the tribes of southern Nyasaland

[1] G. Fritsch, *Die Eingeborenen Süd-Afrikas*, p. 445; J. Chapman, *Travels in the Interior of South Africa*, vol. i, p. 259; A. Merenski, *Beiträge zur Kenntniss Süd-Afrikas*, p. 68.

[2] S. Passarge, *Die Buschimanner der Kalahari*, p. 105.

[3] T. Hahn, *Tsuni-Goam*, p. 18.

[4] E. Casalis, *The Basutos*, p. 183.

[5] W. Joest, "Bei den Barolong," *Das Ausland*, lvii, p. 464.

[6] J. T. Brown, *The South-Central Bantu* (MS.).

[7] M. Kranz, *Natur- und Kulturleben der Zulus*, p. 69.

[8] G. Viehe, "Die Ovaherero," in S. R. Steinmetz, *Rechtsverhältnisse von eingeborenen Völkern in Afrika und Ozeanien*, p. 306.

[9] D. Livingstone, *Narrative of an Expedition to the Zambesi*, p. 285.

[10] D. Macdonald, *Africana*, vol. i, p. 136.

" the husband invariably goes away to live with the people of his wife." [1] The rule obtains among the Marotse,[2] the Yahos and Anyanga,[3] the Tumbuka,[4] the Wakamba, the Mosuto.[5] The marriage of the girls, amongst those people, " brings an additional provider and unpaid worker into the household. For this is the land of exogamy, where the young wife does not go to her husband's home, or enter his family, but, on the contrary, the man leaves his father and mother, and either moves directly into the house of his wife's parents, or builds his own close beside it." [6] Among the Useguha, " unless a man has all his wives in one village, they live with their parents, and in any case after a few years of married life a wife always insists in going to live with her parents, whither the husband has to follow her. Among the Bakumbi he must live from two to five years with his parents-in-law, and the Mkonde always builds his first hut at the village of his wife's parents." [7] Among the Wanyamwezi, the women do not leave their home after marriage, but are joined there by their husbands.[8] Among the Wamegi, " when a man marries he does not remove his wife from her old home, but builds a house for her attached to that of her father, or a conical-roofed hut near the flat-roofed house, and resides with her; when he marries another wife, he leaves the first wife for a time and lives with the second wife in her village. It thus often happens, when a man has six or seven wives living in different parts of the country, that he is absent for months from his first wife, as he makes his tour of visits to his other wives and helps them to dig their fields and to sow and reap their crop." [9] Similarly among the Batuse of the Uganda Protectorate, a man never has more than one wife in his own village; his other wives remain in their own villages and he visits them in turn in their homes.[10]

[1] H. H. Johnston, *British Central Africa*, pp. 412, 413, 415, 471. Sir Harry Johnston mentions the Wakonde as an exception, though they also frequently revert, he says, to the traditional usage. But that matrilocal marriage is their immemorial and fundamental practice is very definitely shown by Dr. Weule's information (K. Weule, *Native Life in East Africa*, p. 314; cf. below, p. 579).

[2] A. St. H. Gibbons, *Africa from South to North through Marotseland*, vol. ii, pp. 53 sq.

[3] A. Werner, *The Natives of British Central Africa*, p. 254; Duff Macdonald, *Africana*, vol. i, pp. 136, 140, 146.

[4] D. Fraser, *Winning a Primitive People*, p. 281.

[5] J. M. Hildebrandt, " Ethnographischen Notizen über Wakámba und ihre Nachbaren," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, x, p. 401.

[6] K. Weule, *Native Life in East Africa*, p. 282.

[7] C. Dundas, " Native Laws of some Bantu Tribes of East Africa," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, li, pp. 249 sq.

[8] R. F. Burton, *The Lake Regions of Central Africa*, vol. ii, p. 39.

[9] J. Roscoe, *Twenty-five Years in East Africa*, pp. 21 sq.

[10] Id., *The Bagesu, and other Tribes of the Uganda Protectorate* (*The Third*

Among the primitive Pygmies of the Congo forests "the daughters continue even after they are married to live with their parents, and the sons-in-law, passing over to the group of which their wives are members, place themselves under the orders of their father-in-law."[1] The rule that the women never leave their natal home is common among many tribes of the Congo.[2] Thus among the Babwende of Stanley Pool a woman never leaves her native home; the husband visits her there, and stays with her as long as he wishes. After a while, when he desires a change, he goes to another village, where the same arrangement is repeated.[3] Similar customs are common in West Africa. Miss Kingsley mentions a Fan trader of her acquaintance "whose wives stretch over three hundred miles of country."[4] Among the Agni of the Ivory Coast a man who marries a woman of a different tribe establishes himself in the home of his wife and becomes part of her family, losing all rights of inheritance from his own family.[5] Among the Ekoi of Southern Nigeria the husband takes up his residence in the home of his wife.[6]

Throughout the vast region which extends south of the Sahara desert, from the Atlantic to the Nile, and includes the countries now known as Nigeria and the French Sudan, the social constitution of the various native races appears to have been characteristically matriarchal, descent being traced through the women and property being transmitted by a man to the children of his sister.[7] The usage of matrilocal marriage also is prevalent in every part of that region, though at the present day the usual breaking down of old customs in favour of patriarchal usages is taking place. In Northern Nigeria, among the Kona, the women continue to live in their own homes, but instead of being visited

Part of the Report of the Mackie Ethnological Expedition to Central Africa), p. 197.

[1] A. Hutereau, *Notes sur la vie familiale et juridique de quelques populations du Congo Belge* (*Annales du Musée du Congo Belge*), p. 3.

[2] M. de Saegher, "Les coutumes des indigènes de l'État indépendant du Congo," *Bulletin de la Société d'Études Coloniales*, 1894, p. 88. Cf. E. Torday and T. A. Joyce, "Notes on the Ethnography of the Ba-Mbala," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxv, pp. 338, 410; Id., *Les Bushongo*, p. 115.

[3] W. H. Bentley, *Pioneering in the Congo*, vol. ii, p. 44; W. Allen and T. R. H. Thomson, *A Narrative of the Expedition to the River Niger in 1841*, vol. ii, p. 203.

[4] M. Kingsley, *Travels in West Africa*, p. 315.

[5] F.-J. Closel and R. Villamur, *Les coutumes indigènes de la Côte d'Ivoire*, p. 101.

[6] T. Amaury Talbot, *In the Shadow of the Bush*, p. 109.

[7] J. G. Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, vol. ii, p. 602, from a MS. of Mr. H. R. Palmer.

by their husbands, it is they who visit the men at night.[1] Among the Kilba of the same region, the wife returns home after the birth of her first child, and remains there for at least three years; the child lives with his mother's people until it grows up.[2] Similarly among the Fulani, "the husband goes to live with his wife, not the wife with her husband. The first-born son of a Fulani always lives with his mother's kinsfolk till his father dies."[3] With the Kulangas, the women never leave their home;[4] and similarly among the Madi the man is obliged to remove on marriage to his wife's home.[5] In the Nioro district of the French Sudan well-to-do families generally refuse to allow their daughters to leave their home, the husbands come and reside with them.[6] Among the Buduma of Lake Chad, if a man marries into another tribe, the wife "never follows him, but remains with her own people."[7] Among the Baele of the same region the women also never leave their home; a house is built for a married daughter adjoining that of her parents.[8] Among the Nuer of the Upper Nile a woman never goes to live with her husband in his home until at least two years after they have been married.[9] Among the Barabra of Nubia, after the marriage negotiations are concluded, a house is built for the couple in the courtyard of the bride's home.[10] Among the natives of the large region of Darfur, in the Egyptian Sudan, the immemorial custom is for the women to continue in their maternal home after marriage. The husband comes and lives with his wife's people, and during the first year of marriage is regarded as their guest, the wife's father defraying all the expenses of the couple. The husband may after a time set up a household of his own, but never until he has a family of two or three children; should he suggest doing so before that time, his indiscretion is regarded as a justifiable ground for divorce. Indeed, the women are

[1] O. Temple, *Notes on the Tribes, Provinces, Emirates, and States of the Northern Provinces of Nigeria*, p. 237. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 234.

[3] J. G. Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, vol. ii, p. 602, after H. R. Palmer.

[4] L. Tauxier, *Études soudanaises. Le Noir du Yatenga*, p. 217.

[5] R. W. Felkin, "Notes on the Madi, or Moru, Tribe of Central Africa," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, xii, p. 322.

[6] Nicole, "Die Diakite-sarakolesen im Kreise Kita, westlicher Sudan," in S. R. Steinmetz, *Rechtsverhältnisse von eingeborenen Völkern in Afrika und Ozeanien*, p. 102.

[7] P. A. Talbot, "The Buduma of Lake Chad," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xli, p. 248.

[8] G. Nachtigal, *Sahara und Sudan*, vol. ii, p. 177.

[9] H. C. Jackson, "The Nuer of the Upper Nile," *Sudan Notes and Records*, vi, p. 141.

[10] G. W. Murray, "Marriage Ceremonial of the Barabra," *Man*, xvii, p. 108. Cf. Id., "The Ababda," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, liii, p. 420.

extremely reluctant to leave their natal home at any time. It is regarded as highly improper for the marriage to be consummated anywhere but in the wife's home.[1]

The same usages which obtain amongst the Pygmies and the semi-extinct primitive races of Africa are also universal and time-honoured amongst the white races of Northern Africa who now inhabit the Sahara region. Special interest attaches to the social and cultural history of those races; for, according to a view which is held by some of the most eminent anthropologists at the present day, and which appears to gain increasing support with each extension of our knowledge, those populations are the direct representatives of the race which, migrating to the islands and European shores of the Mediterranean, laid there the first foundations of Western civilisation. There are, as we shall see, strong grounds for thinking that the social organisation of the peoples who brought about the earliest European culture was pronouncedly matriarchal in character, and it is, therefore, interesting to find the same type of social organisation still existing among the representatives of their supposed African ancestors. The view which is now generally held and which appears to be most in accordance with the evidence is that, apart from local admixtures of negro blood and from the descendants of the Arab conquerors of the seventh century, all the peoples of Northern Africa west of Egypt belong essentially to one and the same race, which the Greeks called Libyans and which are now generally known as Berbers.[2] They are a white race scarcely differing from the inhabitants of southern Europe, and in the hill regions of the Atlas are so fair that they might easily pass for Irishmen or Scotsmen.[3] The Berbers of Algeria and Tunisia have to a large extent adopted Muslim customs and are now thoroughly patriarchal in their social organisation;[4] but those tribes which withdrew to the interior rather than yield to foreign invasion, and which are known as Tuareg (sing.: Targi), have preserved both their ancient language and their social constitution. "Berber society," says Renan, "is nought else but an example that has survived until our own time of an ancient type of society which formerly covered the whole of the world before the administrative

[1] Muhammad Ibn-Umar Al-Tunisi, *Voyage au Darfour*, pp. 242 sq., 219.

[2] L. L. C. Faidherbe, "Recherches sur les tombeaux mégalithiques de Roknia," *Bulletin de l'Académie d'Hippone*, 1868, p. 7; C. Mannert, *Geographie der Griechen und Römer*, vol. x, p. 573; H. Schirmer, *Le Sahara*, pp. 220 sqq.; C. Tissot, *Géographie comparée de la province romaine d'Afrique* (in P. Thomas, *Exploration scientifique de la Tunisie*), vol. i, p. 445.

[3] D. Randall-Maciver and A. Wilk, *Libyan Notes*, p. 29; E. Barclay, *Mountain Life in Algeria*, p. 36.

[4] A. Hanoteau and A. Letourneux, *La Kabylie et les coutumes Kabyles*, vol. ii, p. 148.

ruler, as in Egypt, or the mighty conqueror, as in Assyria, Persia, or Rome, had arisen." [1]

Among the Tuareg the woman "does not leave her dwelling-place to follow her husband, but he must come to her in her own village." [2] "The relations of man and wife in Aheer (or Aïr, one of the chief centres of the Targi population of the Sahara) are curious if not extraordinary," says Mr. J. Richardson. "A woman never leaves the home of her father. When a man marries a woman he remains with her a few weeks and then, if he will not take up his residence in the town or village of his wife, he must return to his own place without her. When the husbands visit them they give them something to eat, and they remain a few days or weeks, and again depart to their own native town, leaving the wife with her property and any chance lover. But the men marry two or three wives, and so are constantly in motion, first going to visit one wife and then another." [3] Descent, among the Tuareg, is reckoned in the female line and the child takes the condition of his mother; a man's property and titles are handed down not to his children, but to his sister's children.[4] They regard themselves, as we do, as descended from the first woman, Eve, but in their case there is no Adam.[5] Their ancestors in Roman times, the Numidians, had the same customs. They were named after their mothers; 'mas' means 'son of,' and the son of Gula was called Masinissa, that is, 'Son of Issa.' His sons were Misagenas, Micipsa, Masgaba. Iugurtha was the son of a slave woman, and therefore bore his father's name, but his sons were called after their mothers.[6] The women retain complete control of their property after marriage, and are not obliged to contribute towards the husband's household expenses, nor do they consent to do so. Each is thus economically quite independent. Most of the property is accumulated in the hands of the women.[7] An old German poet who accompanied some crusading expedition mentions that in Tunis "it is the women and not the men who inherit property." [8] The matriarchal character of Targi society was noticed by the first traveller who described them in modern times, the Arab Ibn

[1] E. Renan, "La Société Berbère," *Revue des Deux Mondes*, cvii (1873), pp. 154 sq.

[2] H. Barth, *Travels and Discoveries in Africa*, vol. i, p. 340.

[3] J. Richardson, *Narrative of a Mission to Central Africa*, vol. ii, pp. 103 sq.

[4] H. Duveyrier, *Les Touaregs du Nord*, p. 397; H. Barth, *Travels and Discoveries in Africa*, vol. i, p. 341.

[5] H. Duveyrier, *op. cit.*, p. 397.

[6] M. J. de Goeje, "De Berbers," *De Gids*, July 1867, pp. 27 sq.

[7] H. Duveyrier, *op. cit.*, pp. 339 sq.; V. Largeau, *Le Sahara algérien. Les déserts de l'Erg*, p. 277.

[8] J. Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer*, p. 408.

Batuta. "The women," he says, "are exceedingly beautiful, and they are of more consequence than the men. The character of these people is indeed strange, for they are quite impervious to jealousy. None is named after his father, but each derives his descent from his uncle on the mother's side. Only a man's sister's children inherit from him, to the exclusion of his own children. . . . As regards the women, they are not timid in the presence of men, nor do they cover their faces with a veil, although they are zealous at their prayers. Whoso wishes to marry any of them may do so, but the women do not follow their husbands, and should any of them wish to do so, her relatives would prevent it." [1]

The position which women occupy among the Berber races of the Sahara has been commented on by every traveller. Among the Berber tribes of Morocco "the independence of the women is a cause of scandal." The girls marry whom they please without consulting anyone, and the alliance is officially promulgated by the announcement that "So-and-so, daughter of So-and-so, has taken Such-a-one as her husband." [2] In the Tibbu country, in the Eastern Sahara "it is man and his mistress, and not woman and her master." The Tibbu ladies do not even allow their spouses to enter the house without previously sending word to announce their visit. The women transact all the trade and manage all affairs. "The Tibbu women, indeed, are everything and their men nothing—idling and lounging their time, and kicked about by their wives as so many drones of society. The women maintain the men as a race of stallions, and not from love of them, but to preserve the Tibbu race from extinction." [3] Among the northern Tuareg what strikes one most, says Duveyrier, is "the preponderant part played by the women." [4] "In all matters, their word is law." [5] The culture of the Tuareg is almost exclusively confined to the women; the men are entirely illiterate, but the women have artistic and literary tastes, and it is in their hands alone that is preserved the knowledge of the ancient Libyan tongue and of the script which is identical with that of the most ancient inscriptions of North Africa, and presents a striking affinity to that of Minoan Krete and the as yet undeciphered inscriptions of the Aegean.[6] "In all their historical traditions, the women in-

[1] *The Travels of Ibn Batuta*, tr. S. Lee, p. 234.
[2] R. de Segonzac, *Voyages au Maroc*, pp. 87 sq.
[3] J. Richardson, *Travels in the Great Sahara*, vol. ii, pp. 343 sq.
[4] H. Duveyrier, *op. cit.*, p. 334.
[5] F. Foureau, *Documents scientifiques de la mission saharienne*, vol. ii, p. 847.
[6] H. Duveyrier, *op. cit.*, pp. 339 sq.: E. Renan, "La Société Berbère," *Revue des deux mondes*, cvii (1873), p. 140. Cf. below, p. 396, note [1].

variably play the principal part." [1] Among the southern Targi tribes, says M. de Zeltner, " the women are consulted in the important affairs of life and their influence is very great, as has been observed of the Berbers. In short, it is no exaggeration to describe Targi society as a gynaecocracy." [2]

The Malay race, which has spread over the whole Indonesian region and has sent offshoots westward as far as Madagascar, northwards to Formosa and China, and in early days to Polynesia, has for centuries come under the influence of Hindu and Islamic religions. The Malays, nevertheless, always distinguish between the laws and customs of their adopted religion and their own ancient traditional law, known as ' adat,' and they cling with considerable persistence to the latter. The old form of marriage, known as ' ambil anak,' is among most Malay populations preferred to the patrilocal marriage by purchase, or ' jujul,' which has been introduced by Islam. " Immediately after his marriage a Malay husband settles down to live in his father-in-law's house." Where there is but one daughter in the family, or in the case of a younger daughter, her parents commonly give up the house to her and go and live in an annex.[3] " The married man becomes entirely separate from his original family and gives up his right of inheritance." [4] Chinese travellers of the time of the Ming dynasty (1368–1643) had noted that among the Malays of Sumatra " in marrying, the husband goes to the house of the wife and afterwards belongs to her family ; therefore they prefer getting girls to boys." [5] Malay tradition, as well as historical indications, represent the highlands of middle Sumatra as the cradle of the nation, and their inhabitants, the Menangkabau—a name probably derived from the Sanskrit ' pinang khabu,' ' the land of origin ' [6]—as the original and pure Malays. The Rajahs of Menangkabau were once supreme over Sumatra, and were known as Maha Raja de Raja, or King of

[1] H. Duveyrier, *op. cit.*, p. 400.

[2] F. de Zeltner, " Les Touaregs du Sud," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliv, p. 359. Cf. Leone Africano, in Ramusio, *Navigationi et Viaggi*, vol. ii, fol. 72 ; H. Barth, *Travels and Discoveries in North and Central Africa*, vol. v, p. 183 ; J. Chavanne, *Die Sahara*, pp. 181, 209 sq. ; J. Aymard, *Les Touaregs*, pp. 92 sqq. ; V. Largeau, *Le Sahara algérien. Les déserts de l'Erg*, pp. 277 sq.

[3] R. J. Wilkinson, *Papers on Malay Subjects. Life and Customs.* Part i. *The Incidents of Malay Life*, p. 38.

[4] W. Marsden, *The History of Sumatra*, p. 236 ; cf. pp. 235, 262 sq. ; E. A. Francis, " Benkoelen in 1833," *Tijdschrift voor Nederlands-Indië*, iv, Deel i, pp. 441 sq.

[5] W. P. Groeneveldt, " Notes on the Malay Archipelago and Malacca compiled from Chinese Sources," *Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch genootschap van kunsten en wetenschappen*, xxxix (1880), p. 77.

[6] M. Joustra, in J. C. van Eerde, *De Volken van Nederlandsch Indië*, vol. i, p. 151.

Kings.[1] In the year 1160 men from Menangkabau migrated across the straits and founded the city of Singapore; and at the present day the inhabitants of the Negri Sembilan State, in the Malay Peninsula, still call themselves Orang Menangkabau, the Men of Menangkabau.[2] In the secluded highlands of Padang, the Menangkabau communities preserve unmodified to this day the original social constitution and customs of the race. Tylor thus paraphrases from the account of them given by the Dutch Controlleur, Verkerk Pistorius: "The traveller, following the narrow paths among dense tropical vegetation, comes upon villages of long timber houses almost hidden among the foliage. Built on posts, adorned with carved and coloured woodwork and heavily thatched, these houses duplicate themselves into barrack-like rows of dwellings occupied, it may be, by over a hundred people, forming a 'Sa-mandei,' or 'Motherhood,' consisting of the old house-mother and her descendants in the female line, sons and daughters, daughter's children, and so on. If the visitor, mounting the ladder-steps, looks in at one of the doors of the separate dwellings, he may see seated beyond the family hearth the mother and her children eating the midday meal, and very likely the father, who may be doing a turn of work in his wife's rice-plot. If he is a kindly husband he is much there as a friendly visitor, though his real home remains the house where he was born. To the European the social situation wears a comic aspect, as when the Dutch Controller describes the 'chassez-croisez' which take place at dusk when the husbands walk across the village from their homes to join their wives."[3] There is nothing to prevent a man having several wives; in which case he visits them in turn in their various homes.[4] "The Malay family, properly so-called, the 'Motherhood,'" writes Pistorius, "consists of the mother and her children. The father does not form part of it. The bonds of kinship which unite the latter to his brothers and sisters are much closer than those between him and his wife and children. Both the man and the woman continue after their marriage to live in the family of their brothers and sisters. The husband is not charged either with the feeding or the maintenance of his wife and children; that obligation falls on the maternal family to whom the wife and children belong. The head of the family is usually the brother

[1] W. Marsden, *The History of Sumatra*, pp. 327 sqq.; J. Crawfurd, *History of the Indian Archipelago*, vol. ii, p. 374; S. de Graaff and D. G. Stibbe, in *Encyclopædie van Nederlandsch-Indië*, vol. ii, p. 739; R. O. Winstedt, *Malaya*, pp. 126 sq.

[2] F. Junghuhn, *Die Battaländer auf Sumatra*, vol. ii, p. 347.

[3] E. B. Tylor, "The Matriarchal Family System," *The Nineteenth Century*, July 1896, pp. 90 sq.

[4] J. C. van Eerde, "Een huwelijk bij de Minangkabausche Maleiers," *Tijdschrift voor Indische taal-, land- en volkenkunde*, xxvi, p. 462.

of the mother, called 'mamak'; he has the administration of the goods, but, according to custom, it is his sister who keeps the family valuables and money in her room. The family property is inalienable within the motherhood. The belongings of a Malay pass at his death to his maternal family—first to his brothers and sisters, after to the children of his sisters, but never to his wife and the children that are born of her." [1]

The original archaic Malay populations thus present a more primitive form of the matrilocal marriage institutions which are prevalent among the whole Malay race. In various branches of that race, and often, indeed, in the same district, every conceivable transition between the primitive 'Motherhood' of the Menangkabau and the patriarchal form of marriage of Islam where a man has full 'patria potestas' over his children may be observed. In the Indragiri district of North Sumatra the same unmodified matriarchal organisation is found as in Padang highlands. Among the Orang Mamaq, who are divided into strictly exogamous clans, both the husband and the wife remain after marriage in their own clan. They very seldom live together: when they do the husband comes over to his wife's clan and lives with her. Husband and wife do not form one family; the household consists of the woman, her brothers, and her children. In the view of the Orang Mamaq there exists no relationship between a father and his children; the latter inherit from their mother's brother. In the Tiga Loerong district husband and wife do usually live together, but their home is the wife's, the husband passing over to her clan. He has, nevertheless, no power over his children, who do not inherit from him, but from their uncle.[2] Similar usages are found among the Malays of Tapong and Siak. The wives never leave their native village, while their husbands come over from another village and place themselves under the orders of the clan-chief of their wife's clan.[3]

The same rules which mark the original social organisation of

[1] A. W. P. Verkerk Pistorius, *Studien over de inlandische huishouding in de Padangsche bovenlande*, pp. 42 sqq., 82 sq. Cf. A. L. van Hasselt, *Volksbeschrijving van Midden-Sumatra*, pp. 245 sqq.; G. A. Wilken, *De verspreide geschriften*, vol. i, pp. 313 sqq.; G. D. Willinck, *Het rechtsleven bij Minangkabausche Maleiers* (Leyden, 1909); J. L. van der Toorn, "Aanteekennigen uit het familienleven bij den Maleier in de Padangsche bovenlanden," *Tijdschrift voor Indische taal-, land- en volkenkunde*, xxvi, pp. 208 sq.; M. Joustra, in J. C. van Eerde, *De volken van Nederlandsch-Indië*, vol. i, pp. 152 sqq.

[2] A. F. P. Graafland, "De verbreiding van het matriarchaat in het Landschap Indragiri," *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, 5e Serie, xxxix, pp. 42 sqq.

[3] J. A. van Rijn van Alkemale, "Verslag eener reis van Siak naar Pija Kombo," *Tijdschrift van het Kon. Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig Genootschap*, 2e Serie, ii, p. 211.

the Malays obtain among the very primitive races which inhabit the almost inaccessible forests of Eastern Sumatra. Among the Sakai, tribal organisation is "strictly matriarchal." The men have no possessions, and take up their abode for a longer or shorter time in the house of a woman. "The woman can simply send away her husbands; house, children, and furniture remain in every case the property of the woman." The man, too, can go away when he chooses, but he is obliged to refund the expenses incurred for his maintenance by his wife's family.[1] Similar customs are observed by the Malays of Rantau-Binuwang.[2] Among the Atjehs, who occupy the western part of Sumatra, the women never leave their paternal home after marriage.[3]

The customs of the Malay race have passed with it over to the mainland. "In Negri Sembilan, land tenure, contract and succession to property are still governed mainly by the matriarchal law of Menangkabau."[4] "A man marrying into another tribe becomes a member of it; the children also belong to the tribe of the woman."[5] In the Binua tribes of Johore also the man joins the family of his wife, and she never leaves it to follow him.[6]

Matrilocal marriage is the rule among the primitive races of Timor,[7] of the neighbouring islands of the Southern Moluccas,[8]

[1] M. Moszkowski, "The Pagan Races of East Sumatra," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1909, pp. 715 sq.; Id., *Auf neuen Wegen durch Sumatra*, p. 105.

[2] J. A. van Rijn van Alkemale, "Beschrijving eener reis van Bengkalis langs de Rokan-rivier naar Rantau-Binoewang," *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, 4e Serie, viii, p. 45.

[3] C. Snouck Hurgronje, *De Atjehers*, vol. i, pp. 46, 357; H. T. Damste, in J. C. van Eerde, *De Volken van Nederlandsch Indië*, vol. i, p. 64.

[4] R. O. Winstedt, *Malaya*, p. 107; cf. p. 85.

[5] T. J. Newbold, *Political and Statistical Account of the British Settlements in the Straits of Malacca*, vol. ii, p. 123.

[6] J. R. Logan, "The Biduanda Kallang of the River Pulai in Johore," *Journal of the Indian Archipelago*, i, p. 270.

[7] N. O. Forbes, "On some Tribes of the Island of Timor," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xiii, pp. 414, 416; P. J. Veth, "Het eiland Timor," *De Gids*, 1885, pp. 38 sq.; A. C. Krujt, "De Timoreezen," *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, lxxix, pp. 358 sq., 367; J. C. van Eerde, *De Volken van Nederlandsch Indië*, vol. ii, p. 414; A. de Castro, "Résumé historique de l'établissement portugais à Timor," *Tijdschrift voor Indische taal-, land- en volkenkunde*, xi, p. 481.

[8] H. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua*, pp. 206 (Watu Bela), 251 (Aru), 324 (Luang Sermata), 447 (Wetar); K. Martin, *Reisen in den Molukken, in Ambon, den Uliassern, Seran (Ceram) und Buru*, p. 154; A. van Ekris, "Iets over Ceram en de Alfoeren," *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, N.V., i, p. 80; E. W. A. Ludeking, "Schets van de Residentie Amboina," *ibid.*, 3e Serie, iii, p. 63; P. Drabbe, "Het heidensch huwelijk op Tanimbar," *ibid.*, lxxix, p. 559.

and in Celebes.[1] In the Northern Moluccas, as in Java, Islamic marriage customs have now become universal; but in the islands of Sangir and Talau, between Celebes and the Philippines, "the man always goes to the house of his wife and becomes a member of her family." [2]

In Borneo, among both Land- and Sea-Dayaks, it is the rule that the husband takes up his residence with the family of his wife; often he is merely a visitor there. To this rule there are but few exceptions, as when, owing to the large number of brothers and sisters, the wife's home is too crowded to accommodate the husband, or when he is the only support of aged relatives.[3] Thus in British North Borneo "after marriage the bridegroom becomes the liege-man of his wife's family, dwelling in his father-in-law's house for at least six months; but in districts such as Tuara and Pape, where the common village home has been abolished, he is allowed to move after the period and build a house of his own." [4] In the Kenya and Kayan tribes the husband takes up his residence in the same room as his wife's people; he does not take his wife to his own home until his father dies, or a new house is built. If the woman be of noble birth she never in any circumstances leaves her home for that of her husband.[5]

In the Philippines likewise it was the general native custom for the women to continue in their own home after marriage, their husbands joining them there.[6] Among the wild Igorots of Bontoc, when a girl marries, a hut is built for her and her husband adjoining that of her parents.[7] Similarly among the Bila-an and the Mandaya of Mindanao, the husband takes up his quarters with his wife's people, either until he has a family of his own or for an indefinite number of years.[8] It was noted as a strange circumstance

[1] N. Adriani and A. C. Kruijt, *De Bare'e-sprekende Toradjas in Midden Celebes*, vol. ii, pp. 23 sqq.; N. Adriani, "Mededeelingen omtrent de Toradjas van Midden Celebes," *Tijdschrift voor Indische taal-, land- en volkenkunde*, xliv, p. 237; F. Treffers, "Het landschap Laiwoei in Z. O. Celebes en zijne bevolking," *Tijdschrift van het Koninklijk Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig Genootschap*, 2e Serie, xxx, pp. 209 sq.

[2] S. J. Hickson, "Notes on The Sengirese," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xvi, p. 138.

[3] Spencer St. John, *Life in the Forests of the Far East*, vol. i, pp. 50, 52, 162; H. Ling Roth, *The Natives of Sarawak and British North Borneo*, vol. i, p. 124; C. A. L. M. Schwaner, *Borneo*, vol. i, pp. 198 sq.; A. W. Nieuwenhuis, *In Central Borneo*, vol. i, p. 74; E. H. Gomes, *Seventeen Years among the Sea-Dayaks of Borneo*, p. 122.

[4] O. Rutter, *British North Borneo*, pp. 306 sq.

[5] C. Hose and W. MacDougall, *The Pagan Tribes of Borneo*, vol. i, p. 76. vol. ii, pp. 174 sq.; A. W. Nieuwenhuis, *Quer durch Borneo*, vol. i, p. 74.

[6] R. Reyes Lala, *The Philippine Islands*, pp. 90 sq.; F. Jagor, *Reisen in den Philippinen*, p. 235; F. Cañamaque, *Las islas Filipinas*, pp. 186 sq.

[7] A. E. Jenks, *The Bontoc Igorots*, p. 68.

[8] F. Cole *The Wild Tribes of Davao District, Mindanao*, pp. 144, 192.

by the early Spanish conquerors that among the wildest tribes, whom they called 'Pintados,' on account of the tatuings with which their bodies were covered, the men "love their wives so dearly that in case of a quarrel they take sides with their wives' relations even against their own fathers and mothers";[1] that is to say, as is the rule with matrilocal peoples, the husband fought with his wife's clan and not with his own.

The natives of the Micronesian region, the Carolines with the exception of Yap, the Marshall, Mortlock, Pelew, and Gilbert Islands, are matriarchal in their social organisation. Thus in the Pelew Islands "the meaning of the family is different from our conception, and has reference to female descent," the head of the family is the oldest female, 'adhalal a blay,' the 'Mother of the family,' and the head of each district is 'adhalal a pelu,' the 'Mother of the Land'; all landed property is in the hands of the women, and a man's property goes not to his sons, but to his sister's children.[2] Marriage is throughout the region essentially matrilocal, although the rule may in some islands not be strictly adhered to when inconvenient. In the Pelew Islands a man is under the obligation to reside at least for a time in his wife's home, and she may not be confined anywhere else.[3] In Ponapé matrilocal marriage is the rule.[4] In Yap a man visits his wives in their various homes.[5] In the Gilbert Islands, "on marriage a man always removes to the house of his wife. If he marries the eldest daughter, her parents give up the home to her and build themselves a new house in the neighbourhood."[6] In the Mortlock Islands the husband has his field in one part of the reef and passes backwards and forwards across the lagoon, to and from his wife's home in another part, lending a hand to the cultivation of her patch.[7]

Similarly in the western islands of Torres Straits, where matrilocal marriage is the rule, it is common for men to marry in another island and to divide their time between their own plantation and that of their wife, crossing backwards and forwards at different seasons of the year between the two islands. If the husband, in later life, settles down in a more permanent manner, it is usually in the home of his wife.[8]

[1] M. de Loarca, 'A Treatise on the Philippine Islands," in E. M. Blair and J. A. Robertson, *The Philippine Islands, 1493–1893*, vol. v, p. 119.

[2] J. S. Kubary, *Die socialen Einrichtungen der Pelauer*, pp. 35, 38.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 55. [4] F. W. Christian, *The Caroline Islands*, p. 74.

[5] A. Senfft, "Die Rechtsitten der Jap-Eingeborenen," *Globus*, xci, p. 141.

[6] A. Brandeis, "Ethnographische Beobachtungen über die Nauru-Insularen," *Globus*, xci, p. 57. Cf. Tutuila, "The Line Islanders," *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, i, p. 271.

[7] J. Kubary, "Die Bewohner der Mortlock Inseln," *Mittheilungen der geographischen Gesellschaft in Hamburg*, 1878–79, pp. 245, 252, 260.

[8] A. C. Haddon, in *Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits*, vol. v, pp. 225, 229 sq.

A very similar state of things is found amongst the natives of Dutch New Guinea, in the Doreh region. A man is usually to be found dwelling in a hut with one woman; but he has other wives in some neighbouring village or island, and divides his time between the several households with which he is connected by marriage.[1] Similar arrangements obtain at the opposite, that is, the south-eastern, extremity of the large island; a man has a number of wives whom he visits in turn in the various villages where they dwell. That arrangement which has been already noted in several parts of the world, and which may be called a polyaecious form of marriage, is very clearly described, as practised by his countrymen, by a semi-civilised native of the Dobu region of New Guinea. "Suppose," he reports, "you reside at a village called A, one of your wives will be a woman belonging to the village B, another to C, the third to D, the fourth to E, and the fifth to F. No one of them can be of your town, A; the A women are forbidden to you. And each of those five wives of yours stays in her own town; she does not come to yours. Her house is built in her town, and you dwell in your house in A. But it is your business to go and visit them at B, C, D, E, and F, and plant food in each of those places. And as for the children of these women, they belong to the town and tribe of their mother, so that you have no children at all in A, and your line is extinct in your own town. But if you have a sister, and a man marries her, he does not take her away to his own town. Her house is built near yours in A, and her children are not counted to her husband's tribe or clan; they are counted to yours. Thus your own children go to other tribes, but your sister's children come to yours."[2] The natives of Motu, in British Papua, have similar arrangements; they visit their wives in neighbouring villages in the same manner as those of Doreh and Dobu.[3] In the Wagawaga district husbands take up their abode permanently in the homes of their wives.[4] Matrilocal marriage would thus appear to be the typical native usage in most parts of New Guinea, although there are great gaps in our information concerning the various parts of that vast island. There are instances in several regions of a state of transition from matrilocal to patrilocal usages. Thus in some parts of Dutch New Guinea a man may take his wife to his home for a year, after which she returns to hers, where

[1] F. J. F. van Hasselt, "Die Noeforezen," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, viii, p. 185.

[2] G. Brown, *Melanesians and Polynesians*, p. 119.

[3] W. Y. Turner, "On the Ethnology of the Motu," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, vii, p. 475.

[4] J. Hennesy, in *Annual Report on British New Guinea for* 1893-94, p. 80.

he visits her. The fundamental matrilocal character of their customs is significantly indicated by the fact that no boy can go through the puberty ceremonies unless he has resided for a time with his mother's family.[1] Among the Massim tribes of eastern New Guinea all degrees of transitions and, as it were, hesitations between matrilocal and patrilocal marriage customs occur; it is incumbent on the men to spend some time in the wife's family and to make a garden there, but they also cultivate a patch round their own homes, and they spend the first years of their married life in a semi-migratory existence between the two homes.[2]

In New Zealand a young man on marriage "continued to live with his father-in-law, being looked upon as one of the tribe, or 'hapu,' to which his wife belonged, and in case of war the son-in-law was often obliged to fight against his own relations. So common is the custom of the bridegroom going to live with his wife's family that it frequently occurs, when he refuses to do so, that his wife will leave him and go back to her relatives. Several instances came under my notice," says Mr. Taylor, "where young men have tried to break through this custom and have lost their wives in consequence."[3] Often both the men and the women continued to live with their own relatives, the husbands visiting their wives from time to time.[4] In Samoa likewise it was usual for the husband to take up his abode in the home of his wife.[5] He became an absolute bond-slave to his mother-in-law.[6] In the Ellice Islands the husband lived with his wife's mother until the combined families grew too large for the hut.[7] In Raratonga, if a woman married a man belonging to the same island, she went to live with him; but if she married a man from another island, he had to come and live with her.[8] In the Hervey or Cook

[1] M. Moszkowski, "Die Völkerstämme am Mamberano in Holländisch-Neuguinea und auf den vorgelagerten Inseln," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xliii, pp. 322 sq.

[2] C. G. Seligman, *The Melanesians of British New Guinea*, pp. 506, 508 sq.

[3] R. Taylor, *Te Ika a Maui, or New Zealand and its Inhabitants*, p. 164. Cf. E. Tregear, "The Maoris of New Zealand," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xix, p. 103; E. Best, "Maori Marriage Customs," *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute*, xxxvi, p. 64.

[4] F. Müller, in *Reise der oesterreichischen Fregatte Novara, Anthropologischer Theil*, vol. iii, p. 58.

[5] G. Kurze, "Die Samoanen in den heidnischen Zeit," *Mitteilungen der geographischen Gesellschaft (für Thüringen) zu Iena*, xix, p. 3; G. Brown, *Melanesians and Polynesians*, pp. 42 sq.

[6] J. Fraser, "Some Folk-songs and Myths from Samoa," *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales*, xxv, p. 83 n.

[7] Mrs. Edgeworth David, *Fufunati*, p. 167; C. Hedley, "The Atoll of Fufunati, Ellice Group," *Memoirs of the Australian Museum*, iii, Part iii, p. 53.

[8] F. J. Moss, "The Maori Polity in the Island of Raratonga," *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, iii, p. 23.

Islands, if the wife were a chief's daughter, it was compulsory that the husband should take up his domicile in her home ; his children belonged to her clan, and both they and their father were under the obligation to fight with the mother's clan, even against that of the husband's father.[1] Similar matrilocal usages have been noted in the Marquesas,[2] in Bowditch Island,[3] and in Rotuma.[4]

In the Nicobar Islands " until he marries, a man considers himself a member of his father's household, but after that event he calls himself the son of his father-in-law, and he becomes a member of his wife's family, leaving the house of his parents, or even the village, if the women dwells elsewhere." [5]

Among the Ainu of Japan, one of the most primitive races of Asia, the native usage is for the women to remain in their own home, and for their husbands to join them there, although at the present day, where contact with the Japanese is closest, a woman may sometimes join her husband in his home after some years, but never before the birth of a child.[6] According to the older usage " the bridegroom is removed from his own family to take up his abode close to the hut of his father-in-law ; he is, in fact, adopted." [7] The Ainu, we are informed, " do not like to give their daughters into another family, but prefer to adopt the son-in-law." [8] Where a man has several wives, they remain each in her own home.[9] In the Kuril Islands, which are inhabited by a branch of the same race which has not come under Japanese influence, the primitive customs are regularly maintained ; a man does not live with his wives, but merely visits them in their homes.[10]

Among all the peoples of northern and of central Asia no custom is more persistently and strictly observed than that which requires the bridegroom to reside for a more or less prolonged period in his wife's family, or that the bride, after a short residence with her husband, shall return for a prolonged period to her own home. Those customs, which are similar to the practices now observed in some parts of New Guinea and Africa which, to our knowledge,

[1] W. W. Gill, *The South Pacific and New Guinea*, p. 14.

[2] Mathias Garcia, *Lettres sur les Îles Marquises*, p. 113.

[3] J. J. Lister, "Notes on the Natives of Fakaofu (Bowditch Island), Union Group," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxi, p. 54.

[4] J. S. Gardiner, " The Natives of Rotuma," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxvii, p. 485.

[5] C. Boden Kloss, *In the Andamans and Nicobars*, p. 236.

[6] H. von Siebold, *Ethnologischen Studien über die Aino auf der Insel Yesso*, p. 31.

[7] J. Batchelor, *The Ainu and their Folk-Lore*, p. 225.

[8] M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, p. 102 n. ; from a personal communication from Mr. Pilsudski.

[9] J. Batchelor, *op. cit.*, p. 231.

[10] S. P. Krasheninnikoff, *The History of Kamtchatka, and the Kurilski Islands*, p. 237.

are in a state of transition from recent matrilocal to patrilocal usages, suggest that they are survivals of a time when marriage throughout those parts of Asia was also permanently matrilocal. And that inference is confirmed when it is found that among several of them this is, in fact, the case. At the present day the Yakut, the most numerous and widespread of those Siberian races, visit their wives for several years in their homes, and many children are usually born before a separate home is set up.[1] Travelling in their country in the eighteenth century, the French consular agent Lesseps, thus described their practice: "Polygamy is a social institution amongst them. Being obliged to make frequent journeys from place to place, they have a wife in each of the places where they stay, and they never gather them together in one home."[2] "Each wife of a polygynous Yakut," says Troshchanski, "lived separately with her children, and relations and cattle; during the frequent absences of her husband she was actually the head of the family."[3] Among the Chukchi of the extreme north-east of Asia, every man, no matter how rich he may be, is obliged to take up his residence for a considerable time, often for several years, during which he begets a considerable family, with his wife's people; at times he becomes a permanent member of it.[4] In the neighbouring Aleutian Islands, wives remained for at least one or two years after marriage in their own home, and never in any circumstances left it until they had a child.[5] It has been noted as a "singular custom" of the natives of Kamchatka that a man is there obliged to take up his residence in his wife's home and to serve her family in the capacity of a slave for from one to ten years; after that period of probation the husband "lives with his father-in-law as if he were his own son."[6] It was usual to marry all the sisters of the family, or several cousins.[7] Among the Koryak likewise the young husband was obliged to take up his residence in the home of his wife, where he might remain

[1] W. G. Sumner, "The Yakuts, abridged from the Russian of Sieroshevski," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxi, p. 94; M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, pp. 107 sq., 114, 197 n.

[2] *Journal historique du voyage de M. de Lesseps du Kamtschatka en France*, vol. ii, p. 285.

[3] M. A. Czaplicka, *op. cit.*, p. 197 n.

[4] W. Bogoras, *The Chukchee* (*Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. vii), pp. 586 sq.

[5] W. H. Dall, *Alaska and its Resources*, p. 402; J. G. Georgi, *Description de toutes les nations de l'Empire de Russie*, vol. ii, p. 203; A. Erman, "Ethnographische Wahrnehmungen und Erfahrungen an der Küsten des Berings-Meeres," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, iii, p. 162.

[6] P. Dobell, *Travels in Kamtchatka and Siberia*, vol. i, p. 82.

[7] G. W. Steller, *Beschreibung von dem Lande Kamtchatka*, pp. 343, 346; J. G. Georgi, *Description de toutes les nations de l'Empire de Russie*, vol. iii, p. 77.

five or ten years.[1] The same customs obtain among the Yukaghir; the bridegroom is accepted by the bride's father only on condition, the latter solemnly declares, that "he will stay with me till the end of my life, till death." The husband frequently succeeds his father-in-law as head of the house.[2] Among the Tungus the newly married couple were wont to remain for at least two years after their marriage with the bride's father; after that time the latter presented them with a 'yurta' of their own. There is little doubt that marriage was with them originally entirely matrilocal, for their social constitution was matriarchal, all relationship being counted on the female side only. "They are a very ferocious people," writes an old Chinese historian; "in a fit of rage they would kill a father or an elder brother, but never hurt their mother, because the mother was considered the fountain of kinship."[3] Among the Buryat, a Mongolic tribe of southern Siberia, the bride after marriage returns home for six months or more, and those visits are several times repeated until she finally settles down in her husband's home. We are definitely informed by Buryat tradition that it was formerly the usage for the husband to take up his abode permanently in the home of his wife.[4] Among the Samoyeds the women return home after marriage, but only for a few weeks.[5] The custom that the bride should return to her home for a longer or shorter period, after a brief honeymoon, is common among all the Tartar populations of Central Asia. She remains with her parents sometimes for as long as two years, and during that period her husband only pays clandestine visits to her during the night.[6] Similar customs are observed in the Caucasus. Among the Chevsurs the bride never spends more than three days with her husband, after which she returns home and is secretly visited by him.[7] Among the Ossetes the wife returns to her own home after some months, and the husband must come and formally

[1] W. Jochelson, *The Koryak* (*Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. vi), pp. 739, 746; G. Kennan, *Tent-Life in Siberia*, pp. 152 sqq.; S. P. Krasheninnikof, *The History of Kamtchatka*, p. 237.

[2] W. Jochelson, *The Yukaghir and the Yukaghirised Tungus* (*Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. ix), pp. 88 sqq.

[3] E. H. Parker, "The History of the Wei-Wan, or Wei-Whan, Tunguses of the First Century," *The Chinese Review*, xx, p. 73.

[4] M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, pp. 119 sq.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 124.

[6] J. B. Fraser, *A Winter's Journey from Constantinople to Tehran*, vol. ii, p. 372; A. Burnes, *Travels into Bokhara*, vol. ii, p. 48; A. Vambery, *Sketches of Central Asia*, p. 109; Id., *Travels in Central Asia*, p. 323.

[7] G. Radde, *Die Chewsûren und ihr Land*, pp. 88 sq.; N. von Seidlitz, "Gemeinde- und Familienleben der Chewsuren," *Das Ausland*, 1891, p. 320; M. Kovalewski, "La famille matriarcale au Caucase," *L'Anthropologie*, iv, p. 272.

claim her once more.[1] The same usage is observed by the Votyak, and the transfer of the bride, after she has given birth to a child in her own home, is attended with the same ceremonial as the original wedding.[2] Among the nomadic tribes of Afghanistan it is usual for the husband to join the family of his wife, at least for a certain period.[3]

In several parts of China are various aboriginal populations of non-Chinese race. One of those tribes, the Nue'Kun, is said to be permanently ruled by a woman, the supreme authority being confined to the female descendants of the ruling family.[4] Among the more secluded of those tribes, in the mountains of Kwei-Chow, marriage is matrilocal; after ten years of married life a man sometimes removes from his wife's family to a household of his own. In the populations of the lowlands, such as the Lunk-Tsung-Ye-Yan,[5] and the Miao,[6] which have come in closer contact with the Chinese, the wife remains in her home until the birth of the first child. In south-western China, among the Lolo, the claims of the husband to remove his wife to his home are emphatically asserted, but are associated with a significant indication of other customs. The bride is brought to the house of her father-in-law, but "the remarkable particularity amongst the Lolo is that invariably, some days after marriage, the bride escapes and runs home to her father's house." The husband must use entreaties and offer presents to win her back; if she prove obdurate, he has the recognised right to use a stick.[7]

Throughout the eastern peninsula of southern Asia—that is, among the peoples of Siam, Burma, Indo-China and Tonkin—marriage customs are characteristically matrilocal. Thus in Burma, "after marriage the couple almost always live for two or three years in the house of the bride's parents, the son-in-law becoming one of the family and contributing to its support. Setting up a separate establishment even in Rangoon, where the young husband is a clerk in an English office, is looked upon with disfavour as a piece of pride and ostentation. If the girl is an only daughter, she and her husband stay on till the old people die."[8]

[1] C. von Hahn, "Die Täler der 'Grossen Ljachwa' und Ksanka (Ksan) und das südliche Ossetien," *Globus*, lxxxviii, p. 24.

[2] J. G. Georgi, *Description de toutes les nations de l'Empire de Russie*, vol. i, p. 71.

[3] H. W. Bellew, *Journal of a Political Mission to Afghanistan*, vol. i, p. 27; M. Elphinstone, *An Account of the Kingdom of Caubul*, vol. i, p. 240.

[4] J. Gray, *China*, vol. ii, p. 307.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 304.

[6] J. Kohler, *Rechtsvergleichende Studien*, p. 187.

[7] A. Henry, "The Lolos and other Tribes of Western China," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxiii, pp. 105 sq.

[8] Shway Yoe, *The Burman: his Life and Notions*, vol. i, p. 70.

In Siam, after the marriage negotiations are completed, it is the first duty of the bride's father to provide a home for the couple. "It is customary to erect the building near the home of the bride's father; hence a newly married young man is scarcely ever to be found with his own father, but with his father-in-law." Until after the birth of the first child all the expenses of the young couple fall to the charge of the bride's father.[1] The rule of matrilocal marriage is the primitive usage of all the peoples of Cochin China. It is falling into disuse among the more advanced populations of Annam and Cambodia, where in the more conservative families the bridegroom is merely required to reside with his wife's family for about a year.[2] But among the more unsophisticated tribes of northern Tonkin, whence the Annamites and Cambodians derive, the usage is general and strictly observed. Thus among the Moï, the most important and numerous of those groups of tribes, "a girl who marries does not leave her parents; it is, on the contrary, the husband who comes to dwell with his wife, unless he is rich enough to provide a slave as a compensation in her stead."[3] The bride is taken on a visit of five or ten days to the home of her father-in-law, but the marriage may not be consummated there. After the visit the couple return in state to the bride's home and settle there permanently. If, as is usual, there are several wives, they are commonly sisters; but if another wife is taken in another family, she also remains in her own home, and the husband divides his time between the homes of his various wives. An arrangement may, however, be made, if the second wife is not in good circumstances and has not a comfortable home, for the first wife to invite her to come and share her house with the husband and her sisters.[4] Similar customs are observed by the other primitive populations of northern Tonkin, such as the Thaï, the Man, the Muong, the Pateng.[5]

[1] C. Bock, *Temples and Elephants*, p. 183; cf. J. Bowring, *The Kingdom and People of Siam*, pp. 118 sq.; E. Young, *The Kingdom of the Yellow Robe*, p. 98; Pallegroix, *Description du Royaume de Thaïs, ou Siam*, vol. i, p. 230.

[2] Tran-Nuong Hanh, "Moeurs et coutumes Annamites," *Annales de l'Extrême Orient*, xiv, p. 370; E. Aymonnier, "Notes sur les coutumes et croyances des Cambodgiens," *Cochinchine Française. Excursions et Reconnaissances*, 1883, pp. 198 sq.

[3] A. Gautier, "Voyage au pays des Moïs," *Cochinchine Française. Excursions et Reconnaissances*, 1882–83, p. 246.

[4] J. Canivey, "Notice sur les moeurs et coutumes des Moï," *Revue d'Ethnographie et de Sociologie*, vi, pp. 3 sqq. Cf. H. Besnard, "Les populations Moï de Darlac," *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, vii, p. 74.

[5] E. Lunet de Lajonquière, *Ethnographie du Tonquin septentrional*, pp. 207, 242, 348; M. Abadie, "Les Man du Haut Tonquin," *Revue d'Ethnographie et des Traditions populaires*, iii, p. 212; Silvestre, "Les

The rule is as strictly observed among the inland populations of southern Indo-China.[1]

In India, in the Hills of Assam, are various tribes who, undisturbed by the tramps and drums of three conquests, have retained to this day a primitive social organisation, and still erect large standing stones like the menhirs of Brittany over their dead. In a Synteg household you will find an old crone who is the grandmother, or even perhaps the great-grandmother of the family, together with her grandchildren and great-grandchildren; but the husbands of the daughters are not there. They only visit their wives at night, and are known as 'u shong kha,' that is, 'begetters.'[2] Among the Khasis, "the husband does not take his bride to his own home, but enters her household or visits it occasionally. He seems merely entertained to continue the family to which his wife belongs."[3] In some Khasi tribes the husbands take up their abode with their wives, who remain under the same roof as their mothers and grandmothers. The grandmother is called the 'young grandmother' to distinguish her from *the* grandmother who is the ancestress of the family and its protecting goddess. All a man earns before he is married goes to his mother, after his marriage his earnings go to his wife's family. Property is transmitted from mother to daughter, but curiously it is the *youngest*, not the eldest daughter, who gets the lion's share, and, in one tribe the whole, of the landed property. The maternal clan which thus constitutes the social units of those peoples is called 'Mahari,' that is, 'Motherhood.' "Their social organisation," says Sir Charles Lyall, "presents one of the most perfect examples still surviving of matriarchal institutions carried out in a logical and thorough manner which to those accustomed to regard the status and authority of the father as the foundation of society are exceedingly remarkable. Not only is the mother the head and source and only bond of union of the family: in the most primitive parts of the hills, the Synteg country, she is the only owner of real property and through her alone is inheritance transmitted. The father has no kinship with his children, who belong to their mother's clan. The flat memorial stones which they set up to perpetuate the memory of the dead are called after the woman who represents

Thaï blancs de Phong-Tho," *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, 1918, p. 30; Bonifacy, "Étude sur les coutumes et la langue des La-Ti," *ibid.*, vi, p. 272; Père Azémar, "Les Steings de Brolai," *Cochinchine Française. Excursions et Reconnaissances*, xxii, p. 221.

[1] A. Lavallie, "Notes ethnographiques sur diverses tribus du sud-est de l'Indo-Chine," *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, i, p. 309. Cf. below, vol. ii, p. 170.

[2] P. R. T. Gurdon, *The Khasis*, pp. 76, 82.

[3] H. Yule, "Notes on the Kasai Hills and People," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, xiii, Part ii, pp. 624 sq.

the clan, and the standing stones ranged behind them are dedicated to male kinsmen on the mother's side." [1]

The same organisation is found among other tribes of the region. Thus among the Garos "it is agreed that the woman occupies the superior position. The husband enters her mother's family, and the children belong to her clan, and not to that of the father. All property goes through the woman, and males are incapable of inheriting in their own right." The husband takes up his abode with his wife in the house of her parents.[2] Among the Lalungs, another tribe of the Khasi and Jaintia Hills, "the usual custom in regard to marriage is for the parents of the girl to find a husband for her and take him to their house as a member of their family. The offspring of such marriages enter the clan of the mother." [3] Among the Kochs "the men are so gallant as to have made over all property to the women, who in return are most industrious, weaving, spinning, brewing, planting, sowing, in a word doing all the work not above their strength. When a woman dies the family property goes to her daughters, and when a man marries he lives with his wife's mother, obeying her and his wife." [4]

The usage of matrilocal marriage is found among several of the most typical aboriginal races of India, especially where Brahmanical Hindu customs have not to any great extent influenced the original institutions of the people, and among many other tribes the survival of partial matrilocal customs indicates that they were formerly general. Among the Kehal, a nomadic tribe of boatmen on the Indus, who are now Muhammadans, the husband "goes to live permanently with his father-in-law and subsequently becomes his heir." [5] Among the Gonds the son-in-law resides for a period varying from seven or eight months to three years in the home of his wife.[6] Among the Santals and the Mundas permanent matrilocal marriage is common, and the son-in-law becoming a member of the family, succeeds to a portion of his

[1] Sir G. Lyall, in P. R. T. Gurdon, *The Khasis*, Introduction, p. xxiii. and P. R. T. Gurdon, *ibid.*, pp. 63, 82 sq.

[2] E. A. Gait, *Census of India*, 1891, "Assam," vol. i, p. 229; cf. E. T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal*, p. 63.

[3] E. A. Gait, in *Census of India*, 1891, "Assam," vol. i, p. 231.

[4] B. H. Hodgson, "On the Origin, Location, Numbers, Creed, Customs, Character and Condition of the Kocch, Bodo and Dhimal People, with a General Description of the Climate they dwell in," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, xviii, Part ii, p. 707. Cf. J. Wise, *Notes on the Races, Castes and Tribes of Eastern Bengal*, pp. 126 sq.

[5] H. A. Rose, *A Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Punjab and North-West Frontier Province*, vol. ii, p. 487.

[6] W. Crooke, *The Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh*, vol. ii, p. 434.

father-in-law's inheritance.[1] Among the Ragjahr, a mixed caste of farm-servants in the northern districts of the Central Provinces, the bride after spending three months with her husband returns to her home for a year.[2] Among the Bhongi, when the bride is wealthy, it is obligatory for the husband to take up his residence in her home.[3] Among the Kaikadis, a wild tribe dwelling in the hills of Khandesh and Bijapur, the husband is bound to dwell with his wife's family until he has a family of his own of at least three children.[4] So again among the Lamans of Ahmadgar the husband is expected to reside for several years in his wife's home before he sets up one of his own.[5]

In Southern India, on the Malabar coast, the famous Nayars constituted the aristocratic caste of the native Tamil population. Their marriage customs have attracted much attention, and will have to be discussed elsewhere in some detail. All that we have to note here is that among them no woman ever left her home to take up her residence with her husband. The family group, or clan, or, as it was called, the 'tarwad,' or 'Motherhood,' consisted "of all the descendants in the female line of a common female ancestor."[6] The household was constituted by the mother and her children, sisters and brothers; no husband formed part of it. The husbands were in the strictest sense visitors only, and so scrupulously was that position recognised that a Nayar husband would not even partake of food in the home of his wife, not being a member of it, but made a point of paying his visits after supper.[7] At the present day much of the social organisation of Nayar 'motherhoods' has suffered the disintegrating influence of modern conditions, but the essential rule of matrilocal marriage continues to be adhered to, and "ancient and aristocratic families still refuse to send their ladies out of the home."[8] Throughout South Malabar and North Travancore it is exceptional for a woman to remove after marriage to her husband's home.[9]

In several of the instances above considered, marriage is not permanently matrilocal, but the continued residence of the woman

[1] L. S. S. O'Malley, in *Census of India*, 1911, vol. v, "Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, and Sikkim," part i, Report, pp. 315 sq.

[2] R. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, vol. iv, p. 408.

[3] W. Crooke, *The Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh*, vol. i, p. 281.

[4] *Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency*, vol. xii, p. 122.

[5] *Ibid.*, vol. xvii, p. 162.

[6] E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, p. 120, n.

[7] F. Buchanan, *A Journey from Madras*, vol. ii, p. 412.

[8] K. M. Panikkar, "Some Aspects of Nayar Life," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlviii, p. 291.

[9] V. Nagam Aiya, *The Travancore State Manual*, vol. ii, p. 358.

in her own home after marriage and the residence of the husband with her family are limited to varying periods of months or years. Sometimes such attenuated matrilocal usages have dwindled down to a mere ceremonial. Thus, in the Patani States of the Malay Peninsula it is obligatory for a young couple to spend the first fortnight of their married life in the wife's home.[1] Since permanent residence of the wife in her mother's family was the original rule with the Malays, the obligation to remain there a fortnight after marriage can only be regarded as a ceremonial relic of the older usage. When the same custom is found elsewhere, as, for instance, among the Kaduppattan of Cochin,[2] the inference is probable that it derives from a similar original practice. Again, among the Baila of Rhodesia, a region where matrilocal marriage was once general, the wedding night is now spent by the newly married couple at the bridegroom's house, but they proceed the next day to the wife's home, and after a ceremony in which the bridegroom casts a spear in the ground before his wife, they remain there two nights.[3] Among the Kagoro of Nigeria the bride and bridegroom spend their wedding night only at the house of the bride's parents.[4] The same custom is strictly observed by some tribes of Dardistan; but amongst others the prescriptive residence of the young couple in the bride's home extends to several months.[5] Perhaps the most attenuated form of matrilocal customs is found among some of the tribes of Southern India. Among the Mappellas of Malabar, the bride and bridegroom, after the wedding ceremony, are locked up together in a room in the bride's home "for a few moments." The marriage is supposed to be consummated; but, as a matter of fact, the custom is purely ritual.[6] Among the Wends the bridegroom spends the wedding night at the bride's house; before doing so he bids an unnecessarily solemn farewell to his family.[7] As with most other primal institutions of human society an attenuated relic of matrilocal marriage survives in our own usages as the custom of partaking of the wedding lunch at the bride's house; the bridegroom thus begins his married life as a guest of his wife's family.

[1] N. Annandale and H. C. Robinson, *Fasciculi Malayenses*, vol. ii, p. 75.

[2] M. Sankara Menon, in *Census of India*, 1901, vol. xx, Cochin, p. 166.

[3] E. W. Smith and A. H. Dale, *The Ila-speaking Peoples of Northern Rhodesia*, vol. ii, p. 56.

[4] A. J. N. Tremearne, "Notes on the Kagoro and other Nigerian Head-hunters," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii, p. 170.

[5] C. de Ujfalvy, *Les Aryens au nord et au Sud de l'Hindou-Koush*, pp. 302, 304.

[6] E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, p. 63.

[7] Schwela-Schorbus, "Die 'grosse' wendische Hochzeit," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*, iii, pp. 391 sq.

In those instances the vestigial matrilocal usages are but empty ceremonial practices which cannot serve any practical object, and have merely a sentimental value. In other instances, several of which have been noted, the practice of transferring the wife to the husband's home is qualified either by alternating residences of the couple in the home of the husband and of the wife respectively, or by a return of the bride to her own home for a shorter or longer period, and by frequent prolonged visits to her family. The usage of removing the wife to the home of her husband has evidently in those instances not the force of a primary principle, and has not yet become fully established as such. In many parts of Africa, as in other uncultured societies, even where the wife is brought to her husband's home, the connexion with her own family remains much closer than is the rule in advanced patriarchal societies. Of the Bakerewe, a missionary remarks: "A custom which is very injurious to good understanding and to stability in marriage is the habit which the women have of going back to their family on the least occasion. If she is indisposed, the woman says: 'I am going home.' If a feast is held by her people, she says: 'I am going home.' And those residences, often very prolonged, demoralise the poor husband, who is left alone. But he is powerless to alter things; it is the fashion."[1]

In many other instances partial matrilocal marriage, limited to a period of months or of years, is scarcely distinguishable from what is termed 'marriage by service,' in which the bridegroom gives his services for a stipulated period in consideration of being afterwards permitted to remove his wife from her parents' home to one of his own. The practice will have to be considered when the means by which that right is acquired come to be discussed. We shall see that only on a very superficial view of the facts could the usage be interpreted as having had its origin in the commutation of a payment. The practice of making a payment to the wife's family, which is a comparatively late social usage and is unknown in societies where the notion of traffic has not yet developed, appears, on the contrary, to be a commutation of the services which the wife's family expect from the son-in-law. All matrilocal marriage is, in a sense, 'marriage by service,' for the association of the husband with the wife's family is generally conditional on his contributing his labour towards their maintenance and also on his fighting on their behalf, even against his own people, should occasion arise, and the association continues only so long as he fulfils those obligations. The practice of 'marriage by service,' in the relatively small number of instances where it is associated with 'marriage by purchase,' and where services for a given period

[1] E. Hurel, "Religion et vie domestique des Bakerewe," *Anthropos*, vi, p. 293.

are tendered in place of such payment, is clearly an adaptation of more ancient usages to conditions and transactions which are foreign to the constitution of primitive society. It is nowhere found except where permanent matrilocal marriage also is still customary, or is known to have formerly been the general usage. Thus, in reference to the tribes of Assam, where not only matrilocal marriage but the most complete matriarchal social organisation obtains, as among the Khasis, the Garos, the Kochs, we are told that among the Bodo and Dhimal, who now pay a bride-price on marriage, " a youth who has no means of discharging this sum must go to the house of his father-in-law elect and there literally earn his wife by the sweat of his brow, labouring 'more judaico,' upon mere diet for a term of years varying from two on an average to five or even seven as the extreme period. This custom is named gaboi by the Bodo, gharjya by the Dhimals." [1] It would be difficult to suppose that the custom of these tribes is independent in origin from the universal and permanent matrilocal customs of their neighbours and kinsmen, the Kochs, the Garos and the Khasis. Similarly, when we find the same custom of 'marriage by service' reported from some parts of Indo-China, among the Malays, or in Africa, and the bridegroom is described as earning his wife by service in lieu of paying for her, the practice can scarcely be regarded as unconnected with the general matrilocal usages of the Indo-Chinese, the Malays and the Bantu. The 'service' performed by the bridegroom is very commonly not an optional alternative to the payment of a bride-price, but is compulsory, no matter how well able he may be to make that payment. Nay, in some instances, instead of the 'service' being regarded as a form of payment, the husband himself is paid by the wife's parents to forgo any claim to remove her and her children from their home.[2] Matrilocal marriage, even when quite unmodified and permanent, has not infrequently been erroneously described by some of the older observers as 'serving for a bride.' Thus the Jesuit missionaries in North America, with the Biblical precedent of the marriage of Jacob in their minds, frequently represented the marriage customs of the Indians as marriage by service. Their accounts abound in inconsistent and contradictory statements in this, as in other respects; some expressly tell us that the Indians served for their wives 'for a year,' or 'till the birth of the first child.' But it is easy to see from the discrepancies in those accounts, and from explicit statements, some of which I have cited, that those descriptions rest upon misunderstandings. Far

[1] B. H. Hodgson, " On the Origin, etc., of the Kocch, Bodo and Dhimal People," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, xviii, Part ii, p. 735 wrongly numbered 715.

[2] A. de Castro, " Résumé historique de l'établissement portugais à Timor," *Tijdschrift voor Indische taal-, land- en volkenkunde*, xi, p. 481.

from the relation between the husband and the wife's family terminating after the birth of a child, it was, on the contrary, confirmed, and in fact only began, after that event.[1] The traveller Henry, who knew the Iroquois, as well as many other tribes, intimately, states that a woman never left her parents' home till after the death of her mother.[2] It can be readily understood that where the 'home' merely consists of a leather tent, considerations of convenience would generally lead, when the family increased, to the erection of a separate wigwam; but this in no way affected the constitution of the social group, and there is no evidence that in any circumstances a woman left her clan to join that of her husband. So likewise in many instances where we are told that after a number of years the husband removes his wife to a home of his own, this does not necessarily mean that he takes her away to his own people, but that, owing to the increase in the family, it is found convenient to build a separate dwelling, often adjoining her parental home. The parallel of the marriage of Jacob, which caused missionaries who detected a similarity between the customs of the North American Indians and those of the ancient Hebrews to take a misleading view of the marriage customs of the former, is itself not an example of the commutation by services of a payment entitling the husband to remove his wives, for, on the contrary, the Biblical narrative expressly tells us that Jacob's father-in-law utterly denied that he had any such right, even after twenty years.[3]

The determination of the dwelling-place by the female is, we saw, the natural consequence of biological facts, and is the rule among animals; it is the female, and not the male, who chooses a suitable lair or shelter for the rearing of her brood, and the male accommodates himself to those requirements, and when associating with the female seeks her in her abode. All animals may be said to be, in so far as they form sexual associations, matrilocal in their habits. It is thence natural to infer that the habits of primitive humanity were the same. That this inference is correct is proved by a social fact to which there are no exceptions. Whenever a man removes his wife from her home and brings her to his own, the procedure invariably involves a compact or transaction whereby such a transfer is sanctioned by the woman's family; that sanction is obtained in all but some of the highest phases of culture by bestowing upon them a compensation or consideration. Another woman may be given in exchange, or more usually some form of payment is made upon which the permission to remove the woman depends. Such a transaction, however simple, postu-

[1] See below, vol. ii, p. 90.
[2] A. Henry, *Travels and Adventures in the Years 1760–76*, p. 23.
[3] *Genesis*, xxxi. 26, 43.

lates a certain degree of cultural development and social organisation; it would be out of the question to impute such a juridic or commercial procedure to any race of animals. But there must have been a time when emergent humanity differed but little from animals and was equally incapable of negotiating such a transaction. A woman might, it is true, be removed from her home by forcible capture and abduction; but we shall, I think, see that it is quite impossible to suppose that this ever was the usual and general mode of obtaining a wife.[1] All agreements or transactions whereby sanction is given by a woman's family to remove her to another home are, on the other hand, commutations of the usages of a more primitive time when the man had no such right. That right was acquired by the development of juridic and commercial transactions and of the purchasing power of the man. Thus, in Indonesia matrilocal marriage was, we have seen, the original and primitive usage. Among the Alfurs of Ceram a man has the option of marrying his wife without payment and taking up his residence in her village, or of paying a bride-price and removing her to his own. If he marries a woman of the same village, there is then no question of payment.[2] Similarly, in the Kei Islands payment of a bride-price is a late innovation introduced by Islam, which entitles a man to remove his wife and children to his own home; if that bride-price is not paid, there is, however, no bar whatever to his marrying her, but the woman remains in her home and the children are counted as members of her family.[3] The same conditions obtain among the Alfurs of Buru.[4] The patrilocal form of marriage thus depends upon a transaction superimposed upon the original arrangement whereby a man went to live with his wife's people. If that be so, and if it cannot be supposed that early humanity emerging from an animal state began at once to enter into somewhat elaborate commercial transactions to form sexual unions, there is no alternative but to conclude that the practice of matrilocal marriage was the original form of marriage union, and is coeval with the origin of humanity.

That conclusion is entirely borne out by our ethnological documents, for whereas the practice of matrilocal marriage, which is still found among a very considerable number of peoples in every quarter of the globe, has left clear traces of its former prevalence

[1] See below, vol. ii, pp. 234 sqq.

[2] W. G. Boot, "Korte schets der noord-kust van Ceram," *Tijdschrift van het Kon. Nederlandsch aardrijkskundig genootschap*, 2de Serie, x, pp. 892 sq.

[3] C. M. Pleyte, "Ethnographische beschrijving der Kei-eilande," *Tijschrift van het Kon. Nederlansch aardrijkskundig genootschap*, 2 Serie, x, p. 813.

[4] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes ne Papua*, p. 22; G. A. Wilken, *De verspreide geschriften*, vol. i, pp. 45 sqq.

among almost all others, even where the very memory of such a practice has long since passed away, it is not possible, on the other hand, among the peoples where the wife's residence with her mother's family is now the practice, to point to a single indication suggesting the former existence of the opposite custom. That the former was the original practice and the latter a later development was the conclusion of Sir Edward Tylor, who, comparing the statistical coincidence of maternal systems of kinship and of the customs of matrilocal and of patrilocal marriage, found that while the maternal system of reckoning is most fully developed where the husband resides with his wife's family, it is never found in its complete form where the practice is for the husband to take his wife to his own home. The numerical comparison of his records further showed that "residence of the husband with the wife's family appears earliest, after this the removal stage, and latest residence of the wife with the husband." [1]

We were led to conclude that the rule that the female members of a primitive human group should not leave it and that the males should seek wives elsewhere, which has been seen to obtain still among a large number of peoples, was essential to the preservation of the character and constitution of those primitive social groups, for unless those rules were observed such groups must needs have broken up into promiscuous herds dominated by unchecked masculine instincts; and it is upon the operation of the maternal instincts that the development of social sentiments, in primitive stages, is dependent. The rule is, therefore, necessarily correlated to other features in primitive social organisation. One of the usages with which it is found to be most frequently associated is the practice of reckoning descent, not from the father, but from the mother, that is, in the female instead of, as is usual with us, in the male line. The classical example of that usage, and one which first drew attention to it, is the account given by Herodotus of the practice of the Lykians in Asia Minor. "They have," he says, "a singular custom which no other people have; for they take their names after their mother and not after their father; and if a Lykian be asked who he is, he will recite his genealogy on his mother's side, reckoning up his ancestry from mother to mother." [2] That tracing of descent in the female line, which Herodotus thought 'singular,' is known to be the rule with about half the people of the world below the most highly developed stages of culture; and with most of those peoples who reckon descent in the paternal line clear evidence exists showing that the opposite rule formerly obtained amongst them

[1] E. B. Tylor, "On a Method of Investigating the Development of Institutions, applied to the Laws of Marriage and Descent," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xviii, pp. 247, 258.

[2] Herodotus, i. 173.

also. That practice, which first suggested the view that the position of women was formerly different from that which they occupy in patriarchally organised societies, is often regarded as the most distinctive feature of a matriarchal social order. But it does not necessarily imply a dominant position of women, or that it owed its origin to such a dominant position. Where there is little or no private property to transmit it would be more natural to reckon descent from the mother, a relationship which is directly observable, than from the father, whose relation to the offspring is not so clear to the primitive observer. We know that, as a matter of fact, the tracing of descent in the female line is quite compatible with the most completely oppressed condition of women. In the great majority of Australian tribes descent is reckoned exclusively in the maternal line, yet there is scarcely another society where women are in a state of such brutal oppression as among the Australian aborigines. Matrilineal descent, or mother-kin, cannot therefore by any means be regarded as implying a matriarchal order of society in the sense of a social order where the influence and power of women is greater than in societies organised on patriarchal principles, and it cannot be considered as being in itself a certain indication of a former matriarchal social state.

But it is quite otherwise as regards the practice of matrilocal marriage. Here again it is not beyond the ingenuity of the theorist to offer various suggestions as to the reason for the practice, and to ascribe it, as has been done, to peculiar local conditions. But however ingenious those interpretations of the origin of the custom, there can be no dispute as to its effects. When a woman, instead of following her husband, remains in her own home and in the midst of her blood-relations, while the husband is more or less a stranger within the gate, or is accounted a member of her family instead of the woman being transferred to his, it is obvious that the wife occupies a position of vantage entirely different from that which she holds in patriarchal societies, however civilised and refined, and that in those circumstances her status cannot be one of complete subjection. Heer Adriani remarks that among the Toradjas of Middle Celebes, owing to the woman remaining in her own home and in the midst of her own relatives, the husband's position is always one of subordination.[1] The whole organisation of Zuñi society, remarks Dr. Kroeber, is founded upon the continued residence of the woman in her home. "Attached to her ownership of it is the Zuñi woman's position in her world. Upon her permanent occupancy of her house rests the matrilinear custom of the tribe."[2] The

[1] N. Adriani, "Mededeelingen omtrent de Toradjas van Midden-Celebes," *Tijdschrift voor Indische taal-, land- en volkenkunde*, xliv, p. 227.

[2] A. L. Kroeber, "Zuñi Kin and Clan," *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History*, xviii, Part ii, p. 48; cf. p. 87. On

arrangement postulates, for one thing, that landed property, when it comes to be of value, is held by the woman and that the husband is economically destitute but for the daily produce of his labour. It also follows that such property is transmitted in the female line, and that the children are part of the group of the mother and not of the group to which the father belongs. In Dalmatia, even in the last century it was customary, when a woman owned land, that her husband, who came to live with her, should change his family name and assume that of his wife. Thus the children took the family name of their mother and not that of their father.[1] While the reckoning of descent through females does not necessarily imply a matriarchal type of society, matrilocal marriage does; and accordingly, while we may find many matriarchal features existing where marriage is patrilocal, it is exceedingly exceptional to find patriarchal customs associated with an established practice of matrilocal marriage.[2] Of the various features of the matriarchal order of society the practice of matrilocal marriage is, then, the most distinctive and important; and wherever we come upon clear indications that it was formerly the practice for the wife to continue in her family after marriage we may, I think, conclude that, whatever the present character of the society in which such indications are found, it was at one time of a matriarchal order.

The Status of Women in Uncultured Societies.

It used to be a commonplace that the position of women in uncivilised societies is one of outrageous oppression, and few of the older writers could touch on the subject without laying down the principle that the position of women in a given society is the truest index of its degree of civilisation. "It may, perhaps, be laid down as an invariable maxim," so ran the stereotyped remark, "that the condition of the female part of society in any

the effects of matrilocal marriage see also the remarks of L. Brentano, "Die Volkswirtschaft und ihre konkrete Grundbedingungen," *Zeitschrift für social- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, i, p. 138.

[1] O. M. Uticšenovič, *Die Hauskommunionen der Südsclaven*, p. 44.

[2] The Atjehs of Sumatra reckon descent in the male line and transmit property to their children although their marriage customs are strictly matrilocal. But Dr. Hurgronje, the author of a most exhaustive study of those people, is of opinion that their organisation was until recently matriarchal, and that patriarchal customs are with them the result of Islamic influence grafted on to their original organisation (C. Snouck Hurgronje, *De Atjehers*, vol. i, p. 46). Similarly, it is obvious that the reckoning of descent in the male line in the island of Yap, while, as everywhere else in the Caroline group, marriage remains matrilocal, is due to quite exceptional local circumstances (see below, p. 336).

nation will furnish a tolerable just criterion of the degree of civilisation to which that nation has arrived."[1] Like most dogmatic pronouncements on social history the assertion, in accordance with which the Redskins and the Papuan cannibals would have to be accounted more civilised than the Chinese and the ancient Greeks, is the exact reverse of the truth. In the great majority of uncultured societies women enjoy a position of independence and of equality with the men and exercise an influence which would appear startling in the most feministic modern civilised society. Accounts and descriptions abound, it is true, of savage man " crushing down his mate, as yet we find in barbarous isles." But the majority of such accounts have their origin in the general misunderstanding that, when a primitive woman is seen working hard, she must be in the oppressed condition of a slave.

There are, nevertheless, some primitive societies at the lowest levels of culture where the women are under the callous despotism of brute-force wielded over them without scruple by the men; and where such a subjugation has taken place in an uncultured society, the resulting state of things is, of course, much more barbarous than could be the case in any civilised community. Thus, among the Australian aborigines the condition of the women is utterly degraded. " Nowhere else," remarks a resident of long standing amongst them, "is it possible to meet with more miserable and degraded specimens of humanity than the women of Australia. The women are treated by the men with savage brutality."[2] " The poor creatures," says another writer, " are in an abject state, and are only treated with about the same consideration as the dogs that accompany them."[3] A girl of seven, eight, or ten is handed over to a man old enough to be her grandfather. He drags the child by the hair to his camp, and " the bridal screams and yells make the night hideous."[4] " For the slightest offence or dereliction of duty she is beaten with a waddy or a yam-stick, and not infrequently speared. The records of the Government Courts in Adelaide furnish numberless instances of blacks being tried for murdering their ' lubras.' The woman's life is of no account

[1] J. Barrow, *Travels in China*, p. 138. Cf. J. R. Foster, *Observations made on a Voyage round the World*, pp. 418 sqq.

[2] J. Browne, " The Aborigines of Australia," *The Nautical Magazine and Naval Chronicle*, 1856, pp. 537 sq.

[3] J. D. Woods, *The Native Tribes of South Australia*, p. xviii. Cf. G. F. Angas, *South Australia Illustrated*, pp. iv sq.

[4] A. A. C. Le Souëf, in R. Brough Smyth, *The Aborigines of Victoria*, vol. i, p. 78. Cf. A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 193; Id., " Australian Group Relations," *Smithsonian Reports*, 1883, p. 798; Id., " The Diery and other Kindred Tribes of Central Australia," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xx, p. 61; D. Collins, *An Account of the English Colony of New South Wales*, vol. i, p. 559.

if her husband chooses to destroy it, and no one ever attempts to protect her or take her part under any circumstances. In times of scarcity of food she is the last to be fed and is not considered in any way. That many die in consequence is not a matter of wonder." [1] "They ill-use them in a most brutal manner," says another writer, "often, yes very often, killing them outright in their ungovernable periods of passion. When an accident of the kind happens, the other members of the tribe do not pay the least heed to it; it is only a woman, and a husband has a perfect right to chastise his women, even unto death." [2] "Blows over the head with a stick are the more common modes of correction, and spearing through the body for a slight offence." [3] "Few women," says Eyre, "will be found upon examination to be free from frightful scars upon the head or the marks of spear wounds about the body. I have seen a young woman who from the number of marks appeared to have been almost riddled with spear wounds." [4] Dr. Howitt knew of women "being almost cut to pieces," [5] and Sir George Grey likewise remarks on the "ghastly wounds" inflicted on the women for trifling causes.[6] The number of a man's wives in Western

[1] J. D. Woods, *op. cit.*, pp. xvii sq. "Among the tribes of South Australia, if a woman is the cause of any quarrel, the usual course is to remove the cause by killing the woman" (H. Koeler, "Einige Notizen über die Eingebornen an die Ostküste des St.-Vincent Golfs, Süd Australien," *Monatsberichte über der Verhandlungen der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin*, Neue Folge, i, p. 52). Cf. G. Grey, *Journals of Two Expeditions of Discovery in North-Western and Western Australia*, vol. ii, p. 254.

[2] P. Beveridge, *The Aborigines of Victoria and Riverina*, pp. 15 sq.

[3] E. Palmer, "Notes on some Australian Tribes," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xiii, p. 281. Cf. J. Macgillivray, *Narrative of the Voyage of H.M.S. 'Rattlesnake,'* vol. ii, p. 9; J. Beete Jukes, *Narrative of the Surveying Voyage of H.M.S. 'Fly,'* vol. ii, p. 249; H. Koeler, *loc. cit.*; J. Fraser, "The Aborigines of New South Wales," *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales*, xvi, p. 220; Scott Nind, "Description of the Natives of King George's Sound (Swan River Colony) and Adjoining Country," *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, i, p. 37; C. Lumholtz, *Among Cannibals*, p. 162; D. Collins, *An Account of the English Colony of New South Wales*, vol. i, p. 559; W. Westgarth, *Australia Felix*, p. 68.

[4] E. J. Eyre, *Journals of Expeditions of Discovery into Central Australia*, vol. ii, p. 322.

[5] A. W. Howitt, "The Diery and other Tribes of Central Australia," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xx, p. 61 n.

[6] G. Grey, *Journals of Two Expeditions of Discovery in North-West and Western Australia*, vol. ii, p. 249. Some of the scars found on Australian women are the result of the custom of 'cutting themselves for the dead,' and are self-inflicted (W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 33). But these are quite distinct from injuries produced by violence. The former were generally on the upper part of the body and arms, the latter usually on the thighs and legs; both kinds of injuries were equally well known to the earliest observers, and have been separately described by them (e.g., S. Nind, *op. cit.*, p. 46; G. Grey, *op. cit.*,

Australia, says Mr. Hodgson, " varies from two to six, and the daily number of wounds inflicted on each by their lord and master is in about the same proportion, nor are the wounds slight. The poor thing receives the external tokens of her husband's love on her thick-skulled pate with a coolness which is incredible." It is not uncommon, he adds, to meet a woman " with scarcely a single hair to be seen from the frequent strokes that had descended upon her unfortunate pericranium." [1] Female Australian skulls commonly show, in fact, huge scars from old fractures.[2] Any female, old or young, found unprotected is almost invariably ravished, and in most instances killed afterwards.[3] Queensland natives chastise their wives by rubbing hot coals over their stomach.[4] A Central Australian native, being annoyed with his wife, was with difficulty dissuaded by some missionaries from roasting her alive over a slow fire.[5]

vol. ii, p. 334 ; C. P. Hodgson, *Reminiscences of Australia*, pp. 208, 248), the mistake of confounding them could not therefore have been made by anyone familiar with native Australian habits and customs, and certainly not by Dr. Howitt or by Sir George Grey. Among some tribes, such as those of Port Macquarie and Moreton Bay, where the treatment of the women is distinctly better than among the southern tribes, no such scars are seen. " None of the women bore the frightful scars and cicatrices resulting from the blows of their inhuman masters which scarcely any female of the tribes south of Sydney is exempt from " (C. Hodgkinson, *Australia from Port Macquarie to Moreton Bay*, p. 230).

[1] C. P. Hodgson, *Reminiscences of Australia*, pp. 208 sq.

[2] T. Waitz and E. Gerland, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, vol. vi, p. 775.

[3] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race*, vol. i, p. 108 ; E. J. Eyre, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 387 ; W. E. Roth, *Ethnological Studies among the North-West-Central Queensland Aborigines*, p. 182 ; A. Oldfield, " The Aborigines of Australia," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society*, iii, p. 249 ; D. Collins, *An Account of the English Colony of New South Wales*, vol. i, pp. 559, 563 ; Craufurd, in *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxiv, p. 181.

[4] W. E. Roth, *North Queensland Ethnography, Bulletin No.* 8, p. 4.

[5] " Die Eingeborenen von Neuholland," *Evangelisches Missions-Magazin, Neue Folge*, iv, p. 263. Cf. B. H. Purcell, " Rites and Customs of the Australian Aborigines," *Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte*, 1893, p. 288.

The blackfellows of Australia—which has become a sort of cockpit of semi-theological controversy—have been several times ' whitewashed ' as regards their treatment of the women. Against statements such as those cited above, other statements have been adduced referring to acts of kindness on the part of the men towards the women, and to affection between them (see, e.g., H. J. Nieboer, *Slavery as an Industrial System*, pp. 9 sqq. ; B. Malinowski, *The Family among the Australian Aborigines*, pp. 68 sqq.). Of such apparent contradictions in our documentary evidence, Dr. Malinowski remarks : " Nieboer's computation is very interesting as an illustration of how one can prove ' pro ' and ' contra ' from ethnological material, even while confining oneself to a limited area and subject. All the series of statements collected in this book are further examples of the same fact " (*op. cit.*, p. 76 n.). But, although in the multitude of general accounts which

A very similar state of things is found in most Melanesian islands. In the northern groups, that is, in the archipelagoes of New Britain and New Ireland, the women retain a good deal of independence and influence, but in the more southern islands of Melanesia, in correlation apparently with the greater power exercised by chiefs, they are entirely under the despotic rule of the men. "The New Caledonians take no more account of a woman than of a pig. Dogs in our country are better treated."[1] A New Caledonian chief, having acquired an old flint-lock, practised shooting with the new weapon, using women set up in a row as targets.[2] Another native, whose soul

we have concerning the Australian aborigines there must inevitably be a considerable proportion of statements which are inaccurate, misleading, superficial, or tendencious, there is really no such ambiguity as those writers make out. Dr. Malinowski himself sums up the evidence he has collected on the subject by saying that "the husband had well-nigh complete authority over his wife; that he treated her in harmony with the low standard of culture, harshly, but not excessively harshly; that apparently the more tender feelings of love, affection and attachment were not entirely absent from the aboriginal household. But it must be added that, on these two last points, the information is contradictory and insufficient" (*op. cit.*, p. 84). I shall have to refer in another place to the question of affection and love among primitive races, and it will be noted that in many respects the primitive savage is very prone to affection, though hardly to love. But that affection is superficial and impulsive; manifestations of it are consistent with the utmost brutality that can be conceived. The Australian aborigines are extremely attached to their dogs. They "take as much care of them as if they were human beings." No means of gaining their affection is so effective as showing consideration for their dogs; they "would as soon think of killing themselves as these dogs" (S. Gason, *The Dieyerie Tribe of Australian Aborigines*, pp. 12 sq.; cf. E. Thorne, *The Queen of the Colonies*, p. 337). They take them to bed with them (P. Beveridge, *The Aborigines of Victoria and Riverina*, p. 117). Are we to conclude that the status of dogs is high in Australian society? When Dr. Malinowski represents the brutality of the Australian native as an exaggerated sense of 'authority,' and as associated with sentiments of 'right' or of 'justice,' however misguided, and explains it as "in harmony with the low standard of culture," the interpretation is not in accordance with the facts of comparative anthropology. There is a very simple and clear test of the matter. Is the "standard of culture" of the Seri Indians higher than that of the Australians? Is the "standard of culture" of the Veddahs, of the Alfurs, of the Aleuts, of the Cajaguas very distinctly higher than that of the Australians? Yet is there any possible comparison, pick and choose your evidence as you will, between the treatment of women amongst any of those people and their treatment amongst the Australian aborigines? The difference, then, is not due to 'authority' being interpreted "in harmony with a low standard of culture," but to that 'authority' itself, which is merely the unscrupulous and unchecked operation of brute-force.

[1] M. A. Legrand, *Au Pays des Canaques. La Nouvelle Calédonie et ses habitants*, p. 118.

[2] T. H. Hood, *Notes of a Cruise in H.M.S. 'Fawn' in the Western Pacific*, p. 218.

had been touched by the words of the Gospel, went to the missionary and asked to be baptised and received into the Church. The good Father, on making the customary enquiries, found that the man had two wives, and explained to him that he could not be admitted to the sacrament while he was living in sin. The disappointed convert went away, but returned the next morning and assured the good Father that all was in order and that he was now in a state of grace, for he had killed the superfluous wife and eaten her.[1] The New Caledonian women "are greatly inferior to the men, which is certainly owing to the abject condition to which they are reduced by them."[2] In Fiji every girl in a village was regarded as the property of the village chief; he might dispose of her as he pleased, sell her or lend her. The women were kept in complete subjection and quailed before the men; they were commonly tied to posts and flogged. A woman might be killed, and even eaten, by her husband without his incurring any punishment or revenge.[3] A Fijian chief was once heard lamenting over the death of his son, and recalling the virtues of the youth: "Oh, my son, my son!" exclaimed the bereaved parent in his grief, "So just, so brave and fierce was he; if ever one of his own wives disobeyed him, he cooked and ate her on the spot!"[4]

In some parts of Africa things are as bad. The Bangala of the Congo do quite commonly eat their wives. Not longer since than the year 1887 a Bangala chief coolly informed a missionary that he had eaten seven of his wives, and that he had invited their relatives to the feast in order that there should be no family unpleasantness.[5] Among the Somals, the bride, when introduced into the bridal chamber, begins married life by receiving a sound flogging from her husband, who awaits her whip in hand.[6] The same mode of welcoming a blushing bride is required by custom among the Sifan of Chinese Tibet.[7]

Such is the condition of things which naturally tends to come about in low phases of culture where man is dominant. No innate sentiment or scruple, and no external compelling force, restrains primitive man from using any advantage with ruthless brutality

[1] M. A. Legrand, *loc. cit.*

[2] T. Moncelon, "Réponse alinéa par alinéa, pour les Néo-Calédoniens au Questionnaire de sociologie et d'ethnographie de la Société," *Bulletin de la Société d'Anthropologie*, Série iii, ix, p. 357. Cf. J. L. Brenchley, *Jottings during the Cruise of H.M.S. 'Curaçoa,'* p. 346.

[3] C. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Expedition*, vol. iii, pp. 97, 351; J. A. Moerenhout, *Voyages aux îles du Grand Océan*, vol. ii, p. 48.

[4] T. H. Hood, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

[5] H. H. Johnston, *George Grenfell and the Congo*, vol. i, p. 403.

[6] R. F. Burton, *First Footsteps in East Africa*, p. 120.

[7] W. J. Reid, "Among the Farthest People," *The Cosmopolitan*, xxviii, p. 452.

towards the women whom he regards as his property and his slaves and to exploit them to the utmost, while they are utterly powerless to offer any resistance. In view of that fact it must, on consideration, appear strange that there should be any exceptions. Every race and every society has passed at some time through a condition of rude savagery; in that state, if no scruples and no restrictions operated, how came woman ever to escape the utmost depths of degradation, or, having once been reduced to the status of a chattel-slave, how was she ever able to rise from that condition? Yet from what has already been noted, the exceptions are common, universally distributed, and pronounced in their contrast to such a state of subjection. A fuller survey shows an even more extensive prevalence among primitive women of a status of independence, influence, and even of domination.

Among the Eskimo, "the women appear to stand on a footing of perfect equality with the men, both in the family and in the community."[1] Among the North American tribes not only in those purely matriarchal communities where, as has been seen, the position of the women is supreme, but among all tribes, although the women may work hard, as even the Pueblo women do, their position is one of complete independence, and indeed of fundamental influence. When the actual constitution of those tribes is considered it is seen that the missionary Lafitau was scarcely exaggerating when he said: "Nothing is more real than this superiority of the women. It is in the women that properly consists the nation, the nobility of blood, the genealogical tree, the order of generations, the preservation of families. It is in them that all real authority resides; the country, the fields, and all the crops belong to them. They are the soul of the councils, the arbiters of war and peace."[2] That description has been thought to be highly coloured, but we have evidence to show that it is strictly accurate. When the Iroquois met the American authorities to negotiate terms of alliance, their chosen orator, 'Good Peter,' addressed Governor Clinton in the name of the women in the following words: "Brothers! Our ancestors considered it a great offence to reject the counsels of their women, particularly of the Female Governesses. They were esteemed the mistresses of the soil. Who, said our forefathers, brings us into being? who cultivates our lands, kindles our fires, and boils our pots, but the women? Our women, Brother, say that they are apprehensive their uncles have lost the power of hunting, but take this opportunity of thanking you for preventing their fall down the precipice to which their uncles have brought them.

[1] J. Murdoch, "Ethnological Results of the Point Barrow Expedition," *Ninth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 413.

[2] J. F. Lafitau, *Moeurs des sauvages amériquains*, vol. i, p. 70.

They entreat that the veneration of our ancestors in favour of the women be not disregarded, and that they may not be despised: the Great Spirit made them. The Female Governesses beg leave to speak with the freedom allowed to women and agreeable to the spirit of our ancestors. They entreat the Great Chief to put forth his strength and to preserve them in peace. For they are the life of the nation."[1] Warriors sometimes affected a professional contempt for women as non-combatants, but in the face of the actual realities of their social organisation that theoretical professional pride was little more than hollow bluster. "Even among the Iroquois," says Mr. Lucien Carr, "those fierce and haughty warriors who sweep, as with the besom of destruction, from the Atlantic to the Mississippi and from the St. Lawrence to the Cumberland, woman's influence was absolutely paramount. Chiefs, warriors and councils were all obliged to yield to her demands when authoritatively expressed; and there are few scenes more dramatic in Indian story than those in which the eloquent Red Jacket and Corn Planter were constrained to do her behest in the face of their repeated declarations to the contrary."[2] The reality of that power is concretely evidenced by the fact that the deeds of land transfer of the Colonial Government nearly all bear the signatures of women.[3] The compensation due for the murder of a woman was double that for the murder of a man.[4]

Among the Plains Indians the position of the women was scarcely less independent. "Among the Cheyennes the women are the rulers of the camp. They act as a spur to the men if they are slow in performing their duties. They are far more conservative than the men, and often hold them back from hasty, ill-advised action. If the sentiment of the women of the camp clearly points to a certain course as desirable, the men are quite sure to act as the women wish."[5] "The social position of the Navaho women is one of great independence; most of the wealth of the nation belongs to them; they are the managers of their own property, the owners of their children, and their freedom

[1] 'Substance of the Speech of Good Peter to Governor Clinton and the Commissioners of Indian Affairs at Albany," *Collections of the New York Historical Society for the Year 1814*, vol. ii, p. 115.

[2] L. Carr, "The Social and Political Position of Women among the Huron-Iroquois Tribes," *Sixteenth Report of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology*, p. 211.

[3] F. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, vol. ii, p. 130. Cf. L. H. Gray, art. "Iroquois," in Hastings's *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. vii, p. 421.

[4] L. H. Gray, *loc. cit.*

[5] G. B. Grinnell, *The Cheyenne Indians*, vol. i, pp. 128 sq.

lends character to their physiognomy." [1] Among the natives of Virginia an old traveller noted the high position of the women; "the men are very dutiful towards them." [2] In New Mexico at the present day Mr. Bandelier found that his host could not sell an ear of corn or a string of chilli without the consent of his fourteen-year-old daughter, who kept house for him.[3]

Of the condition of things in pre-Columbian Central America, Father Mendieta remarks: "In this climate the women appear to have the advantage over the male sex." [4] Herrera, speaking of the natives of the province of Cumana, reports laconically: "The men are daring, cruel and subject to their women." [5] Elsewhere, referring to the natives of Nicaragua, he adds that "the women wore gorgets and shoes and went to the market; the men swept the house and did other such-like service, and in some places they spin." [6] Andagoya gives further details: "The husbands were so much under subjection," he says, "that if they made their wives angry they were turned out of doors, and the wives even raised their hands against them. The husband would go to the neighbours and beg them to ask his wife to let him come back, and not to be angry with him. The wives made their husbands attend on them and do everything like servant lads." [7] Something of the same oppressed condition of the husband appears to have survived among the Payaguas. They dare not assert any authority over their wives. If the husband gives his wife any cause, real or fancied, of offence, she packs up the tent and its furniture, appropriates even the canoe, and takes everything away; the children follow her, and the husband and father is left with the clothes (?) he stands in and his weapons as his only possession.[8] Among the Calchaquis of Tucuman, in western Peru, the women, says Father Techo, are the only persons who can manage their combative and quarrelsome men. "The women are most powerful to reconcile the warring parties and produce peace, those most barbarous people easily granting anything at the request of those that have suckled them." [9] The Guaycurus "are kind to women,

[1] L. Ostermann, "The Navajo Indians of Mexico and Arizona," *Anthropos*, iii, p. 862, after Matthews.

[2] J. Brereton, in *Hackluytus Posthumus, or Purchas His Pilgrimes*, vol. xviii, p. 319.

[3] A. F. Bandelier, *Report of an Archaeological Tour in Mexico*, p. 138.

[4] G. de Mendieta, *Historia ecclesiastica Indiana*, p. 421.

[5] A. de Herrera, *The General History of the West Indies*, vol. iii, p. 299.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 297. Cf. F. Lopez de Gomara, *Historia general de las Indias*, p. 283.

[7] P. de Andragoya, *Proceedings of Pedrarias Davila in the Province of Tierra Firme*, p. 33. Cf. *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses*, vol. ii, p. 186.

[8] F. de Azara, *Voyages dans l'Amérique Méridionale*, vol. ii, p. 132.

[9] Nicholas del Techo, "The History of the Provinces of Paraguay,

not only those of their own tribe, who are greatly esteemed and hold a position of great predominance. The women have certainly more liberty than is bestowed by our Sovereign Lady Queen Isabella on the women of Spain." [1] Among the Guarani-speaking tribes, " what gives the natives most satisfaction is to see their old women happy, for they are guided in everything by what they tell them, and are more obedient to them than to the old men." [2] Among the Mantenerys of the upper Purus River, " the women seem to be on a perfect equality with the men ; they frequently scold them and interfere with their trade." [3] The position of women among the Carajas is said to be very good ; they give their advice in all matters of importance.[4] Among the Patagonians, " the women can by no means complain of want of devotion on the part of the men." [5]

In New Britain, remarks a traveller, " the grey mare appeared to be the better horse." The women loudly abuse and rebuke the men if the latter do not act according to their wishes. When barter is being effected with the natives, the men hand over all they get to the women, who examine the goods carefully and take charge of them.[6] In New Ireland the women, in contrast to what obtains in most other parts of Melanesia, " have pretty much their own way," and " on the whole they are treated kindly by the men." [7] In New Hanover the men will not transact any business or sell anything without the consent of their wives.[8] In British New Guinea the consent of the women is likewise sought before entering into any transaction.[9] The same is true of Dutch New Guinea ; one traveller saw a man subjected to a sound drubbing from his wife because he had brought some trinket to the boats for barter. The men are described as being under the tyranny of the women ; all property, except weapons, is in their hands and they command a monopoly of the staple food, the sago. " The part which the women play among the tribes of the interior is even more important

Tucuman, Rio de la Plata, etc.," in Churchill, *A Collection of Voyages and Travels*, vol. iv, p. 722.

[1] A. Nunez Cabeza de Vaca, *Comentarios*, pp. 560, 564.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 555.

[3] W. Chandless, " Ascent of the River Purus," *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, xxxvi, p. 102.

[4] F. Krause, *In dem Wildnissen Brasiliens*, p. 325.

[5] Lady Florence Dixie, *Across Patagonia*, pp. 68 sq.

[6] W. Powell, *Wanderings in a Wild Country*, p. 17.

[7] D. Rannie, ' New Ireland," *Proceedings and Transactions of the Queensland Branch of the Geographical Society of Australasia*, ii, Part i, p. 81.

[8] H. Strauch, " Allgemeine Bemerkungen ethnologischen Inhalts über Neu-Guinea, die Anachoreten-Inseln, Neu Hanover," etc., *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, ix, p. 62.

[9] J. Chalmers and W. W. Gill, *Work and Adventure in New Guinea*, p. 209.

than on the coast. The mother-in-law rules absolutely in the home, and all barter is conducted by her." [1]

Throughout the Malay Archipelago women are treated with uniform consideration, and among many populations, and those almost invariably the most primitive and uncultured, they occupy a position of definite influence. In Sumatra generally the men, we are told, " preserve a degree of delicacy and respect towards the sex which might justify their retorting on many of the polished nations of antiquity the epithet of Barbarians." [2] Among the Bataks, the most primitive population of the island, no instance ever came to the notice of Dr. Junghuhn of a woman being maltreated, and, on the contrary, the behaviour of the men towards women is marked, he says, with a gentleness that does them honour.[3] Among the Alfurs of Ceram, a wild population of hunters and fishers, " the position of women is distinctly high." They are treated with great deference, and all men remain silent when a woman is speaking; their influence in all political business is unmistakable.[4] " Among the nations of Celebes," says Crawfurd, " the women appear in public without any scandal; they take an active concern in all the business of life; they are consulted by the men on all public affairs, and frequently raised to the throne, and that too when the monarchy is elective. Here the woman eats with her husband, nay, by a custom which points at the equality of the sexes, always from the same dish, the only distinction left to the latter being that of eating from the right side. At public festivals women appear among the men; and those invested with authority sit in their councils when affairs of State are discussed, possessing, it is often alleged, even more than their due share in deliberations." [5] Among the Minahassa of northern Celebes the husband will not dispose of anything without his wife's consent, and a man has been known to go and consult his wife before transacting the sale of an egg.[6] In southern Celebes likewise the woman " is the absolute mistress of the house, and her husband undertakes nothing of importance without consulting her." [7] Among the Dayaks of Borneo the women enjoy every-

[1] M. Moszkowski, " Die Völkerstämme am Mamberamo in Holländisch Neuguinea," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xliii, p. 323; cf. A. F. R. Wollaston, *Pygmies and Papuans*, p. 130.

[2] W. Marsden, *The History of Sumatra*, pp. 265 sq.; cf. W. Crawfurd, *The History of the Malay Archipelago*, vol. i, p. 75; H. T. Damste, in *De volken van Nederlandsch-Indië*, vol. ii, p. 64 (Atjeh).

[3] F. Junghuhn, *Die Battalander auf Sumatra*, vol. ii, p. 133.

[4] F. J. P. Sachse, *Het eiland Seram en zijne bewoners*, p. 107.

[5] R. Crawfurd, *History of the Malay Archipelago*, vol. i, p. 74.

[6] H. J. E. Tendeloo, " De toestand der vrouw in de Minahassa," *Mededeelingen van wege het Nederlandsche Zendelinggenootschap*, xvii, pp. 19, 21.

[7] J. A. F. Schut, in J. C. van Eerde, *De volken van Nederlandsch-Indië*, vol. i, p. 316.

where a position of extreme independence; they "not infrequently wield supreme rule in the house and even govern whole tribes with masculine vigour; they take part in military expeditions and even personally lead the men to battle. Many of the most important deliberations are decided by the influence which the women wield over the men." [1] In the island of Timorlaut a husband is severely punished if he beats his wife, but she, on the other hand, may beat her husband with a stick without being liable to any penalty.[2]

On the Nicobar Islands "the position of women is, and always has been, in no way inferior to that of the other sex. They take their full share in the formation of public opinion, discuss publicly with men matters of general interest to the village, and their opinions receive due attention before a decision is arrived at. In fact, they are consulted on every matter, and the henpecked husband is of no extraordinary rarity in the Nicobars." [3] Much the same is true of the Andamanese; "the consideration and respect with which women are treated might with advantage be emulated by certain classes in our own land," says Mr. Man.[4] They "have a good deal of influence and are under no restrictions." [5]

In all parts of Micronesia, as we saw was the case in Pelew Islands, the position of women is, by common consent, notably exalted.[6] An old missionary, visiting a 'savage island' in the Ladrones group, with current notions concerning the crushed position of women among savages in his mind, thus describes his disillusion: "The women in this country have arrogated to themselves those rights which everywhere else are claimed by the husband. The wife absolutely rules the house. She is the master, and the husband is unable to dispose of anything without her consent. If he does not show all the deference which the wife claims the right of exacting from him, if his conduct is irregular, or if she happens to be in a bad temper, she maltreats him, or else quits him and resumes her pristine liberty. Her children follow her. Thus a poor husband has

[1] C. A. L. M. Schwaner, *Borneo*, vol. i, p. 161; cf. C. Brooke, *Ten Years in Sarawak*, vol. i, pp. 70, 97, 130 sq.

[2] H. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua*, p. 302.

[3] C. Boden Kloss, *In the Andamans and Nicobars*, p. 242; cf. p. 220.

[4] E. H. Man, "On the Aboriginal Inhabitants of the Andaman Islands," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xii, p. 327.

[5] M. V. Portman, *A History of our Relations with the Andamanese*, vol. i, p. 34.

[6] C. E. Meinicke, *Die Inseln des stillen Oceans*, vol. ii, pp. 341 sq., 383, 408; T. Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, vol. v, pp. 104 sq.; H. Hale, *Ethnology and Philology of the United States Exploring Expedition*, pp. 72 sq.; O. Finsch, "Über die Bewohner von Ponape," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xii, p. 317.

sometimes the chagrin of finding himself in a moment without either wife or children, in consequence of the ill-humour or whim of a capricious woman." The writer goes on to describe how, if the husband is suspected by his wife of conduct of which she disapproves, she calls all her female relatives to arms—literally, for they come armed with spears and clubs and sack all the guilty man's possessions, often ending by pulling the house down.[1] "The women," says another writer, "exercised all rule except leadership in war and the navigation of canoes. Without being precisely invested with political authority, they exercised nevertheless so great an influence in the councils and tribunals on which they sat that the direction of public affairs may accurately be said to have rested in their hands." [2]

Throughout Polynesia the position of women, though theoretically subordinate, is invariably one of great independence and influence, and stands in marked contrast with their status in Melanesia. In Tonga it is described as "equal, if not superior, to that of the men"; they are served at meals before men of equal rank, and are treated with great deference.[3] In Tahiti they are regarded by the men as equals; they "possess an influence over their husbands which causes them to be treated with attention, lest the husband should lose his wife, as she would soon find a husband ready to receive her with more kindness; and the result of this is that infidelity is more common amongst the women than amongst the men." [4] In Samoa the women spoke at tribal councils, and a chief was bound by custom to abide by the wishes of his sister. In war no one dare kill a woman. Care was taken to save them as much work as possible; the men not only provided the food, but also did the cooking and housework.[5] In New Zealand "many of the women exercise the greatest influence over their tribes; especially the widows of important chiefs, or aged women, some of whom are supposed to possess the power of witchcraft and sorcery." [6]

[1] C. Le Gobien, *Histoire des isles Marianes*, pp. 59 sq.

[2] L. de Freycinet, *Voyage autour du Monde par ordre du Roi*, vol. ii, Part i, pp. 376, 475.

[3] W. Mariner, *An Account of the Natives of Tonga*, vol. ii, pp. 95, 134; J. E. Erskine, *Journal of a Cruise among the Islands of the Western Pacific*, pp. 153, 215; W. Waldegrave, "Extracts from a Private Journal kept on board H.M.S. 'Seringapatam' in the Pacific," *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, iii, p. 186.

[4] W. Waldegrave, *op. cit.*, pp. 179 sq.

[5] G. Turner, *Samoa*, pp. 112, 195 sq.; E. von Hesse-Wartegg, *Samoa, Bismarck-Archipel und Neu-Guinea*, pp. 241 sq.; W. von Bülow, "Das ungeschriebenes Gesetz der Samoaner," *Globus*, lxix, p. 193.

[6] G. F. Angas, *Savage Life and Scenes in Australia and New Zealand*, vol. i, p. 317.

In Madagascar the women have always enjoyed great independence and influence. The Abbé Rochon, who visited the country at the end of the eighteenth century, says the men thought of nothing so much as how to please their women; "the balance of power inclines in favour of the woman."[1] A modern missionary says that the women rule the family.[2] According to Sir Francis Galton, "Bushmen husbands are, generally speaking, henpecked. They always consult their wives";[3] and we have descriptions of the rough handling to which they are at times subjected by the 'weaker sex.'[4] Among the Bechuana the wife occupies an important position. The mother of the chief is present at councils and he can hardly decide anything without her consent. A married man cannot dispose of the property which he and his wife hold in common unless his wife agrees, and on this point the husband generally conforms to her wishes.[5] Among the Hottentots the women have always occupied a position approaching to one of family despotism; the husband "has not a word to say; the woman is supreme ruler."[6] Among the Herero "the women enjoy great consideration and are treated with respect."[7] A young mother is regarded as a holy personage, and the herdsmen bring the milk of their cows to her to be blessed by her touch.[8] Among the Banyai, if a man was asked to perform a service, "he would reply, 'Well, I shall go and ask my wife.' If she consented, he would go and perform his duty faithfully; but no amount of coaxing would induce him to do it if she refused. The person whom Nyakoba appointed to be our guide," says Livingstone, "came and bargained that his services should be rewarded with a hoe. I had no objection to give, and showed him the article. He was delighted with it, and went to show it to his wife. He soon afterwards returned and said that, although he was perfectly willing to go, his wife would not let him. I remarked to my men:

[1] Abbé A. Rochon, in *Madagascar, or Robert Drury's Journal*, edited by P. Oliver, pp. 369 sq.

[2] P. Walter, "Die Inseln Nossi-Be und Mayotte," in S. R. Steinmetz, *Rechtsverhältnisse von eingeborenen Völkern in Afrika und Ozeanien*, p. 370.

[3] F. Galton, *The Narrative of an Explorer in South Africa*, p. 175.

[4] J. Chapman, *Travels in the Interior of South Africa*, vol. i, p. 391.

[5] L. Alberti, *De Kaffers aan de zuidkust van Afrika*, pp. 89, 92, 93. Cf. G. Schweinfurth, *Im Herzen von Afrika*, vol. ii, p. 96.

[6] T. Hahn, *Tsui-Goam*, pp. 19 sq.; Id., in *Jahresberichte des Vereins für Erdkunde zu Dresden*, 1870, p. 80; L. Jacobowski, "Das Weib in der Poesie der Hottentotten," *Globus*, lxx, p. 173; M. Poix, "Les Hottentots ou Khoi-Khoi et leur religion," *Revue d'Anthropologie*, xvi (1887), p. 272.

[7] J. Irle, *Die Herero*, p. 110.

[8] H. Schinz, *Deutsch-Süd-West-Afrika*, p. 167.

'Did you ever see such a fool?' They answered: 'Oh, that is the custom of these parts; the wives are the masters.'" [1]

It is a characteristic of all Bantu women that they will not stand rough treatment, and strongly resent any act which they regard as unjust or unkind. As a good observer well puts it, "Native women are very thin-skinned and sensitive. I remember being roused one morning in Bihe by an awful hubbub, as though someone were being murdered near my house. I ran out in my pyjamas expecting to see someone speared or hacked to pieces with an axe. Instead I saw a native woman with her hands clasped around her head. She was crying, and the big tears were coursing down her cheeks as she ran along the road. 'What is the matter, woman?' I asked. 'Oh,' she said, 'my husband spoke roughly to me, and I'm going home to my mother.'" [2] "The negress," remarks another observer, "does not easily allow herself to be compelled to involuntary toil; she has far too lively a spirit of independence and even of opposition." On one occasion, relates the same writer, the Dualla women from one village went on strike; they one and all left the village and their men, and built themselves another village farther on. The cause of the strike was that they thought their men-folk were too niggardly, and did not supply them with a sufficient allowance of dress materials in the form of European cloth. The strike was completely successful and ended in the abject surrender of the insufficiently generous husbands.[3] Among the Bagesu of the Uganda Protectorate "a wife would not hesitate to attack her husband with her hands, a stick, or a knife, and a man of a quiet disposition was often completely ruled by his wife." [4]

In southern Nigeria, among the Ekoi, "the chief wife, not the husband, was regarded as the head of the house. So strictly are women's rights guarded by native law that even now it is not unusual for a wife to summon her husband before court on the heinous charge of having made use, without her permission, of some of her property, perhaps a pot or a pan." [5] In Kikuyu, the position of woman "in girlhood, wifehood, motherhood, and old age is in many ways preferable to that of her white sister." [6] Among the Warega of the Congo women are said to enjoy almost as much consideration as the men.[7] Among the Madi negroes it is noted

[1] D. Livingstone, *Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa*, pp. 622 sq.

[2] D. Campbell, *In the Heart of Bantu Land*, p. 162.

[3] Max Buchner, *Kamerun, Skizzen und Betrachtungen*, p. 32.

[4] J. Roscoe, *The Bagesu and other Tribes of the Uganda Protectorate*, p. 35.

[5] P. A. Talbot, *In the Shadow of the Bush*, pp. 97 sq.

[6] W. S. and K. Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People. The Akikuyu of British East Africa*, p. 120.

[7] C. Delhaise, *Les Warega*, p. 193.

that "women are treated with respect and politeness by the men, who always show them preference, resigning to their use the best places, and paying them such-like courtesies. . . . Any insult to a woman is revenged, and is frequently the cause of war." [1] Among the Manbuttu and Momou, women "are much respected"; their husbands "regard them as at least the equals of the men." The Manbuttu woman "plays a considerable part in the great gatherings which are held to discuss important questions which concern the fate of the nation, to decide peace or war. It is not long since a wife of the late Sultan Nyangara, named Nenzima, directed with great wisdom the policy of the Manbuttu people. All the great chiefs who ruled in that country came to her to ask advice in difficult circumstances." [2] Schweinfurth remarks that "they exhibit the greatest degree of independence. The position in the household of the men was illustrated by the reply which would be made if they were solicited to sell anything as a curiosity, 'Oh, ask my wife; it is hers.'" [3]

Among the tribes of the Upper Nile the women are "practically on an equality with the men, except occasionally when they rise to the height of henpecking their husbands." [4] Among the Bega, the wife "rules the roost in a way which is difficult to reconcile with the defiant and haughty nature of those untamed nomads." [5] Among the Beni-Amer the position of the husband is pitiable, indeed ridiculous. He is deliberately exploited by the women, whose avowed object is to ruin him. For every child that is born he must make his wife a present: should he in an unguarded moment lose his temper and speak a rough word to her, he is turned out of doors, a hue and cry is set up throughout the village, the wife's brothers and all the women rush to the support of the offended lady, and the husband is only admitted back into the house on payment of a trifle, such as a cow or a camel; or else he is made to spend the night outside until, on payment, his offence is remitted. The husband's worldly goods are thus gradually transferred to his better half and become her unalienable property, and when the man has nothing left he is dismissed and another victim sought. To show any affection to the wretch would on the part of the virago be a humiliating degradation not to be contemplated.[6] In the province of Dongola, the position of the husband is equally abject. His relations with his wife are

[1] R. W. Felkin, "Notes on the Madi or Moru Tribe of Central Africa," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, xii, p. 329.

[2] H. H. Johnston, *George Grenfell and the Congo*, pp. 674 sq.

[3] G. Schweinfurth, *Im Herzen Afrikas*, vol. ii, p. 91.

[4] A. L. Kitching, *On the Backwaters of the Nile*, p. 147.

[5] W. Junker, *Travels in Africa*, p. 132.

[6] W. Munzinger, *Ostafrikanische Studien*, p. 325.

carefully regulated by tribal law. It is illegal for him to dispose of any property without consulting her. "Further, he should bear with all her caprices, or if she abuses him, he is expected to laugh at it and is not despised for so doing. The husband is absolutely forbidden to beat his wife, whatever her offence. Intolerable offences he should report to her guardian, and the guardian will beat her, and she be proud of it; whereas if the husband beats her himself, the guardian is deeply affronted and exacts compensation. The woman expects to share as an equal partner in all that concerns the common life, but she ought not to show love for her husband even in private, or pity for him if he is sick, or sorrow if he goes away on a journey, or divorces her, and it is reckoned disgraceful for a woman to weep in public over her husband's death." [1]

It has already been seen that very similar conditions obtain among the Tuareg of the Sahara.[2] "In order that the Targi woman should have placed herself thus above the law," remarks Duveyrier, "more than the attractive power of the female sex over the male has been necessary." [3] In Abyssinia, likewise, women occupy a high position, and their rights are at least equal to those of the men.[4]

In Asia, while among the most highly civilised races of the continent, such as the Hindus and the Chinese, women occupy a position of effacement and subordination, their status is almost completely reversed among the most primitive and secluded races. Among the savages of the Aleutian Islands the women are the dominant sex; a man scarcely dares even to express his wishes in the presence of his wife.[5] In Kamchatka "husbands are under the iron rule of their wives." [6] Among the primitive Ainu the position of women is dominant; "the wives dictate to their husbands, and make them fetch and carry." [7] Of the Giliak of Sakhalin a Japanese traveller writes: "In this country it is the custom that women should rule over the men; they treat these like servants and make them do all the work." [8] Among the Moï, the most primitive race of

[1] J. W. Crowfoot, "Customs of the Rubatab," *Sudan Notes and Record*, i, pp. 121 sq.

[2] See above, pp. 286 sq.

[3] H. Duveyrier, *Les Touaregs du Nord*, p. 420.

[4] G. K. Rein, *Abessinien*, vol. i, p. 312.

[5] A. Dall, *Alaska and its Resources*, p. 396.

[6] J. G. Georgi, *Description de toutes les nations de l'Empire de Russie*, vol. iii, p. 89. Cf. G. W. Steller, *Beschreibung von dem Lande Kamtschatka*, pp. 289, 294, 345.

[7] A. Bastian, *Die Völker der oestlichen Asien*, vol. v, p. 866. Cf. B. Pilsudski, "Schwangerschaft, Entbindung und Fehlgeburt bei den Bewohnern der Insel Sachalin." *Anthropos*, pp. 762 sqq.

[8] Mama Rinsô, "Tô-tato Ki Ko, d. i., Reise nach der östlichen Tatarei," *Nippon, Archief voor de beschrijving van Japan*, vii, p. 169.

Indo-China, "nowhere does woman enjoy more consideration and esteem. It would be going too far to say that the Moï wife is the head of the family and rules her husband; the truth is that in that community all members are absolutely equal." [1] Among the Garos of Assam, says Sir W. Hunter, "women enjoy a power and position quite unknown among more civilised tribes and people." [2] The free and independent position of the women in Tibet has frequently attracted attention. "In that country," says an old traveller, "the wives are the chief rulers in the household, which they govern more than do their husbands. These live in great dependence upon their wives and show great respect towards them; and they treat them with so much love and submission that they do not undertake anything without their advice and consent." [3] "By what means," remarks Mr. Rockhill, "have those women gained such complete ascendancy over the men, how have they made their mastery so complete and so acceptable to a race of lawless barbarians who but unwillingly submit to the authority of their chiefs, is a problem well worth consideration." [4]

The problem is, indeed, not only difficult, but insoluble. If it be asked, How could the power and ascendancy of women come to establish itself in a primitive society where the men are, as we are accustomed to imagine, predominant and masterful, and to displace the authority and initiative which we assume to be natural in the male? the only answer is that such a process is impossible. If man in his rudest and most brutal original condition had been supreme master in the human group, and women had occupied the position of chattel and slaves in which we find them among some savage races, there is no conceivable process by which, in a primitive state of culture, that position could have been modified, much less reversed.

That impossibility depends not so much upon the completeness of male domination, when once it is established, or upon the physical inferiority of woman and her incapacity to throw off the burden of oppression, as on her utter indisposition to do anything of the kind. Woman is immeasurably orthodox; revolt is alien to her nature and to her mentality. A defiant and rebellious attitude is found in women only where they already occupy a position of considerable vantage and influence; it is not found where their status is really one of oppression. However burdensome their position may be, it is accepted; it may be lamented, but it is set down to fate, not to injustice. As Olive Schreiner justly remarks,

[1] A. Gautier, "Voyage au pays des Moï," *Cochinchine Française, Excursions et Reconnaissances, 1882–83*, p. 244.

[2] W. W. Hunter, *A Statistical Account of Assam*, vol. ii, pp. 153 sq.

[3] Father Desideri, in C. Puini, *Il Tibet*, p. 132.

[4] W. W. Rockhill, *The Land of the Lamas*, p. 230. Cp. below, pp. 657 sq.

"Wherever there is a general attempt on the part of the women of any society to readjust their position in it, a close analysis will always show that the changed, or changing, conditions of that society have made women's acquiescence no longer necessary or desirable."[1] In other words, their condition is no longer one of subjection.

The toil with which we find primitive women burdened is freely and even eagerly accepted by them. It was a pervading fallacy of earlier accounts of primitive social conditions that wherever women were seen working hard, their status was judged to be one of slavery and oppression. No misunderstanding could be more profound; the significance of such evidence is the exact reverse. Generally speaking, it is in those primitive societies where women toil most that their status is most independent and their influence greatest; where they are idle, and work is done by slaves, the women are, as a rule, little more than sexual slaves. The woman who is seen toiling, and whose fate is pitied, may be the virtual ruler of her home. She may be a princess, a queen. The primitive princesses of Africa, Polynesia, Micronesia, like the Homeric Nausicaa, labour as other women. In Uganda "princess and peasant women alike look upon cultivation as their special work. No woman would remain with a man who did not give her a garden and a hoe to dig with; if these were denied her she would seek an early opportunity to escape from her husband and return to her relations to complain of her treatment, and to obtain justice or a divorce."[2] The negress who is seen hoeing the ground, with perhaps a baby on her back, in Madagascar, is as likely as not the owner of the field, and the most despotic of wives. In New Zealand the wife of a chief, the powerful ruler of a large district, would insist on cultivating her field of sweet potatoes laboriously, even though she was old and infirm.[3] In the Pelew Islands, "the richest woman in the village looks with pride upon her taro patch, and although she has female followers enough to allow her to superintend the work without taking part in it, she nevertheless prefers to lay aside her fine apron and to betake herself to the deep mire clad in a small apron that hardly hides her nakedness, with a little mat on her back to protect her from the burning heat of the sun, and with a shade of banana leaves for her eyes. There, dripping with sweat, in the burning sun, and coated with mud to the hip and over, she toils to set

[1] O. Schreiner, *Woman and Labour*, p. 14.

[2] J. Roscoe, *The Baganda*, p. 426.

[3] M. S. Dumont D'Urville, *Voyage de la corvette L'Astrolabe*, vol. iii, pp. 301 sq., after S. Marsden.

the younger women a good example."[1] Among the Pueblo tribes, as among all other American tribes, the women work harder than the men; the Zuñi woman who may be seen toiling up the steep path that leads up the cañon to the cliff dwelling which she has built, carrying a huge water-vessel—also her own handiwork—strapped to her forehead, is the matriarchal head of her home. The Seri women do all the labour of the community; the men are by comparison but idle drones. To the subject of the labour of women in primitive society further reference will be made later, and it will be shown that in no instance is it undertaken by them otherwise than voluntarily; it is never imposed upon them by the men.[2] Primitive women would as strongly resent that the work which they regard as their own sphere of activity should be done by others as a primitive warrior would resent his being forbidden to join his companions in the field. An Indian woman, seeing some white men carrying bundles of firewood, ran at once to their assistance and collected wood for them, "because to see men doing women's work was a scandal which she could not bear to look upon." The breach of usage was painful and offensive to her.[3]

The toil to which primitive woman is subjected is regarded by her as a functional division of labour. The same attitude of acceptance extends to whatever treatment she may customarily be called upon to endure, however oppressive and unjust. Where wife-beating prevails, a woman whose husband does not beat her despises him for his lack of spirit.[4] The New Caledonian women "are satisfied with their condition."[5] Australian women evince the greatest attachment and devotion to husbands who treat them with brutality.[6] Even the custom of suttee is nowise resented or objected to by women. In India it frequently happened that several widows would dispute among themselves for the honour of accompanying their husbands on the funeral pyre. These quarrels had to be settled by the Brahman in charge of the funeral, whose duty it was to determine which widow should have the preference.[7] The wives of a chief in Benin contended similarly as to who should

[1] J. S. Kubary, *Ethnologische Beiträge zur Kentniss der Karolinesen Archipels*, p. 159.

[2] See below, pp. 436 sqq.

[3] J. Long, *Voyages and Travels of an Indian Interpreter*, pp. 137 sq.

[4] H. H. Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, vol. iii, pp. 66 sq.

[5] L. Moncelon, "Réponse . . . pour les Néo-Calédoniens au question naire de la Société," *Bulletin de la Société d'Anthropologie*, Série iii, ix, p. 358.

[6] G. Bennett, *Wanderings in New South Wales*, pp. 248 sq.; E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race*, vol. i, p. 110; J. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, p. 37.

[7] J. A. Dubois, *Hindu Manners, Customs, and Ceremonies*, vol. ii, p. 363. Cf. W. H. Sleeman, *Rambles and Recollections of an Indian Official*, pp. 19 sqq.

have the privilege of being slaughtered on his grave.[1] Among the Natchez the women were anxious to obtain the honour of being killed on the grave of a chief; they bespoke their place and employed their leisure time in preparing the rope with which they hoped to be strangled.[2] In New Zealand, the women of aristocratic families displayed the same solicitude. Judge Maning gives a graphic description of the commotion attending the demise of a Maori chief. His older wives, two wizened hags, were found the next morning hanging to the main rafter of the 'whare.' When the European suggested that they should be cut down, the chief's successor remarked that this would be premature, as they might not be quite dead. "The two young wives had also made a desperate attempt in the night to hang themselves, but had been prevented by two young men who, by some unaccountable accident, had come upon them just as they were stringing themselves up, and who, seeing that they were not actually 'ordered for execution,' by great exertion, and with the help of several female relatives whom they called to their assistance, prevented them from killing themselves out of respect for their old lord."[3] In Fiji, some missionaries having 'rescued' a woman who, according to usage, was to have been throttled on the grave of her husband, did not bethink themselves of keeping watch over their protégée. She escaped during the night, swam ashore, and returned to the village "intent on the completion of the sacrifice which she had, in a moment of weakness, reluctantly consented to forgo on the previous day."[4] Herodotus tells us that the same competitive eagerness for the honour of being immolated on the grave of their husbands was the rule among Scythian women.[5]

The learned Swiss jurist Bachofen, who was the first to draw attention to some of the evidence showing the prevalence at one time of feminine dominance, suggests that women rebelled in disgust at the promiscuity imposed by male rule. "Gynaecocracy," he wrote, "has everywhere been developed, consolidated, and maintained by the conscious and continuous opposition of woman against a debasing promiscuity."[6] But nothing could be more fantastically impossible than such an occurrence. Sexual morality has for the most part been imposed by man on woman, not by woman on man. There is no tendency in woman to object to the sexual standards, whatever they may be, which obtain in her

[1] H. Ling Roth, *Great Benin*, p. 43.
[2] F. X. de Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, vol. vi, p. 179.
[3] F. E. Maning, *Old New Zealand*, pp. 172 sq.
[4] J. Erskine, *Islands of the Western Pacific*, p. 228.
[5] Herodotus, v. 5.
[6] J. J. Bachofen, *Das Mutterrecht*, Introduction, p. xix.

environment. The popular delusion that she in any way resents polygamy is destitute of foundation. In polygamous countries women are as virtuously orthodox, and if appealed to they as proudly uphold and passionately defend the established order as they do in a monogamous environment. "It is not a little singular," remarks a missionary with the usual naïveté, "that the females upon whom the burden of this degrading institution mainly rests are quite as much interested in its continuance as the men themselves. A woman would infinitely prefer to be one of a dozen wives of a respectable man than to be the sole representative of a man who had not the force of character to raise himself above the one-woman level."[1] "A Fula woman of some consequence and much good sense, whose husband had four wives, being asked if she did not wish to reign alone, replied in the negative; for as she was not company for her husband, she would be quite at a loss for amusement were it not for the conversation of his other wives."[2] "The more wives the better, says the African lady. I know men," says Miss Kingsley, "who would rather have had one wife and spend the rest of their money on themselves in a civilised way, driven to polygamy by the women."[3] A recent missionary account states: "Polygamy is favoured and fostered equally by men and women; in some respects the latter are the chief supporters of the system."[4] Pages might be filled with similar testimonies, and I know not of one in the opposite sense. The scorn poured by the women of the harem on a woman who has so little self-respect as to accept the position of sole slave of a man would be entertaining to the latter.

Where the social order tends to promiscuity and sexual freedom, women accept and uphold it as strongly as they do polygamy or monogamy. Travellers who decline the savage's hospitable offer of his wives or daughters cause the utmost offence to those ladies. The daughters of an African chief in those circumstances thus upbraided an explorer: "Why do you disdain us? Are the women of your country prettier? In any case we mean to remain. We are not going to let it be said that the daughters of the chief have been turned out of the white man's tent. We are not going to expose ourselves to the derision of every woman. And let me tell you, white man, that whoever you may be, we

[1] J. L. Wilson, *Western Africa*, p. 112.

[2] T. Winterbottom, *An Account of the Native Africans of the Neighbourhood of Sierra Leone*, vol. i, p. 146.

[3] M. H. Kingsley, *Travels in West Africa*, p. 212. Miss Kingsley gives many interesting details of the resentment of the women against the missionaries for endeavouring to introduce monogamy.

[4] G. T. Basden, *Among the Ibos of Nigeria*, p. 97. Cf. below, vol. ii, pp. 261 sqq.

are the daughters of a chief, and will not submit to being insulted." [1] In another instance the mother of the proffered damsel similarly gave vent to her proud indignation at the white man's reserve, reciting the noble ancestry of her daughter, and denouncing the base insult that had been offered to a respectable family.[2] The like indignation when refused by a guest to whom they have been offered is expressed by Eskimo,[3] Yukaghir,[4] and Chinook women.[5] A husband who does not know how to perform the duties of hospitality by offering his wife to a guest is despised by the women who look upon him as a mean and scurvy fellow. Of the North American Indians a traveller remarks that "the husband who should refuse to lend his wife would fall under the condemnation of the sex generally." [6] Nowhere do we come upon any manifestation on the part of women of dissent from the sexual code of their social environment. In our own society a woman does not revolt against it, however dissolute it may be, and even though she may be plainly a sufferer from its effects; she, on the contrary, looks with utter scorn upon 'virtuous women.'

The Establishment of Male Domination in some Societies in the Lowest Stages of Culture.

It has been supposed by some writers that the favoured status of women in some communities is the outcome of special local economic conditions, such as the acquisition by the women of the land which they cultivated or their ownership of the dwellings and other real estate, and that the matriarchal character of those communities is therefore the result of comparatively late social conditions. It is beyond doubt that where, as among the Pueblos, the Khasis, the Pelew Islanders, and other Micronesian peoples, or the Tuareg, personal property has accumulated in the hands of the women that potent economic lever is not an original condition; for ownership of land is in primitive societies of little significance, personal property scarcely exists, and does not give rise to economic ascendancy. A highly developed matriarchal community, in which the influence of women is consolidated by the control of important property, can exist only where agriculture has attained considerable importance, or other forms of economically vital

[1] A. de Serpa Pinto, *Comment j'ai traversé l'Afrique*, vol. i, p. 389.

[2] G. A. Farini, *Huit mois au Kalahari*, pp. 190 sq.

[3] E. Petitot, *Les Grands Esquimaux*, p. 141.

[4] W. Jochelson, *The Yukaghir and Yukaghirised Tungus* (*Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. ix), p. 64.

[5] M. Lewis and W. Clarke, *Travels to the Source of the Missouri River*, vol. ii, p. 291.

[6] A. Henry, *Travels and Adventures in the Years 1760–1776*, p. 241.

resources have developed. But in order that the women should be able to avail themselves of those economic advantages, they must have retained from the first, and before the appearance of those relatively late favourable economic conditions, a position of independence and influence. Unless this is postulated, the 'favourable conditions' referred to are no more favourable to the women than to the men; and would, indeed, inevitably be taken advantage of by the men, and not by the women. It is not possible to suppose that matriarchal communities developed out of such a state of society as we find in Australia or in Melanesia; for had the male domination or despotism found in those societies existed in earlier stages among the Khasis, Menangkabau, or Pelew Islanders, no favourable conditions such as are suggested could have brought about a change in the status of the women. Such a supposition is an extravagance as little conceivable as Bachofen's notion of a revolt of women, and one which even the most ardent defenders of the patriarchal theory would, I feel sure, have some hesitation in maintaining. Yet unless that incredible assumption is made, the argument as to the local genesis of matriarchal conditions falls to the ground; for if male supremacy, that is, a patriarchal social organisation, be supposed to have existed from the first and rudest stages of social evolution, the result is, as we know, a condition of things out of which it is quite impossible to evolve an independent position of the women. It is necessary, therefore, in order to account for the operation of favourable local conditions in bringing about a matriarchal type of society, to postulate not only the development of those conditions, but also that they arose in a society in which the women already enjoyed influence and independence. Those who argue that the position of women in certain communities may have been due to local and adventitious economic causes thus merely shift the question without answering it, for they have still to account for women having retained their independence and influence in the ruder stages through which those societies must have passed before any favourable economic conditions came into play. The suggestion that the matriarchal order of society is the effect of particular economic conditions, more especially of ownership of land where agriculture has developed, is, indeed, abolished by the fact that matriarchal organisation, if anything more thorough and more absolute than any to be found among people who practise agriculture, is met with in the rudest communities, such as those of the Seri Indians, where no such conditions exist.[1]

[1] Dr. Kroeber, whose views derive great weight from his intimate knowledge of the Pueblos and from the scientific character of all his work, expresses the opinion that the whole matriarchal organisation

The same intrinsic difficulties attend the supposition that any of the features of matriarchal organisation, such as the reckoning of descent or the transmission of property in the female line, could have been developed out of a social state in which the opposite, or patriarchal, practice obtained. Of such a transition from patriarchal to matriarchal customs there does not exist anywhere an example, nor is there any evidence suggesting such a phenomenon.[1] On the other hand, in every society, uncultured or civilised, where patriarchal usages obtain at the present day, indications are to be found of a previous higher status of women, or of an actual matriarchal organisation.[2]

of the Zuñi rests upon the fact that the women are the owners of the substantial houses which they themselves built, and upon the consequent matrilocal character of their marriages (see above, p. 309). The view entirely agrees with the considerations which I have just emphasised. But I cannot perceive how it is possible for Dr. Kroeber to suggest, as he appears to do, that the important part played in the life of the Pueblo tribes by their exceptionally elaborate and substantial dwellings is the sole local cause of the character of their social organisation. Surely Dr. Kroeber is perfectly familiar with the fact that such an organisation is but one example of the social conditions which are practically universal among all the native races of the North American continent. There is nothing peculiar to the Pueblos in that organisation, in their usages of matrilocal marriage, of matrilinear reckoning of descent and transmission of property and offices; these are found equally where, instead of solid structures of masonry, nothing but the temporary leather wigwam of nomadic tribes is to be found, and where the 'houses' are no more than the rudest shelter of a few bundles of scrubwood. Does Dr. Kroeber consider that the social organisation of the Seri is determined by the fact that the women are the owners of half a dozen twigs? There must have been a time when the ancestors of the Pueblo Indians had no houses. Does Dr. Kroeber believe that they then reckoned kinship in the male line? Does he believe that the men removed the women from their family and brought them to dwell with them, and that the advance in architecture brought about a reversal of that custom? Does he believe that the men were in the habit of spearing the women and of customarily hitting them on the head with a bludgeon, and that the status of the women was similar to that of Australian or New Caledonian women? If he does not, I fail to see the reasoning upon which the argument from "favourable local conditions" rests.

[1] As an example of such a transition it has been adduced that certain Kwakiutl Indians, who reckon descent in the male line, are in the habit of adopting the crest or totem of their mother's father in addition to that of their father; and it is suggested that the practice is due to the influence of their neighbours, the Tsinchians and Haidas, who reckon descent in the female line (F. Boas, "The Social Organisation and Secret Societies of the Kwakiutl Indians," *Smithsonian Reports*, 1895, p. 334). That is no more than a supposition, and is unproved and unlikely; but were it a fact, the crest of the Kwakiutl gentleman could scarcely be regarded as weighing against the universal spectacle of the transition from matriarchal to patriarchal usages and the entire absence of any example of the opposite event.

[2] As Sir James Frazer admirably puts it: "The theory that a people

Among matriarchally organised primitive races the change to patriarchal organisation is everywhere taking place under our eyes before the contact of Europeans and the development of property. The North American Indian tribes who have adopted paternal descent have probably done so within the period of European occupation. A Choctaw Indian once told a missionary that he wished to become a citizen of the United States so that he might transmit his property to his children.[1] A Menomini Indian said to L. H. Morgan : " If I should die, my brothers and maternal uncles would rob my wife and children of my property. We now expect that our children will inherit our effects but there is no certainty about it. The old law gives my property to my nearest kindred who are not my children, but my brothers and sisters and maternal uncles." [2] Among the Shawnees, on the other hand, who are now patrilineal, an old sachem hankered after the old custom, and asked that the son of his sister should be allowed to succeed him ; and his wish was respected.[3] In the islands of Torres Straits the social organisation is now patriarchal, but the guardian of the children at their initiation is not their father, but their maternal uncle, and usages establishing between uncle and nephew a relationship which is that naturally existing in a matriarchal community, as well as the right of a man to certain services from his brother-in-law such as he receives when the brother-in-law is a visitor or a stranger in his sister's house, preserve the picture of a different order of society.[4] In New Guinea " it is obvious that the Massim are generally in a condition of transition from matrilineal to patrilineal descent, while at the extreme west of the Massim area the transition has actually taken place." [5] In Sumatra every conceivable transition from matriarchal to patriarchal organisation is to be found, and it is only in the remote and secluded districts that the Motherhood

who once possessed paternal descent afterwards exchanged it for maternal descent would require very strong evidence in its support to make it probable, since both intrinsic probability and analogy are strongly against it. For it seems very unlikely that men who had once been accustomed to transmit their rights and privileges to their own children should afterwards disinherit them and transmit these rights and privileges to their sisters' children instead ; and in point of fact, while there are a good many symptoms of a transition from maternal to paternal descent in other parts of the world, there is, so far as I know, none whatever of a transition in the reverse direction from paternal descent to maternal " (*Totemism and Exogamy*, vol. iii, pp. 320 sq.).

[1] L. H. Morgan, *Ancient Society*, p. 162.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 170 sq.

[3] L. H. Morgan, *op. cit.*, pp. 169 sq.

[4] W. H. R. Rivers, in *Reports of the Cambridge Expedition to Torres Straits*, vol. v, pp. 144–147, 150 sq.

[5] C. G. Seligman, *The Melanesians of British New Guinea*, p. 436.

group has maintained itself in its pristine purity. In the Indragiri valley descending from the secluded highlands the various steps of the transition from the position of the husband as a mere visitor to his residence in his wife's family, as in the Tiga Loerong community, or her removal to a separate, but adjoining house, and finally to her husband's home, are schematically exhibited.[1] In Nigeria, among the Edo, as among the Malays, the two forms of marriage are found; in 'amoiya' marriage the children belong to their father's clan, in 'isomi' marriage to their mother's; and the Edo are descended from the Sobo, who are purely matriarchal.[2] Throughout the Caroline and Marshall group of islands the constitution into maternal clans is universal with the single exception of the island of Yap.[3] In this island, curiously enough, while descent is reckoned in the male line and property is transmitted by a father to his son, yet the practice of matrilocal marriage persists, and the woman, as everywhere else throughout Micronesia, does not leave her maternal home.[4] In the Mortlock Islands, although the rule is that the wife remains in her mother's home, yet where chiefs and sometimes very old men are concerned, the patrilocal practice has been adopted.[5] The singular anomaly found in Yap is due, as Kubary points out, to local conditions not permitting of the clans being sufficiently segregated. That is doubtless also the reason why no typical matriarchal organisation is found in Polynesia, although there are abundant indications of the existence of such an organisation in former times.[6]

The change from a matriarchal to a patriarchal order of society may, however, take place at stages of culture too low to be greatly influenced by economic considerations. In the statistical paper already referred to, Sir Edward Tylor compared the incidence of the two forms of marriage residence and their intermediate forms with the custom of mother-in-law avoidance, which we have already seen reason to regard as closely connected with primitive marriage usages. "If," he says, "the custom of residence and the custom of avoidance were independent, or nearly so, we should expect to find their coincidence following the ordinary law

[1] G. A. Wilken, *De verspreide geschriften*, vol. i, pp. 317 sqq. Similar transitions are observable in southern Sumatra (*ibid.*, vol. ii, pp. 219 sqq.).

[2] N. W. Thomas, *The Edo-speaking Peoples of Nigeria*, vol. i, pp. 47 sq.

[3] J. Kubary, "Die Bewohner der Mortlock Inseln," *Mittheilungen der geographischen Gesellschaft in Hamburgh*, 1878–79, p. 245 n.; F. W. Christian *The Caroline Islands*, p. 74.

[4] A. Senfft, "Die Rechtssitten der Jap Eingeborenen," *Globus*, xci, pp. 141 sq.

[5] J. Kubary, *loc. cit.*

[6] *Ibid.*, *loc. cit.* Cf. G. Brown, *Melanesians and Polynesians*, p. 40.

of chance distribution. In the tribes where the husband permanently lives with his wife's family (65 out of 350) we should estimate ceremonial avoidance between him and them might appear in 9 cases, whereas it actually appears in 14. On the other hand, peoples where the husband at marriage takes his wife home (141 out of 350) would rateably correspond with avoidance between him and her family in 18 cases, whereas it actually appears in 9 cases only. Thus there is a well-marked preponderance indicating that ceremonial avoidance by the husband of the wife's family is in some way connected with his living with them." In regard to that distribution, Tylor did not fail to notice an anomaly, which appeared in direct contradiction with the general evidence afforded by his results. Among the Australian tribes, which have frequently been regarded as our most unadulterated example of primitive society, the general rule, so far as recent observation goes, is for the husband to take his wife home to his own tribe, and nowhere, as has been seen, is the condition of women more degraded and oppressed. Yet the curious sentiments and etiquette referring to the avoidance of the mother-in-law are seldom carried to a more ridiculous extreme. Tylor has the following passage on the subject : " It appeared to me that this must indicate a recent habit of residence on the wife's side, and reference showed a law of the Kurnai tribe of Gippsland that when a native kills game, certain parts of the meat (of a kangaroo, the head, neck, and parts of the back) are the allotted share of the wife's parents.[1] As the duty of supplying game to the wife's household when the husband lives there is one of the best-marked points of matriarchal law, I wrote to Mr. Howitt, as the leading authority on Australian anthropology, suggesting that further enquiry would probably disclose evidence hitherto unnoticed as to the maternal stage of society subsisting in Australia. After examination made, Mr. Howitt replied : ' I am now satisfied that your surmises are quite correct,' and therewith he sent details bearing on the question, especially an account by Mr. Aldridge of Maryborough, Queensland, as to the practice of the tribes in his neighbourhood. This I will quote, as being a strongly marked case of residence on the wife's side. ' When a man marries a woman from a distant locality, he goes to her tribelet and identifies himself with her people. This is a rule with very few exceptions. Of course, I speak of them as they were in their wild state. He became part of and one of the family. In the event of a war expedition, the daughter's husband acts as a blood-relation, and will fight his own blood-relations. I have seen a father and son fighting

[1] L. Fison and A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, p. 207.

under these circumstances, and the son would certainly have killed the father if others had not interfered.'"[1] Among the tribes of east-central Australia, north of Lake Eyre, when a man marries into a neighbouring tribelet, he is obliged to reside with his wife's people for at least three months.[2] In north Queensland, among the tribes of Princess Charlotte Bay, it is the regular usage for the husband to take up his residence with the family of his wife, although a wife is generally procured for a boy by his parents when he is quite young. His father takes the boy to his future mother-in-law, and she builds a hut for him and her daughter next to her own.[3] In the Dieri tribe there is, we are told, "always a hot opposition to a marriage which takes a girl out of it."[4]

There can, in fact, be no doubt that the patriarchal character of Australian society, the dominance of the men and the debased condition of the women are features of comparatively late origin, and that those conditions have supplanted a social state in which women occupied a more influential, if not actually a dominant, position. That is the view of Sir W. Baldwin Spencer and Mr. Gillen, our highest authorities on the central tribes. From a consideration of their traditions they have arrived at the conclusion that "at some time the women were possessed of greater privileges than they enjoy at the present day. There is a great gap between the 'Alcheringa' (the traditional or mythical history of the tribes) and recent times, and a very noticeable feature is the change which has in some way been brought about with regard to the position of women."[5] Among the tribes studied by Sir W. B. Spencer and Mr. Gillen they did not come upon any instance of a man taking up his residence with the clan of his wife; but it is the custom among the Arunta, a custom very strictly observed, that a certain portion of the product of a man's chase regularly goes to the blood-relations of his wife; and further, if those relatives should happen to be hunting in his company they have a recognised right to the whole of the game which he may kill. This, as Sir

[1] E. B. Tylor, "On a Method of Investigating the Development of Institutions, applied to Laws of Marriage and Descent," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xviii, p. 250. Cf. A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, pp. 220, 225, 234, 269.

[2] F. H. Wells, "The Habits, Customs, and Ceremonies of the Aboriginals of the Diamentina, Herbert, and Eleanor Rivers in East-Central Australia," *Report of the Fifth Meeting of the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science* (Sydney, 1893), p. 515.

[3] W. E. Roth, "North Queensland Ethnography, Bulletin No. 10," *Records of the Australian Museum*, vii, p. 4.

[4] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 185. Cf. J. W. Fawcett, "An Aborigine Wedding," *Science of Man*, 1899, p. 256.

[5] W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 195 sq.; cf. pp. 441, 457.

W. B. Spencer and Mr. Gillen point out, indicates "a former condition in which a man owed allegiance to the group of his wife." [1] In Western Australia the degraded condition of women at the present day has been perhaps more uniformly reported and emphasised than in regard to any other portion of the continent. But it has also been noticed that old women enjoy an extraordinary influence, which is in marked contrast with the abject and oppressed condition of the younger ones.[2] It is a traditional custom in those tribes that certain elderly females are solemnly invested by a ceremony held at tribal gatherings with the status of 'moyram,' or 'grandmother.' "It is a proceeding which confers upon the woman privileges of importance to all parties," says Mr. Moore. "She can henceforth no more be carried off for a wife or female drudge, nor be made a victim of revenge. Her influence is henceforth powerful with the tribe either in stirring them up to war or in allaying and reconciling quarrels. She is even permitted, if she thinks fit, when a dispute is anticipated, to mingle among the threatening combatants and deprive them of their spears and their darts." [3] That traditional custom so opposed to the present abject position of women in those tribes, suggests, as Mr. Moore remarks, that their status was formerly entirely different. There is reason to think, as will subsequently be seen, that women formerly played an important part in the exercise of religious or magical functions, from which they are at the present day strictly excluded in Australia; and it appears not unlikely that the West Australian 'Grandmothers' are a reminiscence of a time when the tribal mother from whom the natives still trace their descent occupied a position of influence and importance similar to that of the elder women in matriarchal societies, and may have even been the virtual ruler or sacred chieftainess of the clan.

The Australian natives are not only a primitive, they are in many respects also a degraded race, and with such a race, as soon as the change to a state of male domination took place, it would proceed to its extreme consequences. By virtue of the same low condition the customs and sentiments connected with the earlier social state, such as the mother-in-law prohibitions, the meaning of which is entirely forgotten, would persist with undiminished force. Thus it is that a people in a low state of culture among whom matriarchal influence has undoubtedly existed within fairly recent times, yet presents the spectacle of the most complete subjection of women.

[1] W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 469 sq.

[2] C. P. Hodgson, *Reminiscences of Australia*, p. 218.

[3] G. Fletcher Moore, *A Descriptive Vocabulary of the Language in Common Use amongst the Aborigines of Western Australia*, pp. 76 sq.

Melanesia, more especially in the central and southern groups of islands, is, after Australia, the most pronounced example of an uncultured society in which the position of women is one of complete subjection, and forms in this respect a strong contrast with the neighbouring Polynesian and Micronesian regions. Yet, like Australia, Melanesian social organisation presents countless features which appertain characteristically to a matriarchal order of society, such as the system of maternal clans, the strict observance of mother-in-law tabus, and the special position of the maternal uncle in many parts of that region. In the northernmost part of Melanesia, among the natives of the Gazelle Pensinsula of New Britain, society is dominated by the men, women are strictly excluded from religious functions and from the so-called 'secret societies,' are subjected to a system of terrorism, and are treated with considerable brutality, though not to the same extent as in the more southern groups; yet that society is organised through and through on purely matriarchal principles. Descent, as in Australia, is matrilinear: "the children belong to the clan of the mother, and are not relatives of the father." [1] It is not their father, but their mother's brother who disposes of them, and is responsible for the marriages not only of his nieces, but also of his nephews; and it is from their maternal uncle, and not from their father, that they inherit. "The whole law of the family and of inheritance is regulated by the relation of the people on their mother's side; kinship on the father's side is not considered. The children belong neither to the father nor to the mother, but to the mother's brother or to her nearest kinsman. The maternal uncle has the full right to dispose of his nephews and nieces, and in deciding concerning them he need not trouble himself about the wishes of the parents." [2] Even in the Shortlands, the northern islands of the Solomon group, the same thoroughgoing matriarchal organisation is found; the children belong to the mother's and not to the father's group, they inherit from their maternal uncle and not from their father. Yet the status of the women could not be much lower; "all the rights are on the side of the man. The woman is more the slave and beast

[1] F. Burger, *Die Küsten- und Bergvölker der Gazellehalbinsel*, p. 28.

[2] P. A. Kleintitschen, *Die Küstenbewohner der Gazellehalbinsel*, pp. 190 sq. Cf. F. Burger, *op. cit.*, p. 23; J. Pfeil, *Studien und Beobachtungen aus den Südsee*, p. 28; J. Meier, "Primitive Völker und 'Paradies-' Zustand, mit besonderer Beruchsichtigung der früheren Verhältnisse bein Oststamm der Gazellehalbinsel in Bismarck-Archipel," *Anthropos*, ii, p. 380; A. Hahl, "Ueber die Rechtsanschauungen der Eingeborenen eines Theiles der Blanchebucht und des Innern der Gazelle Halbinsel," *Nachrichten über Kaiser Wilhelms-Land und den Bismarck Archipel*, 1897, p. 78; R. Parkinson, *Dreissig Jahre in der Südsee*, p. 62.

of burden than the mate and companion of her husband."[1] Matriarchal organisation has thus outlived here all reality of feminine predominance. There are strong indications that the present exclusion of women from religious and political life is, as in Australia, a reversal of the state of things which formerly obtained. Marriage in Melanesia is, in accordance with patriarchal power, very generally patrilocal; but there are several notable exceptions which clearly point to a different usage in the past. Among the natives of the Gazelle Peninsula it is usual for a man's various wives to remain with their own families, where they are visited from time to time by the husband.[2] On the island of Nissan it is obligatory for the husband to dwell for a varying period with the relatives of his wife.[3] In the island of Rotuma the universal rule was until quite lately for the women to remain after marriage in their own homes, and for the husbands to dwell with their wives' people. The usage, as in New Britain and among the Massims of New Guinea, is now falling into decay; the couples spend the first years of their married life alternately in the home of the wife and in that of the husband, and it is a matter of arrangement between them whether they shall ultimately settle down in the one or in the other.[4]

The natives of Tierra del Fuego are another race belonging to the lowest cultural level. They stand in many respects lower than the Australian aborigines, and certainly than any Melanesian people; scarcely any other people, in fact, leads a more destitute and miserable existence than these naked savages in an inclement climate.

The position of women amongst the Fuegians appears to be intermediate between the state of complete subjection, which they occupy amongst the Australian aborigines or the Melanesians, and the predominance which they enjoy among other peoples of low culture. Their lot is certainly extremely miserable. "It is upon them that falls the brunt of the struggle for existence," which the race has to sustain against adverse conditions.[5] The behaviour of the men towards them is violent and brutal; they beat and maltreat them on the slightest occasion.[6] Nevertheless, there are many indications

[1] C. Ribbe, *Zwei Jahre unter den Kannibalen der Salomo-Inseln*, pp. 140 sq.

[2] A. Hahl, "Ueber die Rechtsanschauungen der Eingeborenen eines Theiles der Blanchebucht und des Innern der Gazelle Halbinsel," *Nachrichten über Kaiser Wilhelms-Land und den Bismarck-Archipel*, 1897, p. 88.

[3] F. Sorge, "Nissan-Inseln im Bismarck-Archipel," in S. R. Steinmetz, *Rechtsverhältnisse von eingeborenen Völkern in Afrika und Ozeanien*, p. 407.

[4] J. Stanley Gardiner, "The Natives of Rotuma," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxvii, pp. 478, 480.

[5] G. Bove, *Patagonia. Terra del Fuoco. Mari Australi*, p. 131.

[6] C. R. Gallardo, *Los Onas*, pp. 213 sq.; D. Lovisato, "Appunti

that their position is by no means one of absolute subjection. The hard work which is their lot is, as already indicated, no criterion of an oppressed condition. Their whole appearance, which is a very sure indication in this respect, belies the view that they are but the abject slaves of the men : they are tall, robust, healthy and plump, and their carriage is erect and full of dignity and independence.[1] The women are decidedly superior mentally to the men.[2] They are excellent swimmers, while the men are unable to swim.[3] "The woman," says Dr. Lovisato, "is not a companion, but she is not a slave."[4] It is not uncommon, indeed, for the husbands to be under the domination of their wives, and Dr. Spegazzini even speaks of "the great domination of the women."[5] The men have often been known to receive a sound thrashing from their wives.[6] Moreover, if any woman thinks she has any just cause of complaint against her husband, she will report the matter to her people, and the delinquent will have her father, brothers, and all the woman's relatives about his ears to call him to account for his conduct.[7]

It is almost certain that among the Fuegians "the women in former times ruled absolutely."[8] One of the chief traditions of the people is that "formerly the women exercised supreme domination over the men. The women succeeded in maintaining their position of predominance by means of a system of terrifying apparitions of supposed ghosts which, when they appeared, always favoured the women and punished the men, even sometimes with death, whenever they showed any tendency to insubordination or even resisted the caprice of the women. There existed, in short, a perfect reign of terror, the superstitious credulity

etnografici con accenni geologici sulla Terra del Fuoco," *Cosmos di Guido Cora*, viii, p. 150 ; J. Byron, *The Narrative of the Honourable John Byron*, p. 102.

[1] C. R. Gallardo, *op. cit.*, p. 224.

[2] "La Terre de Feu et ses habitants," *Journal des Missions Evangéliques*, li, p. 313.

[3] A. Cojazzi, *Los Indios del Archipielago Fueguino*, p. 96 ; C. Spegazzini, "Costumbres de los habitantes de la Tierra de Fuego," *Anales de la Sociedad Científica Argentina*, xiv, p. 171.

[4] D. Lovisato, *op. cit.*, p. 146. Cf. T. Bridges, "Das Feuerland und seine Bewohner," *Globus*, xlvii, p. 332 ; P. Hyades, "Ethnographie des Fuégiens," *Bulletin de la Société d'Anthropologie*, 3e Série, x, p. 332 ; C. J. F. Skottsberg, "Observations on the Natives of the Patagonian Channel Region," *The American Anthropologist, N.S.*, xv, p. 596.

[5] C. Spegazzini, *loc. cit.*

[6] D. Lovisato, *op. cit.*, p. 146 ; C. Spegazzini, *op. cit.*, p. 166.

[7] C. R. Gallardo, *Los Onas*, p. 221 ; T. Bridges, in *The South American Missionary Magazine*, xxv (1875), p. 10.

[8] J. M. Beauvoir, *Los Shelknam, indigenos de Tierra del Fuego, sus tradiciones, costumbres y lengua*, p. 207.

of the men being exploited by the apparitions of ghosts which were no other than the women disguised." The régime of feminine terrorism was, according to Fuegian tradition, terminated by a sort of revolution in which many of the women were killed, and the men, in their turn, forcibly established a certain amount of domination and terrorism over the women.[1] We shall have to return elsewhere, in speaking of primitive religious functions, to that Fuegian tradition, and we shall see that similar traditions, which are entirely in accordance with known facts, are current in many different parts of the world. There is, therefore, no reason to doubt its substantial accuracy in this instance.[2]

The change from a matriarchal to a patriarchal order of social organisation, which in many instances has not occurred until advanced phases of culture have been reached, may, thus, take place also among savages at the rudest cultural level. The natives of Australia and Melanesia are exceptionally isolated communities, and it may be surmised that the low position of women amongst them is not unconnected with that isolation, and that had they been surrounded by peoples of more advanced culture it would have been impossible for them to survive to the present day. Among less isolated uncultured races the relative status of the sexes is in general the reverse; women occupy a position of greater independence and influence than they usually do in civilised communities; about half of those races in the lower grades of culture reckon kinship in the female line, and a considerable number are either matriarchal in their social organisation or show clear evidence of having been so until a comparatively recent time.

The patriarchal constitution of society is, on the other hand, characteristic of those peoples of whom we speak as civilised, such as the inhabitants of Europe, the so-called Aryan races of India, the Chinese, the Semitic races of Arabia and their descendants, and the converts to their religious and social systems. That association of patriarchal customs with the higher phases of culture suggests that they are not a racial peculiarity of certain peoples, but are the outcome of conditions connected with that state of civilisation with which they are associated; and that, before those higher stages of culture were attained, the societies of what is now the civilised world were, like many surviving barbarous and savage communities, matriarchal in organisation, or less pronouncedly patriarchal than they are now or have been during historical times. And, in fact, when the social history, traditions and records of

[1] A. Cojazzi, *Los Indios del Archipielago Fueguino*, p. 24. Cf. L. F. Martial, in *Mission scientifique du Cap Horn*, vol. i, p. 214; P. Hyades and J. Deniker, *ibid.*, vol. vii, p. 257; C. R. Gallardo, *Los Onas*, p. 328.

[2] See below, vol. ii, pp. 545 sq.

patriarchal civilisations are examined strong evidence is invariably to be found in them, showing that the respective status of the sexes in former times was different, and that the patriarchal character of their institutions followed upon a previous social state in which the position of women was higher and their influence greater.

CHAPTER VIII

THE MATRIARCHAL PHASE IN CIVILISED SOCIETIES

The Indian Aryans.

THE connection of the Aryan race in India with the peoples of Europe is in all probability not so direct and so close as was at one time supposed. The Hindus recall, however, by the emphasis which is laid in their tradition on patriarchal principles, the attitude of the Romans and the ideas which have been in a large measure derived from them as regards the constitution of the family. The subordinate and effaced position of women is indeed far more pronounced among the Hindus than it ever was in patriarchal Rome. It is laid down in the 'Laws of Manu' that "No act is to be done according to her own will by a young girl, a young woman, though she be in her own house. In her childhood a girl should be under the will of her father; in her youth under that of her husband; her husband being dead, under the will of her sons. A woman should never enjoy her own will. Though of bad conduct or debauched, or devoid of all good qualities, a husband must always be worshipped like a god by a good wife." [1]

There can, however, be no doubt that those principles did not formerly obtain among the Aryan Hindus. No greater contrast to the patriarchal principles expressed in the official code of Brahmanical law could be imagined than that presented by the oldest Indian records. "Let a wife," it is declared in a Vedic hymn, "be absolute mistress over her fathers-in-law, absolute mistress over her mother-in-law; let her be mistress over her husband's sisters, let her be mistress over her husband's brothers." [2] Whereas the 'guarding' of women always means in Indian literature their confinement within the walls of the 'zenana,' "there is not a trace in the Rig-Veda of the seclusion of

[1] *The Laws of Manu*, v. 147. 148. 154, *The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxv, pp. 195, 196.

[2] *Rig-Veda*, x. 85. 46, A. Ludwig's translation, vol. ii, p. 537. Cf. *Atharva-Veda*, xiv. 1. 44, W. D. Whitney, *Atharva-Veda Saṁhitā*, vol. ii, p. 748.

women."[1] The women of the Vedic period, whether married or single, moved openly and mixed freely with male company at festivals and functions.[2] Women in Vedic India frequently owned great wealth, and were sought for the sake of their possessions.[3] They enjoyed complete liberty in the choice of lovers and of husbands.[4] That contrast between the freedom which they anciently enjoyed and their position in later times, when they were bound by patriarchal laws, was familiar to the writers of the 'epic' period. In the 'Mahâbhârata,' Pandy thus addresses his wife Kunty: "I shall now tell thee about the practice of old indicated by illustrious Rishis fully acquainted with every rule of morality. O thou of handsome face and sweet smiles, women were not formerly immured in houses and dependent upon husbands and relatives. They used to go about freely, enjoying themselves as best they pleased. O thou of excellent qualities, they did not then adhere to their husbands faithfully; and yet, O beauteous one, they were not regarded as sinful, for that was the sanctioned usage of the times. . . . Indeed, that usage, so lenient to women, hath the sanction of antiquity. The present practice, however, of women being confined to one husband for life hath been established but lately."[5]

Perhaps the most definite and significant indication of the difference in the status of Hindu women in the earlier Vedic period and in later times is afforded by their relation to religious functions. Women are, in the historic and the epic periods, strictly and completely excluded from those functions. "The law has been fixed," it is said in the 'Mahâbhârata,' "that woman has nothing to do with religious ceremonies; for there is a revelation to that effect."[6] And again: "A woman has no sacrificial right, no religious feast or fast; the wife obtains heaven solely by obedience to her husband."[7] In the Vedas, on the other hand, we are told that "From of old comes the wife to the public sacrifice and to the festive gathering; as orderer of the sacrifice comes the noble woman attended by men."[8] In the most solemn religious function

[1] A. Hopkins, "The Social and Military Position of the Ruling Caste in Ancient India, as represented in the Sanskrit Epic," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, xiii, p. 349.

[2] *Rig-Veda*, vii. 2. 8, A. Ludwig, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 404. *Atharva-Veda*, ii. 36. 1 sqq., W. D. Whitney, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 36.

[3] *Rig-Veda*, iv. 3; ii. 1, *ed. cit.*, vol. i, pp. 347 sqq., 318 sq.

[4] *Ibid.*, x. 27; iv. 3, *ed. cit.*, vol. ii, pp. 614 sqq.; vol. i, pp. 354 sq.

[5] *Mahâbhârata*, i. cxxii, Calcutta edition, vol. i, pp. 355 sq.

[6] *Ibid.*, xii. 40. 8.

[7] *Ibid.*, xiii. 46. Cf. *The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. ii, pp. 139, 270; vol. xxv, pp. 161, 196, 437.

[8] *Rig-Veda*, x. 86. 10, *ed. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 632. Cf. *Atharva-Veda*, ii. 36. 1, W. D. Whitney, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 36.

of Vedic religion, the Sacrifice of the Horse, the part played by women was indeed even more essential and important than is here indicated.[1] The priests of a later age were aware of that striking difference; in the 'Satapatha Brâhmana' we are told that "in former times it was no other than the wife of the sacrificer who rose at the call to act as 'havishkrit.'"[2] Women in the historical age were, as at the present day, even forbidden to read the Vedas; "for a woman to read the Veda is a sign of confusion in the realm."[3] Nevertheless, one at least of the Hymns of the Vedas was composed by a woman.[4] The Princess Gargi Vakaknavi is famous in ancient Hindu tradition, and is regarded as a sort of female Rishi; she is pronounced to have possessed the knowledge of Brahma, and her disputations with the renowned sage Yājnāvalkya are recorded in the Sutras.[5] The education of women is represented as at least equal to that of men, and the names of many women distinguished for their learning and for their poetical talents are recorded.[6] It is thus beyond doubt that the position of women among the Indian Aryans has progressively changed from one of freedom and influence to one of comparative subjection and effacement. "The Brahmanas clearly indicate a gradual decline in their position."[7]

The society depicted in the Vedas appears to be essentially patriarchal in organisation, as a pastoral and warlike society might be expected to be. But it is clearly an advanced phase of society, and it is not possible to suppose that such a phase, marked by extensive private ownership of herds of domesticated cattle and horses, by well-defined aristocratic classes of warriors and priests, a highly developed religious cult and literature, represents anything approaching to the primitive condition of that society. "None of the Vedic hymns goes back to the beginning of things," remarks Mr. Kennedy, referring to local Indian history only;[8] the Vedas were composed in India and contain no reminiscence of any migration into that country.[9] Some

[1] See below, vol. iii, p. 188.

[2] *Satapatha Brâhmana*, i. 1. 4. 13, *The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xii, p. 28.

[3] *Mahâbhârata*, iii. 33.

[4] *Rig-Veda*, v. 28.

[5] *Vedânta Sûtras*, iii. 4. 36, *The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xlviii, p. 315; *Brihadâranyaka-Upanishad*, iii. 6 sqq.; *ibid.*, vol. xv, pp. 130 sqq.

[6] A. Weber, "Collectanea über die Kastenverhältnisse in der Brahmana und Sutra," *Indische Studien*, x, pp. 118 sq.; M. Winternitz, *Geschichte der indische Litteratur*, vol. ii, pp. 79, 158; A. A. Macdonell and A. B. Keith, *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*, vol. i, p. 486; vol. ii, p. 485.

[7] A. A. Macdonell and A. B. Keith, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 486.

[8] J. Kennedy, "The Aryan Invasion of Northern India," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1919, p. 506.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 496; E. W. Hopkins, *The Religions of India*, pp. 15, 30.

writers were wont to speak of the Vedas as "the most ancient literature of which we possess written records," and as illustrative of the infancy of the human race.[1] Such language is fantastic. The period of the cultural history of the Hindus represented in the oldest Vedas, is not very remote, and does not, in all probability, go much farther back than the first millennium B.C., if, indeed, as high.[2]

Setting aside the speculative conjectures concerning a hypothetical 'Aryan' race, and confining ourselves to the data of historical documents, the only peoples of that name that are known to us are the Medes, the original inhabitants of Persia, and a

[1] A. Weber, *The History of Indian Literature*, pp. 2 sqq. Weber, like many of the older Sanskritist scholars, dwells upon the primitive character of so-called 'nature-worship.' But 'nature-worship' is anything but a primitive form of religion, and Vedic religion is of a most un-primitive and highly sophisticated type. It is that very character of the conceptions of the Vedas which, to my mind, militates more clearly than any against their antiquity.

[2] "The oldest hymns of the Rigveda, such as those of the Ushas, may have been composed as early as 1200 B.C. To carry the date farther back is impossible on the evidence at present available, and a lower date would be necessary if we accept the view that the Avesta is really a product of the sixth century B.C." (A. B. Keith, in *The Cambridge History of India*, vol. i, pp. 112 sq.; cf. A. A. Macdonell, *A History of Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 11 sq.). Max Müller placed the date of the oldest Vedic hymns at 1200 B.C., of others at 800 B.C. (*Rig-Veda-Samhita*, ed. by F. Max Müller, vol. iv, p. vii). "We would assign the bulk of the Rig Veda to about 1000 B.C." (E. W. Hopkins, *The Religions of India*, p. 7). The tendency of some writers to assign earlier dates to the Vedas (M. Winternitz, *Geschichte der Indische Litteratur*, vol. i, pp. 246 sqq.; R. W. Frazer, *A Literary History of India*, p. 16), is not only unsupported by evidence, but difficult to reconcile with correlated facts. The astronomical theory of Jacobi evolved from the doubtful reference in a late text to a polar star, which leads him by a complicated series of assumptions to a chronology varying from 3000 to 4000 B.C. (H. G. Jacobi, "Über das Alter des Rig-Veda," in *Festgruss an Rudolf von Roth*, pp. 68 sq.; Id., "On the Date of the Rig-Veda," *The Indian Antiquary*, xxiii, pp. 154 sqq. and elsewhere) hung upon the flimsiest of conjectural cobwebs, and has been very thoroughly disposed of (G. Thibaut, "On some Recent Attempts to Determine the Antiquity of Vedic Civilization," *The Indian Antiquary*, xxiv, pp. 85 sqq.; W. D. Whitney, "On Jacobi and Tilaka on the Age of the Veda," *Proceedings of the American Oriental Society*, 1894, pp. lxxxii sqq.; H. Oldenberg, "Der vedische Kalender und das Alter des Veda," *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, xlviii, pp. 629 sqq.; *ibid.*, xlix, pp. 470 sqq.; A. B. Keith, "On the Antiquity of Vedic Culture," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1909, pp. 1100 sqq., etc.). The discovery by Dr. Hugo Winckler of names corresponding to those of Vedic gods in a more primitive form among the Mitani of about 1400 B.C. (see below, p. 350 n.[1]), has been adduced in support of the antiquity of the Vedas; but it appears to tell very strongly the other way, for the evolution from the conceptions indicated in the Boghaz-koï tablet to those presented in the Vedas postulates at least several centuries (cf. H. Oldenberg, "On the Antiquity of Vedic Culture," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1909, pp. 1094 sqq.).

neighbouring Scythic tribe dwelling in Baktria and Sogdiana, in what is now Turkestan.[1] The latter are mentioned by Greek writers in association with the Massa-Getae,[2] and other peoples of Central Asia to whom the general appellation of Scyths was applied, a term probably borrowed by the Greeks from the Persians, who called all Central Asiatic peoples 'Saka,' "from the name of the tribe dwelling nearest to them."[3] The names of Scythic tribes were often descriptive or honorific epithets; thus the term 'Scyth' has been supposed to mean 'Defenders'; the Dahae, or Daves, the chief Scythic nation on the eastern shores of the Caspian, were the 'Resplendent';[4] the Getae were the 'Fighters;'[5] the Aryas, the 'Noble,' 'Illustrious,' or 'Excellent.'[6] The Medes called themselves 'Ariyas'[7] and claimed to be the ancestors of their conquerors, the Persians.[8] The Persian Darius Hystaspes calls himself 'Arya' on his cliff-tomb at Nakhsh-i-Rustam.[9] The eastern portion of Persia, including modern Afghanistan and Baluchistan, was called 'Ariana';[10] and 'Iran,' which is probably a form of the same name,[11] has been in all times the name of the country which we call Persia.[12] There is nothing to indicate that the Medes originally came into Persia from the north; their early migrations may have been in the opposite direction,

[1] There is no indication pointing even to the probability that the term was ever used by any other people as a collective ethnical designation (cf. O. Schrader, *Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte*, pp. 584 sq.).

[2] Strabo, xi. 8. 8, after Erastothenes; Stephanus Byzantinus, s.v. *Ἀριάνια*.

[3] Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, vi. 19; cf. Herodotus, vii. 64.

[4] F. G. Bergmann, *Les Gêtes*, pp. 25, 31.

[5] See below, p. 354.

[6] Cf. the Greek, *ἄριστος*, *ἀρετή*. See F. A. Rosen, *Rigveda* (*Oriental Translation Fund Publications*), p. 20 n.

[7] Herodotus, vii. 62; H. C. Rawlinson, "The Persian Cuneiform Inscriptions at Behistun," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, xi, part i, p. 44.

[8] Strabo, xi. 13. 9.

[9] H. C. Rawlinson, *op. cit.*, p. 46. Cf. F. Spiegel, *Die altpersische Keilinschriften*, p. 184.

[10] Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, vi. 23; Strabo, xi. 10; Dionysius Periegetes, *Orbis descriptio*, viii. 1098; Aelian, *De natura animalium*, xvi. 16; Stephanus Byzantinus, s.v. *Ἀριάνια*; Tacitus, *Ann.* xi. 10.

[11] H. C. Rawlinson, *op. cit.*, p. 45; Müller, "Essai sur la langue pehlvie," *Journal asiatique*, 3e Série, vii, p. 298.

[12] "The province of Fars had been the home of the Achaemenian dynasty, and the centre of their government. To the Greeks this district was known as Persis, and they, in error, used the name of this, the central province, to connote the whole kingdom. And their misuse of the name is perpetuated throughout Europe to the present day, for with us Persia—from the Greek Persis—has become the common term for the whole empire of the Shah, whereas the native Persians call their country the kingdom of Iran, of which Fars, the ancient Persis, is but one of the southern provinces" (G. Le Strange, *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, p. 248).

the Aryans of Baktria and Sogdiana proceeding farther on to the north-east.[1] The population of the sixteenth satrapy of the Achaemenian empire consisted of Parthans, Chorosmians—natives of Huvarazmi, or Khwarizm, on the southern shore of the Sea of Aral—Sogdians, and Aryas.[2] Herodotus mentions a contingent of Aryas and Baktrians in the army with which Xerxes invaded Greece.[3] The Aryas of Baktria and Sogdiana—that is, the country between Hindu-Kush and the river Jaxartes—were, however, by no means the only tribes of the same stock in Central Asia. The whole, or at any rate a large majority, of the peoples included under the denomination of 'Scyths' were of Iranian race, and spoke Iranian languages.[4] Their religious conceptions were also

[1] Of the Parsis and Indo-Aryans, Professor Ripley says: "There can be no doubt of their racial affinity with our Berbers, Greeks, Italians and Spaniards" (W. Z. Ripley, *The Races of Europe*, p. 448, cf. p. 451, and J. Kennedy, "The Aryan Invasion of Northern India," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1919, p. 498; cf. H. C. Rawlinson, "Notes on the Early History of Babylonia," *ibid.*, xv, p. 232). The skulls found by the Pumpelly Expedition in the tumuli of Turkestan are described by Professor Sergi as being of the Mediterranean type (R. Pumpelly, *Exploration in Turkestan, Expedition of 1904; Prehistoric Civilisation of Anau*, vol. ii, p. 446). Those facts would seem to suggest that the Medes and Asiatic Aryans passed into Asia from northern Africa and Babylonia (? Sumer). The Sumerian skulls that have been found at Kish may throw interesting light on the question (*The Times*, June 27, 1924). The view appears to be corroborated by the cuneiform tablets found at Boghaz-koï, which show that the Mitani of Mesopotamia worshipped the gods 'Mi-it-ra,' 'U-ru-w-na' (Varuna), and 'In-da-ra' (Indra) under more archaic names than the inhabitants of Persia (H. Winckler, "Vorläufige Nachrichten über die Ausgrabungen in Boghaz-koï im Sommer 1907," *Mittheilungen der Orientgesellschaft*, 1908).

[2] F. Justi, "Geschichte Irans," in W. Geiger and E. Kuhn, *Grundriss der iranische Philologie*, vol. ii, p. 438.

[3] Herodotus, vii. 66.

[4] F. Justi, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 400; E. H. Minns, *Scythians and Greeks*, p. 36. Because Central Asia and Turkestan are now mostly inhabited by peoples of Turki race, there has been a disposition to assume that wherever central Asiatic nomads are mentioned Tartars or Turanians are referred to. But this is as great an error as it would be to suppose that because Anatolia is at present a Turkish country, the ancient Trojans or the Karians must have been Turks. In ancient times the whole of south-western Central Asia up to the confines of China was preeminently Iranian. "It was not till the Hiung-nu Turks grew very powerful in the third century B.C. that the Indo-Europeans were driven away to the west. From that time the Turks encroached more and more victoriously on the Indo-European area" (J. Edkins, "The Ephthalites," *Journal of the* (North) *China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, xxi, p. 228). All descriptions of the physical characters of Scythic tribes represent them as of Iranian types; and the skulls discovered in the tumuli of Turkestan are of pure European type and show no Turki or Mongoloid affinities whatever (see above note[1]). Throughout their history, the Scyths stand "in sharp opposition to Turki peoples. . . . It would require strong evidence to prove their identity with the Turks" (O.

similar to those of Avestic and Vedic religions; and they practised special Iranian rituals.[1] From about the second millennium B.C. until not long before the Muslim invasion of India various tribes have constantly passed from Ariana and Baktria into the Panjab. The country of eastern Ariana and Arachosia, though several times 'conquered' by the Persians, was never thoroughly assimilated to the Persian Empire; it continued an un-Persianised, or 'undifferentiated' Indo-Iranian borderland, and down to Muslim times "remained more Indian than Iranian."[2] The Parthians called it "White India."[3] In Greek records, remarks Sir H. Rawlinson, "Sacae and Cadrani (?Koratus) are so mixed up with the northern Medes as to be absolutely indistinguishable from them."[4] Scythic tribes from Baktria and Sogdiana settled in Ariana with their Medic kinsmen, and passed thence into India. The earlier of those overflows constituted the 'Aryan' conquest, or penetration, of the Panjab, and eventually resulted in the establishment of the supremacy of the immigrants over the aboriginal, or 'Dravidian,' races of Hindustan. The later immigrations, which did not apparently differ from the first, are called 'Scythic' invasions. "The Aryas were only one of the numerous Scythic tribes who

Franke, "Beiträge aus chinesischen Quellen zur Kenntniss der Türkvölker und Skythen Zentralasiens," *Abhandlungen der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1904, p. 44). The Parthians, who were Scyths (Justin, xlii; Eustathius on Dionysius Periegetes, i. 1047), spoke a Median language (Justin, xl. 2). "The old Scythic speech," said Rawlinson, "is that, I suspect, of the Median tablets" (H. C. Rawlinson, "The Persian Cuneiform Inscriptions of Behistun," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, xi, part i, p. 44). That conclusion has been confirmed by the discovery of MSS. in Turkestan, written in "the language of the Indo-Skyths" (E. Sieg and W. Siegling, "Tocharisch, die Sprache der Indoskythen, vorläufige Bemerkungen über ein bisher unbekannte indogermanische Litteratur," *Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1908, pp. 915 sqq.).

[1] The Hindus regarded the Sakas as of Brahmanic religion and never spoke of them, in the first periods of their invasions, as foreigners (F. E. Pargiter, "Sagara and the Haihayas, Vasisthra and Aurva," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1919, pp. 358 sq.). "By them," say Indian writers, "Vishnu is devoutedly worshipped as the sun" (E. T. Atkinson, *The Himalaya Districts of the North-Western Provinces of India*, vol. ii, p. 383). The Sakas are referred to in the inscription of Behistun as 'preparers of Hauma,' the 'soma' or sacred moon-plant of Iranian and Vedic religion (F. Justi, "Geschichte Irans," in W. Geiger and E. Kuhn, *Grundriss der iranische Philologie*, vol. ii, p. 401).

[2] A. Darmsteter, in *The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. iv, p. 2; cf. Masúdi, *Les prairies d'or* (Mruj-adh-Dhahab), translated by Barbier de Meynard and Pavet de Courteille, vol. ii, pp. 79 sqq.

[3] Isidorus Characenus, *Mansiones Parthicae*, xix, in *Geographi Graeci minores*, ed. C. Müller, vol. i, p. 254.

[4] H. C. Rawlinson, "Notes on the Early History of Babylonia," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, xv, p. 245.

used an Aryan speech."[1] The term 'Arya' does not appear to have been so generally used in the sense of an ethnic designation in India as in Persia. In the Sutras it is used with reference to the three upper castes, or to the Vaisya, or agricultural caste, alone,[2] and seemingly in its adjectival sense of 'noble.'[3] As an adjective there is, according to Geldner, no clear instance of its use in any other sense. The district between the Ganges and the Jumna was called Aryavarta, which may mean either "the country of the Aryas," or more probably "the Holy Land."[4] No Hindus, with the exception of an unimportant clan of Jats in the Multan district,[5] call themselves 'Aryas.'

The ethnic designation by which 'pure Indo-Aryans' are called is 'Jats.'[6] It is also the generic term by which they

[1] J. Kennedy, "The Aryan Invasion of Northern India," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1919, p. 497.

[2] E. W. Hopkins, in *The Cambridge History of India*, vol. i, p. 240; H. Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, pp. 205, 215; A. A. Macdonell and A. B. Keith, *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*, vol. i, pp. 64 sq.

[3] K. F. Geldner, in R. Pischell and K. F. Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, vol. iii, p. 96. There is, so far as I am aware, no passage in Sanskrit literature where the term 'Arya' is unambiguously used in an ethnic sense. The nearest approach to such a passage is that in the Sûtrakritânga Sûtra where it is said that "as a Mlekkha (i.e. a barbarian) repeats what an Arya has said, but does not understand the meaning, merely repeating his words, so the ignorant . . . does not know the truth" (*Sûtrakritânga Sûtra*, i. 1. 2, *The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xlv, p. 241). The impression conveyed by the passage is to a large extent dispelled when we find exactly the same modes of expression in Buddhist literature, the term 'Airya' being used in the special technical sense of 'one who is born again,' who is on the right path to Nirvana, and who knows divine truth, in opposition to 'Prithogdgana,' 'one who is ignorant of divine truth.' By Chinese and Tibetan Buddhists the term 'Airya' in such expressions is translated by the corresponding terms in their languages, and not transliterated as an ethnical term (C. F. Koeppen, *Die Religion des Buddha*, vol. i, pp. 397, 436). It is, of course, quite possible that 'Arya' was at some time used as an ethnical expression in Hindustan; I merely point out that there does not appear to be any direct evidence for the conjecture, which is commonly treated as a fact.

[4] Baudhâyana, i. 1. 10, *The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xiv, p. 147. Cf. *The Laws of Manu*, xi. 22; *ibid.*, vol. xxv, p. 33.

[5] H. A. Rose, *A Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Punjab and North-West Frontier Province*, vol. ii, p. 21.

[6] Numerous local dialectic variations of pronunciation exist, such as Jut or Yuet, Jett, Jit, Jad, Zad, etc. (J. Tod, *Annals and Antiquities of Rajast'han*, vol. i, p. 106). The 'a' vowel-sound in Hindustani is indefinite, and approximates to 'u' in 'but,' as may be noticed in the common forms of Anglo-Indian words, such as 'Suttee,' 'pungharee,' 'Punjab,' 'punch,' etc., for 'sati,' 'panghari,' 'Panjab,' 'pancha.' Among the Balochi the name 'Jat' is modified into 'Jagdal' (L. Vivien de Saint-Martin, *Les Huns Blancs, ou Ephthalites des historiens byzantins*, p. 85). The term 'Rajput,' or 'sons of kings,' the best known designation of the Indo-Aryans, is, of course, a social and not an ethnical term, any more than the name 'Sikh,' which

are known to other races. "By the Arabs," says the author of the 'Mujmal-ut-Tawarikh,' "the Hindus are called Jats."[1] In Chinese histories India is called the 'Kingdom of the Yut.'[2] Tibetan peoples use the term Jat or Jad to distinguish the 'Indo-Aryans' of ethnologists from their own race.[3] The Hindus have never been a nation; but on the rare occasions when, in pre-European times, they have been roused by foreign invasion to something resembling a national sentiment, they have called themselves 'Jats.' In the Muslim conquest the opposing races were Arabs and Jats. When in the sixth century the Huns threatened India, the repulse of the invader was commemorated in the verse, "Ajayaj Jarto Hunan" (The Jata defeated the Huns).[4]

'Jata,' 'jadiya,' in early Zend,[5] 'yudha' in Sanskrit,[6] mean

designates a religious sect. The Rajputs of the Panjab are undoubtedly Jats (see D. Ibbetson, *Report on the Census of the Punjab*, 1881, vol. i, pp. 220 sqq.; J. Tod, *op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. 52 sqq., 96 sqq.). Sir A. Cunningham (*Archaeological Survey of India, Reports*, vol. ii, pp. 96 sqq.) and Mr. V. A. Smith ("The Gurjaras of Rajputana and Kanauj," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1909, p. 62) regard the Jats as Scythic and the Rajputs as 'Aryan.' Sir Herbert Risley (*The People of India*, pp. 36, 58, 123) expresses the exactly opposite view, that the Rajputs are Scythic and the Jats early Indo-Aryan—a view endorsed by Dr. A. F. R. Hoernle ("Some Problems in Ancient Indian History," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1909, p. 142), and by Sir H. A. Rose (*op. cit.*, vol. iii, p. 300). The point appears to me to be a distinction without a difference. Present-day Rajput clans have been largely replaced by Gurjars, who belong to the later Scythic invasions. But the racial identity of Rajputs and Jats has been shown by Sir Denzil Ibbetson to be beyond doubt. It is difficult to tell a British officer in Sikh uniform and panghari from his Jat and Rajput comrades (cf. J. Kennedy, *op. cit.*, p. 499).

[1] H. M. Elliot, *The History of India as told by its own Historians*, vol. i, p. 103. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 128, 188; vol. ii, p. 133; A. P. Caussin de Perceval, *Essai sur l'histoire des Arabes avant l'Islamisme*, vol. iii, p. 380; J. T. Reinaud, *Mémoires sur l'Inde d'après les écrivains arabes*, pp. 188, 200; G. Le Strange, *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, p. 331.

[2] J. von Klaproth, *Tableaux historiques de l'Asie*, p. 288.

[3] The natives of Kulu, who are of Tibetan race, call the natives of Lahul, who are predominantly 'Aryan,' Jad. (H. A. Rose, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 456 n.).

[4] F. Kielhorn, "Epigraphic Notes," *Nachrichten von den königliche Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, 1903, pp. 305 sqq.; A. F. Hoernle, "Some Problems of Ancient Indian History," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1909, pp. 141 sq. The 'r' in Jarto is a common intercalary letter, of which several examples are given in the Prakrit grammar, among which this very one to illustrate the interchange of 'rt' and 'tt'" (F. Kielhorn, *op. cit.*, pp. 306 sq.).

[5] H. C. Rawlinson, "The Persian Cuneiform Inscriptions at Behistun," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, xi, part i, p. 151.

[6] M. Monier-Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, s.v. The name Jat' is usually interpreted as derived from 'jati' ('birth'), and as thus meaning 'offspring' or 'race.' That derivation is not, as a matter of fact,

'fighter,' 'warrior' ('yudh,' to fight, 'yutha,' an army, or multitude). The name of the Vedic caste of warriors, Kashatriya, by which the Rajputs still call themselves, would seem to be connected with the same root. The 'five nations' of the Vedic 'Aryans,' the Yadus, Turvasas, Druhyus, Anus, and Purus, were the five sons of Jayati, brother of Jati, and son of the eponymous mother of the race, Ita.[1] The Jati[2] are mentioned in association with the Druhyus. The Yadus are the most prominent of the 'five nations'; they are represented as surviving in the fight with the Sudas, while Anus and Druhyus perished;[3] and the Jadava race, or sons of Jayati, furnished the first Indian dynasties and became the 'Lunar,' or Paurava rulers, to which the 'Poros'[4] of Alexander's time belonged.

The Jats, the preponderant race of the Panjab throughout history,[5] are also found along the whole track of immigrations into northern India. They are found at the present day in Kabul, at Kandahar, at Herat, the ancient Aria.[6] Arabian writers speak of Jats established in the province of Fárs,[7] and even of inroads

in contradiction with the one above suggested; for both the Sanskrit 'jati' and the Zend 'jata' would seem to be derived from the more primitive common Scythic root 'yut,' 'to do,' 'to be' (E. Norris, "Memoir on the Scythic Version of the Behistun Inscription," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, xv, p. 81). 'Jati,' 'to be born,' is to be brought into being, made. 'Jata, 'yudha,' a 'fighter,' is a 'doer of deeds of valour.'

[1] H. Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 122; E. W. Hopkins, *The Religions of India*, p. 26; A. A. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, pp. 153 sq.; Id., and A. B. Keith, *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*, vol. i, pp. 466 sq., where references are given.

[2] *Rig-Veda*, viii. 3. 9; 6. 8; *Atharva-Veda*, ii. 5. 3; *Taittirîya Samhita*, ii. 4. 9. 2; vi. 2. 7. 5; *Kâthaka Samhita*, viii. 5; xi. 10; xxv. 6; xxxvi. 7; *Pancavimça Brâhmana*, vii. 28. 1; *Kaushîtaki Upanishad*, i. 3.

[3] *Rig-Veda*, i. 174. 9; v. 31. 8; vi. 20. 12; vii. 18. 6. Cf. A. A. Macdonell and A. B. Keith, *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*, vol. ii, p. 185.

[4] F. E. Pargiter, *op. cit.*, pp. 20, 28.

[5] "The Jat is in every respect the most important of the Punjab peoples. In point of numbers he surpasses the Rajput, who comes next to him, in the proportion of nearly three to one. Politically he ruled the Punjab till the Khálsa yielded to our arms. Ethnologically he is the peculiar and most prominent product of the plains of the Five Rivers" (D. Ibbetson, *Report on the Census of the Punjab*, 1881, vol. i, p. 221). The Panjab is the only part of India where, ethnologically and historically, the 'Indo-Aryans' established their supremacy and displaced the aboriginal population. The watershed between the Indus and the Ganges "is the line of demarcation in race and speech between the Indo-Aryans and the Aryo-Dravidians at the present day. It was the same in the late Vedic and the Puranic age" (J. Kennedy, "The Aryan Invasion of Northern India," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1919, p. 505).

[6] C. Masson, *Journeys in Balochistan, Afghanistan, the Panjab*, vol. iv, p. 351.

[7] L. Vivien de Saint-Martin, *Les Huns Blancs*, p. 87, after Ibn Alathir and Ibn Khaldoun.

of Jats into Mesopotamia.[1] Pliny refers to Jatii on the banks of the Jaxartes,[2] and the Greek geographer Ptolemy likewise mentions 'Jatioi,' or 'Jataoi,' in the same region.[3] It appears to be beyond doubt that the name 'Jat' is the same ethnic appellation which was rendered by the Greeks 'Getae.'[4] The Arabs and Sassanide Persians called the latter 'Haÿtal,' using the term in the same way as the ancients used the term 'Scyths' as a generic appellation for all Central Asiatic peoples dwelling beyond the Oxus.[5] The Persian historian Al-Tabari

[1] Ameer Ali, *A Short History of the Saracens*, p. 283; J. T. Reinaud, *Mémoire sur l'Inde d'après les écrivains arabes*, p. 200; cf. p. 188.

[2] Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, vi. 18.

[3] Ptolemaeus, *Geographia*, vi. 12.

[4] J. Klaproth, *Tableaux historiques de l'Asie*, p. 288; C. Lebeau, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, vol. ix, p. 393; J. Tod, *Annals and Antiquities of Rajast'han*, vol. i, pp. 52 sqq., vol. ii, p. 370; C. Ritter, *Allgemeine Erdkunke*, vol. v, pp. 533 sq.; M. Elphinstone, *History of India*, vol. i, p. 437; A. von Humboldt, *Cosmos*, vol. ii, p. xlii; H. H. Wilson, *Ariana Antiqua*, p. 305; A Cunningham, *Archaeological Survey of India, Reports*, vol. ii, pp. 96 sqq.; J. L. Vivien de Saint-Martin, *Les Huns Blancs*, p. 122; W. Sleeman, *Rambles and Recollections of an Indian Official*, p. 307; D. Ibbetson, *Report on the Census of the Panjab*, 1881, vol. i, pp. 220 sq.; O. Franke, "Beiträge aus chinesischen Quelle zur Kenntniss der Türkenvolker und Skythen Zentralasiens," *Abhandlungen der königlich Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1904, p. 24. Ammianus Marcellinus expressly states that the Massagetae were settled in India (see below, p. 357). Lassen rejects the identification with much scorn but few reasons. He offers two remarks, both of which are inaccurate. He says that the theory originated with Tod, which is not true, since the identification was made by Klaproth and by Saint-Martin several years before Tod published his work. He further states that the Jats were anciently called Jartika; but that is merely Lassen's own supposition from a single mention of the name in the 'Mahâbhârata' while the Jati, Yuda, Jadarva, with which all Vedic, Puranic, and epic literatures are filled, are entirely ignored by him (C. Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, vol. ii, pp. 358 sq. Cf. L. Vivien de Saint-Martin, *op. cit.*, pp. 109 sq.). "The identification is not even probable," says Mr. Vincent (notes to W. Sleeman, *loc. cit.*). But if, as we shall see, the Getae of the Greeks are undoubtedly the Ye-Tha of the Chinese, and if, on the other hand, the Chinese called the Panjab the Kingdom of the Ye-Tha, it is difficult to see that the identification is no more than probable.

[5] G. Le Strange, *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, p. 434; P. Sykes, *History of Persia*, vol. i, p. 433; J. J. von Görres, *Heldenbuch von Iran*, vol. ii, pp. 443 sq.; Muhammad ibn Kharvand Shah Mir Khwand, in A. I. Silvestre De Sacy, *Mémoires sur diverses antiquités de la Perse et sur les médailles des Sassanides, suivis de l'histoire de Mirkhond*, pp. 343 sqq.; C. Lebeau, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, vol. iv, pp. 254 sq.; vol. viii, p. 252; J. Vivien de Saint-Martin, *Les Huns Blancs*, p. 12; J. Mohl, "Extraits du Modjmel al-Tawarikh," *Journal Asiatique*, 3e Série, xii, p. 517. The 'l' in 'Haytal' is a common Persian euphonic termination; thus the town of Herat, the ancient Aria, is called in Zend 'Heratall' (C. H. Rawlinson, "The Persian Cuneiform Inscriptions of Behistun," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, xi, Part i, p. 45. Cf. the Baluchi form, 'Jagdal' for 'Jat,' above, p. 352 n.[6]).

states that in the language of Bokhara—that is, Sogdiana—'Haÿtal' means 'strong,' 'valiant,'[1] which would seem to be equivalent to the meaning of 'Jata.' The appellation, transmitted through Armenians, with whom it takes the form of 'Hephthagh,'[2] was further transmuted by Byzantine writers into 'Ephthalites.'[3] These so-called 'White Huns,'[4] were a section of the Great Getae, or Massa-Getae, the prefix 'Mass' (Zend 'maz,' Sanskrit 'maha') meaning 'great.' A large number of different tribes bearing various names appear to be included under the designation. As is well known, the Getae and Great Getae penetrated at different times far to the west, to southern Russia, Thrace and the Danube. Ammianus Marcellinus says that the Alani, whose name appears in the Chinese Annals of the Hang dynasty as 'O-la-na,'[5] and in Persian annals as 'Alanan,'[6] "were the ancient Massa-Getae," and he reports the emperor Julian as exhorting his soldiers by recalling the victories of Lucullus and of Pompey over the Massa-Getae, "whom we call Alani."[7] Ammianus describes

[1] Muhammad ibn Jarir Abu Jafar al-Tabari, *Chronique*, translated by H. Zotenberg, vol. ii, p. 128.

[2] Moses of Choren, *Historia Armeniaca*, p. 365. The 'Hephthagh' are mentioned by the Armenian historian in association with the Sogdians and Tokharians.

[3] Procopius, *Bellum Persicum*, i. 3–8; Theophanes, *Chronographia*, vol. i, pp. 18, 189; Cedrenus, vol. i, p. 355; Agathias, pp. 137 sq.; Menander, pp. 299, 354; Theophylactus Simocatta, p. 172. The editions of the *Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae* are referred to. These texts have been collected in J. G. Stritter, *Memoriae populorum olim ad Danubium, P. Euxinum*, etc., xiv, 590–600.

[4] As Procopius himself is careful to tell us, "these 'White Huns' are quite unrelated to the people commonly known as 'Huns.' They do not dwell with them or even near their country, but on the northern confines of Persia. They are not nomadic like the Huns, but being long since settled in a fertile country, lead a sedentary life and do not make inroads into the lands of the Romans, unless as auxiliaries of the Medes. Alone of all Huns they have a white skin and regular features. Their manners are very different; they do not live, as the Huns do, like wild beasts, but obey a king, are ruled by settled laws, and show no less equity and good faith in their dealings, whether among themselves or with the Romans, than any other polite nation" (Procopius, *op. cit.*, i. 3). The term 'Hun' appears to have been a general term applied by the Chinese to barbarians or savages (O. Franke, Beiträge aus chinesischen Quellen zur Kenntniss der Türkenvölker und Skythen Zentralasiens," *Abhandlungen der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1904, pp. 5 sq.)

[5] Tomascheh, in A. F. von Pauly, *Real-Encyclopädie der classische Alterthumswissenschaft*, vol. i, Part i, col. 1287.

[6] J. von Klaproth, *Tableaux historiques de l'Asie*, p. 177 n., after Firdusi.

[7] Ammianus Marcellinus, xxi. 2. 12; xxiii. 5. 16. Cf. Josephus, *Bell Jud.*, vii. 7. 4; *Antiquitat.*, xvii. 97; Jordanes, *De Getarum sive Gothorum origine et rebus gestis*, xxiv. The word 'alaman' means, among the popula-

these Great Getae as inhabiting "an immense tract of country in the deserts of Scythia, as far as the country of the Chinese." He adds that "they extend, I have been told, as far as the river Ganges which traverses India." "They are nearly all tall and handsome, with moderately fair hair and fierce eyes tempered with softness. They know no slavery, all accounting themselves as issued of noble blood."[1] According to Pliny, however, the Great Getae had a sacerdotal aristocracy.[2] Herodotus tells us that they were sun-worshippers, and that their chief religious rite was the Sacrifice of the Horse.[3]

We possess, in addition to the notices of Greek and Roman writers concerning the Great Getae, a number of accounts from Chinese authors, who had even better opportunities of becoming acquainted with them. A Chinese envoy at the time of the Hang dynasty spent a year amongst them. Their name appears in Chinese writings as the Great Get, Get-ti, Ye-tha, or Yue-chi.[4]

tions of the Pamir at the present day, a warlike expedition (G. Bonvalot, *En Asie Centrale. Du Kohistan à la Caspienne*, p. 253).

[1] Ammianus Marcellinus, xxi. 2. 13 sqq.

[2] Pliny, iv. 11.

[3] Herodotus, i. 215.

[4] The form 月氐 or 月支, which is most frequently met with, is commonly transliterated 'Yue-chi'; but the form 月氏, which is frequently transliterated 'Ye-tha,' is also found, especially in the later accounts (J. von Klaproth, *Tableaux historiques de l'Asie*, pp. 287 sq.; O. Franke, "Beiträge aus chinesischen Quellen zur Kenntniss der Türkenvölker und Skythen Zentralasiens," *Abhandlungen der königlich preussischen Akadmie der Wissenschaften*, 1904, *Philosophische und historische Abhandlungen*, No. i, p. 22). The difference in spelling, which, as will be seen, amounts merely to a thin stroke, is accounted for by Klaproth by the fact that "in the course of centuries the phonetic value of Chinese characters has, it is certain, changed frequently; Chinese grammarians cite a number of examples showing that 't' has often replaced 'ch.' It is probable that the old pronunciation of 'Yue-chi' was 'Yue-ti,' as is indicated by the later spelling. 'Yue-ti' may also be read 'Yut'" (J. von Klaproth, *op. cit.*, p. 288). Dr. Edkins says the same thing, and adds that the old pronunciation of the sign 月, which is the 'moon sign,' one of the oldest in Chinese script, was 'Get' (J. Edkins, "The Yue-ti or Massagetae," *Journal of the* (North) *China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, xxi, p. 227). Schlegel also transliterates the characters 'Get-ti' (G. Schlegel, "The Secret of the Chinese Method of Transcribing Foreign Sounds," *T'oung Pao*, Series ii, vol. i, p. 98). Franke likewise says that the first character may be read 'Get' or 'Jut,' which is, in fact, the usual pronunciation of it in Canton, in the Hakka dialect, and with the Japanese. He points out, further, that the second character, which is commonly transliterated 'chi,' is an ideogram meaning 'people,' 'race,' and that the whole expression may therefore simply be read 'Get' or 'Jut' (O. Franke, *op. cit.*, pp. 22 sq.). I requested a Chinaman to read out the characters as they most frequently appear; he at once read them Yutt-ti, his pronunciation being almost identical with the ordinary Panjabi pronunciation of 'Jat.' The identification with the Getae, which does not rest upon the identity of name only, but on the agreement of the whole

The Chinese accounts describe how the Get-ti, under pressure from northern tribes, bore down southwards on the kingdom of Baktria, whose people they defeated; how they built up a powerful kingdom there and, passing into India, established their domination in the land of the Indus.[1] These are the 'Indo-Scythic,' or 'Saka,' invasions of about the second and first centuries B.C. But these later invaders of the Panjab were Iranian in race and speech,[2] and were but a branch of the same people who had entered India along the same path in Vedic times.[3]

Those Chinese accounts, although of much later date, throw an interesting light upon the more primitive phases of the social organisation of the 'Aryans' of Hindustan. The annals of the Hang dynasty thus refer to the people of the country between the Oxus and Jaxartes: "From Wan (i.e. Farganah) westward to the An-si (i.e. the Parthians) the languages of the people, though differing

accounts of the people, appears to be conclusive and is generally accepted (J. von Klaproth, *op. cit.*, pp. 288, 132; J. De Guignes, *Histoire générale des Huns*, vol. i, p. 375; F. von Richthofen, *China*, vol. i, p. 439; A. de Rémusat, *Nouveaux mélanges asiatiques*, vol. i, p. 220; J. Edkins, *loc. cit.*; O. Franke, *op. cit.*, pp. 42 sq.). As to the connection of the Get-ti, or Yue-chi, with the people of the Panjab, it is expressly set forth in detail by Chinese authors (J. von Klaproth, *op. cit.*, p. 288; O. Franke, *op. cit.*, pp. 77 sq.).

[1] O. Franke, *op. cit.*, pp. 46, 54, 77 sqq.; E. Specht, "Les Indo-Scythes et l'époque du règne de Kanichka d'après les sources chinoises," *Journal Asiatique*, 9e Série, x, pp. 317 sqq.; S. Lévi, "Notes sur les Indo-Scythes," *ibid.*, ix, pp. 5 sqq.; J. von Klaproth, *op. cit.*, pp. 132 sqq.; E. T. Atkinson, *The Himalaya Districts of the North-Western Provinces of India*, vol. ii, pp. 398 sqq.; V. A. Smith, "The Kushan, or Indo-Scythian, Period of Indian History," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1903, pp. 26 sqq.; E. J. Rapson in *The Cambridge History of India*, vol. i, pp. 566 sqq.

[2] Of the Hu, who "are a tribe of the Get-ti" (Hu-Han-Shu, ap. O. Franke, *op. cit.*, p. 26), Ma-twan-lin says: "They have blue eyes and reddish beards" (J. von Klaproth, *op. cit.*, p. 163; O. Franke, *op. cit.*, p. 18). Of the inhabitants of Koa-chung, "which undoubtedly contained people belonging to the Get-ti race," the Chinese historians use the same expressions as they usually employ in describing Europeans; "they have deep eyes and long noses" (O. Franke, *op. cit.*, p. 45). The inhabitants of the Oxus-Jaxartes region are described as having "deep eyes and abundant beards" (see below, p. 359). The language of the Get-ti "differed from that of both Mongolian and Turki tribes" (E. Specht, *op. cit.*, p. 341; J. Edkins, "The Yue-ti or Massagetae," *Journal of the* (North) *China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, xxi, p. 227; L. Vivien de Saint-Martin, *Les Huns Blancs*, pp. 59 sq. Cf. above, p. 351 n.).

[3] When Mr. F. E. Pargiter says that "the Sakas certainly were not Aryans by origin" ("Sagara and the Haihayas, Vasistha and Aurva," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1919, p. 361), he probably uses the term 'Aryan' for Vedic Aryans. He himself supplies confirmation of the abundant and conclusive evidence that they were of 'Arya' race, speech and religion. They were never spoken of by the Hindus as foreigners (mlocchas), but, on the contrary, as Kshatriyas, and as "of much the same religion as the Vedic Aryans" (*ibid.*, pp. 358 sq.).

slightly from one another, are generally similar so that they may understand one another when conversing. All these people have deep eyes and a rich growth of beard. They hold their women in high honour, for whatever a woman says, her husband invariably agrees to it." [1] Of the Hu tribe of the Great Get-ti, the historian Hu-Han-Shu writes: "They also take their personal name after their father, but they take their family name after their mother." [2]

It would thus appear that some of those Aryan tribes had retained to a considerable degree a matriarchal type of social organisation.

There are in ancient Indian society itself several indications pointing to the previous existence of a similar organisation. Thus in the 'Mahâbhârata' we are told that a man should avoid marrying a girl of the same family as his mother,[3] a prohibition still emphasised in Hindu law,[4] and which can scarcely be interpreted otherwise than as a reminiscence of a time when kinship on the mother's side was regarded as closer than kinship through the father. According to the tradition reported by the well-informed Megasthenes, the Pandava dynasty was metronymous, tracing its descent from a divine foundress, Pandaia.[5] The kingdom of Lanka is represented as having been founded by a princess of that family, whom her seven brothers subsequently followed, on the command of their mother, receiving from their sister the government of various districts of the country. "The fact that the mother is in this narrative the real originator of the undertaking," remarks Lassen, "would seem to confirm the surmise that she belonged to the Pandu family, and that the relationship of the brothers through her with that family was the true reason why their sister went to Lanka." [6] The

[1] O. Franke, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 26 sq.

[3] *Mahâbhârata*, xiii. 44. 14.

[4] H. H. Risley, *The Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, vol. i, pp. 1 sq.: "Intermarriage with the mother's relations is guarded against by what Sir Henry Maine calls 'a most extensive table of prohibited degrees.'"

[5] Megasthenes, *Fragm.* 23.

[6] C. Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, vol. ii, pp. 103 sq. Several scholars express doubts as to whether the Pandus were 'Aryans' (e.g. G. Oppert, *On the Original Inhabitants of Bharatavarsa or India*, p. 617). But there exists no evidence to support that suggestion; "all such considerations," as Professor Hopkins, who appears to favour such doubts, remarks, "at present rest on speculation rather than fact" (E. W. Hopkins, in *The Cambridge History of India*, vol. i, p. 254). It would be extremely difficult to explain how the Pandavas, if they were not of the ruling race, should have come to be the heroes of such a national epic as the 'Mahâbhârata,' which is styled the 'fifth Veda.' They appear in that epic as the opponents of Brahmanism, and are therefore 'unorthodox.' But, as Sir George Grierson points out, the distinction between orthodox and unorthodox appears in the Vedas themselves. "A sharp distinction is drawn between the 'sunvants'

Maura dynasty, which founded the first great Indian Empire, and is illustrious through King Chandragupta and the famous Asoka, the imperial patron of Buddhism, was likewise metronymous. It was said to have been founded by Mura, and it was through her that it derived its right of succession from the Nandas.[1] The matriarchal rules of descent mentioned of the Great Get-ti by the Chinese historian appear to have been in force among the princes of that and of the succeeding dynasty. Commenting on the inscriptions in the famous temple-caves of Nāsik, Professor Bhandarkar remarks: "It appears to have been a custom in the case of the kings to apply to them an epithet expressive of their being the sons of a certain mother. The great Gautamiputra was so-called because he was the son of Gautami, though his real name was Satakarni. Pudumayi was called Vasishthiputra because he was the son of Vasishthi. In the same manner Yajna Satakarni must have been called Gautamiputra because his mother was also named Gautami." [2]

In Vedic India the guardian of a woman is her brother, and a girl who has no brother is spoken of as if it were a matter of course that she should be an unattached woman; Aryan law prohibits marriage with such.[3] The Rajputs, the purest representatives of the ancient Aryan conquerors of India, retain in their social organisation many archaic rules and institutions, which, under Brahmanical influence, have disappeared among the Hindus that have mixed to a larger extent with the aboriginal populations. Among them a man may, and is in fact obliged to, marry in a clan less noble than his own; while a woman cannot on any account marry except in a clan that is equal to, or more noble than, her own[4]. Aristocratic exclusiveness is thus considered to be of more importance as regards the women than as regards the men. Such a rule belongs to a matriarchal conception of social organisation, and is found in exactly the same form in so typical a matriarchal

and 'asunvants.' The former are the orthodox pressers of 'soma'; the latter were the unfaithful who did not worship Indra, and who did not press 'soma' (the sacred moon-plant). We have no right to assume that the 'asunvants' were necessarily non-Aryan" (G. A. Grierson, "The Battle between the Pandavas and Kauravas," *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1908, p. 607).

[1] H. H. Wilson, *Select Specimens of the Theatre of the Hindus*, vol. ii, p. 137; C. Lassen, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 197; F. W. Thomas, in *The Cambridge History of India*, vol. i, p. 470.

[2] Râmkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar, 'The Nâsik Cave Inscriptions," *Transactions of the Second Session of the International Congress of Orientalists, held in London in September* 1874, p. 340; cf., p. 348.

[3] *Rig-Veda*, i. 124. 7, ed. cit., vol. i, p. 14. Cf. *Atharva-Veda*, i. 17. 1, W. D. Whitney, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 18.

[4] D. Ibbetson, *Report on the Census of the Punjab*, 1881, vol. i, p. 356.

society as that of the Nayars of Malabar.[1] The philosophical Arab traveller Al-Biruni states, in fact, that, according to the original Indian custom, the child belongs to the caste of the mother and not to that of the father, "but that in his day the usage of marrying in the same caste was becoming substituted for the older practice."[2] The Rajputs also observe the characteristic matriarchal usage that the first step in any proposal of marriage must come from the woman or from her family, and not from the man.[3] Reverence for women, and especially for a man's mother, actual or adopted, is a trait of Rajput manners and tradition, and the current saying by which they are wont to exhort to valour and ambition is to the effect that a man must show himself worthy of his mother and of the milk on which he was brought up.[4] We are told in the 'Mahâbhârata' that in the Panjab, the Indian home of the Rajputs, "their heirs are their sister's children, and not their own."[5] We cannot be sure that this refers to the Aryan rulers and not to some of the aboriginal inhabitants, but it is quite possible that the Rajputs still retained in the epic age an essentially matriarchal constitution. Both existing Hindu social organisation and the literary records have been shaped by the influence of the priestly Brahmanical caste which, after a long and bitter struggle with the warriors, or Kshatriya, obtained supreme power. That change has been marked by many profound transformations, those affecting the position of women and the rules of marriage being among the most pronounced. Many survivals, even in the most fully Brahmanised classes, bear witness to the character of the social order which was superseded. "It is a remarkable fact," observes Dr. Wise, "that Mithila and Savaria Brahmans still

[1] See below, p. 703. The rule which Sir Denzil Ibbetson termed 'hypergamy,' is, it is true, also observed by intensely patriarchal castes in India. It is prescribed in the *Laws of Manu* (iii. 13, viii. 366; *The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxv, pp. 77 sq.), and is adhered to by many Brahman castes. (H. Risley, *The Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, vol. i, pp. 446 sqq.; H. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, vol. ii, pp. 363 sqq.). No very satisfactory reason has been suggested for its observance in those castes. Alliance with a Brahman is, of course, very eagerly sought. The rule, says Sir H. H. Risley, "was popular with the Kulins, because it enabled them to make a handsome income by the accident of birth. Matrimony became a profession." The Brahmans married many scores of girls, whom they left to live with their parents, simply on account of the presents and payments given to them for their trouble (H. H. Risley, *op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. 147, 148). Such satisfactory results of the custom would naturally incline the Brahmanical classes to retain it; but my impression is that it originally derived from matriarchal customs, which attached more importance to a worthy alliance for a woman than for a man.

[2] *Alberuni's India*, ed. E. C. Sachan, vol. i, p. 156.

[3] J. Tod, *Annals and Antiquities of Rajast'han*, vol. i, pp. 231 sq.

[4] *Ibid.*, vol. i, pp. 543 sq. Cf. below, p. 599.

[5] *Mahâbhârata*, viii. 2083.

recognise the 'bhaiya,' or sister's son, as the family priest, and the Mungirya Tantis style him Brahman, investing him with the presidency at all domestic and party gatherings." [1] In the Panwar clan, one of the most ancient and famous of the Rajput clans, the mothers, amid much other traditional advice which they offer to their daughters at their weddings, exhort them, "Get influence over your husband and make him come with you to live with us." [2] Hindu custom continues to observe at the present day those usages which, as has been seen, commonly represent a transition from the practice of matrilocal to that of patrilocal marriage. The Hindu bride is not at once permanently transferred to her husband's family: "In order that she may become accustomed by degrees to married life, her own parents come at the end of a month and take her back to her home, and for the first five years, or until she has children, she lives alternately in her parents' or in her husband's home." [3]

China and Japan.

China is perhaps of all countries the one where patriarchal principles are most strongly emphasised and where the subjugation of women and their complete effacement in every sphere of life is most absolute. It is also the country where indications of any former matriarchal state of society are, it is generally considered, most completely lacking. The darkness in which that aspect of the early social history of China is wrapped is but a part of the general obscurity which surrounds the origin of Chinese civilisation, and which is accentuated rather than elucidated by the mass of much re-edited annals upon which our information chiefly depends.[4] Indications are, nevertheless, not wanting which, when regarded in the light of what we know of the social development of other

[1] T. Wise, *Notes on the Races, Castes and Tribes of Eastern Bengal*, p. 127.

[2] R. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, vol. iv, p. 344.

[3] J. A. Dubois, *Hindu Manners, Customs and Ceremonies*, vol. i, p. 233.

[4] None of the Chinese historical records which we possess is of any great antiquity in its present form. All the ancient records on bronze, wood, and stone are now completely lost (A. Gaubil, *Traité de la Chronologie Chinoise*, p. 186). The early traditional histories, the 'San Fen' and the 'Whu Tien,' have completely disappeared, though fragments of the latter are supposed to be incorporated in the 'Historical Memoirs' of Se-Ma Ts'ien. All historical books which were deposited in the library of Tcheou were destroyed by Ts'in Che Huang (Se-Ma Ts'ien, *Mémoires historiques*, ed. Chavannes, vol. ii, p. 174; H. Doré, *Recherches sur les superstitions des Chinois*, vol. xiii, p. 85). The marble records of Ling Ti were destroyed in 518 (M. de Mailla, *Histoire général de la Chine*, vol. v, pp. 242 sq.). The oldest historical work, the 'Shu-King,' dates from the fourth century B.C. (H. Cordier, *Histoire générale de la Chine*, vol. i, pp. 48 sqq.).

peoples, confirm the presumption that China constitutes no exception.

While emphatically patriarchal, the Chinese are also strictly exogamic. The whole population of China belongs to the 'hundred families,' or more properly clans. Every Chinese bears the name of one of these clans.[1] How real that clan-organisation was once is shown by the fact that even at the present day a man is expected to contribute to the subsistence, not only of his immediate relatives, but of his uncles and cousins, to the remotest degree, when the latter are out of employment;[2] and he is held responsible for their debts and even for their crimes.[3] A man is strictly forbidden to marry a woman bearing the same clan-name as himself;[4] and even if he purchases a concubine or slave-girl and does not know her surname, he must consult the omens by means of a tortoise-shell in order to be assured that he is not incurring the risk of having relations with a woman bearing the same name.[5] He is not even allowed to transmit any of his inheritance to a person bearing a different clan-name.[6] Some of the clans are local, the whole of the inhabitants of a district belonging to the same clan, and in that case the men are obliged to seek wives at considerable trouble and expense outside the district.[7] Persons bearing the same clan-name, even if dwelling in parts of the empire far removed from one another, regard themselves as "of the flesh and bone of the common ancestor."[8] The term for those clans is made up of the signs meaning 'woman' and 'birth,' and their combination thus means "born of the same woman," or "one woman's brood."[9]

[1] J. F. Davis, *The Chinese*, vol. i, p. 282. The number 100 is merely nominal; there are in reality some 480 Chinese clan-names, or 'Po-hsing' (H. Cordier, *Histoire générale de la Chine*, vol. viii, p. 57; S. Couling, *The Encyclopaedia Sinica*, p. 391).

[2] H. A. Giles, *Chinese Sketches*, p. 12.

[3] J. H. Plath, "Gesetz und Recht in alten China nach chinesischen Quellen," in *Abhandlungen der philosophisch-philologischen Classe der Königliche Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Munich 1864, p. 84.

[4] *Lî Kî*, i. 1. 3. 6 (*The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxvii, p. 78); J. F. Davis, *loc. cit.* The strict prohibition is, however, in its present form of somewhat recent origin; it was introduced under the Chou dynasty. A decree of the Hsia and Yin dynasties (A.D. 484) permits marriage between members of the same clan (S. Couling, *Encyclopaedia Sinica*, p. 333).

[5] *Lî Kî*, *loc. cit.*

[6] W. H. Medhurst, "Marriage, Affinity, and Inheritance in China," *Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society, China Branch*, vol. iv, p. 29.

[7] P. G. von Möllendorff, "The Family Law of the Chinese in its comparative Relation with that of other Nations," *Journal of the North China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, N.S., No. 13, p. 105.

[8] *Mémoires concernant les Chinois*, vol. iv, p. 229.

[9] H. A. Giles, *China and the Chinese*, p. 27.

The marriage customs and laws of the Chinese are in all essentials identical with those of all the Mongol and nomadic Tartar populations of Central Asia, except for the more emphatic consolidation of marital power and the legal status of the heir; and the continuity of the evolution between the customs of the ruder tribes and those of the Chinese can be clearly traced.[1] Among the Mongols and Tartars, as in China, the wife is 'purchased,' that is, a bride-price is paid by the bridegroom's to the bride's parents and the bride brings no dowry. But the bride is under the obligation of making one important contribution to the household, namely, the house itself.[2] The same custom, which is also an institution among the Arabs, appears to be, as Robertson Smith pointed out, a survival of a time when it was in the wife's house that the husband took up his abode.[3] That relation between the rule that the wife provides the dwelling and a matriarchal order of society has been noted by the Chinese themselves. Speaking of the Tungus, or ancient Manchus, an old Chinese writer says: "The girl's dwelling and trousseau all come from her own family; hence the custom of counting genealogies from the female side."[4] If Chinese marriage usages are, as all facts tend to show, evolved from customs identical with those which we find among Asiatic nomadic tribes, it follows that they have been preceded by a stage in which marriage was matrilocal.

And there is strong evidence that this is in fact the case. In western China at the present day it is the rule that only after "the bridegroom has lived several days in the house of his parents-in-law he takes his bride to his own house."[5] It was once customary with the aristocratic classes throughout China that the wife, after a short residence at her husband's home, should return to her own house for several months, during which she received ceremonial visits from her husband.[6] That we are justified in assuming those customs to be in truth survivals of a former practice of complete matrilocal

[1] See below, vol. ii, pp. 325 sq.

[2] N. M. Prejewalsky, *Mongolia*, vol. i, p. 70; P. Labbé, *Ches les Lamas de Sibérie*, p. 53; A. de Lechvin, *Description des hordes et des steppes des Kirghiz-Karak*, p. 363; P. S. Pallas, *Travels through Siberia and Tartary*, Part i, p. 227; M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, pp. 106, 118, 121.

[3] See below, pp. 373 sq.

[4] E. H. Parker, "The History of the Wei-Wan, or Wei-Whan, Tunguses of the First Century," *The China Review*, xx, p. 73.

[5] E. and P. Sykes, *Through Deserts and Oases in Central Asia*, pp. 99 sq.

[6] H. S. Plath, "Die hausliche Verhältnisse der alten Chinesen," *Sitzungsberichten der Baierischen Akademie*, ii, p. 226; E. Biot, "Researches into the Manners of the Ancient Chinese, according to the She-King," in J. Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, vol. iv, part i, p. 143.

marriage is rendered probable by the fact that such complete matrilocal marriage is still practised at the present day. Chinese law provides for the case of a husband who takes up his residence in the home of his wife, and protects his rights in such circumstances, imposing a penalty of a hundred strokes of the rod on any father-in-law who, having once received a son-in-law into his house, should propose to turn him out.[1] A husband who thus goes to live in the house of his wife is generally adopted into her family and assumes her family name, instead of her taking his.[2] The practice is at the present time looked upon with disfavour, and is mostly adopted where there are no sons in the wife's family, and the woman, or her husband, is consequently the heir.[3] But the custom of such marriages is, it is stated, a very ancient one, and has only in late times become more rare. In the ancient book of orthodox rules of propriety, the 'Lî Kî,' which so fully and emphatically sets forth the ideals of patriarchal domination and the complete submissiveness which is expected of women, we come upon the startling statement that "there are cases in which the bride will not go to her husband."[4] Such cases are in some parts of China not uncommon at the present day, and it appears from the language of the 'Lî Kî' that they are not a modern development of advanced femininism. There are in many districts anti-marrying leagues among the girls, who refuse to accept the position of complete submission and effacement which is the orthodox lot of a Chinese wife. In Lung Kong they refuse to marry except on their own terms, namely, that "the husband must go to the wife's home to live, or else dispense with her company."[5] In the province of Yunnan the women appear to retain a degree of independence which contrasts with the usual status of Chinese women. The marriage preliminaries are described as follows. The bridegroom comes to the girl's house, "where she has her family and friends gathered for the occasion. The door is shut and the man must knock. His intended then asks who is there, in reply to which he gives his name and particulars. She then asks him if he wishes to come to her house and stop with her; to which he replies he will come and live with her in good partnership. The door is then opened, the man is admitted, and the festivities commence. The wife by marrying the man in this way agrees to keep her husband in everything, but contracts no obligation towards him. It is her

[1] P. Hoang, *Le mariage chinois au point de vue légal*, p. 97; *Ta Tsing, Leu Lee*, ed. by G. T. Staunton, p. 111.

[2] P, Hoang, *loc. cit.* [3] *Ibid.*, pp. 96 sqq.

[4] *Lî Kî*, xxvii. 38.

[5] J. Dyer Ball, *Things Chinese*, pp. 428 sq.

house, and she may do as she likes. The children take the wife's family name and belong to her family." [1]

The above facts seem to show that Chinese marriage, which represents the extreme form of patriarchal principles and practice and of feminine subjection, was originally matrilocal; for those facts indicate an evolution from matrilocal towards patrilocal usages, and it is not possible to interpret them as having arisen in the reverse order out of an initial patriarchal type of marriage institutions.

The present forms of marriage were, according to Chinese mythical tradition, 'instituted' by Fu-Hi, the legendary founder of Chinese civilisation, on the advice of his sister and wife Niu-Kua.[2] Previously to that institution children did not know their fathers, but only their mothers, and sexual relations were 'promiscuous,' [3] which is the usual expression used by patriarchal peoples when referring to matriarchal marriage. Fu-Hi himself, who, in the words of the Taoist mystic, "penetrated the mystery of the maternity of the primary matter," [4] was in the same case as his subjects, for he had no father, but only a mother.[5] The same is true of all the legendary and of many later Chinese emperors; the early dynasties trace their descent from women alone.[6] Fu-Hi was succeeded by his sister-wife, Niu-Kua, whose voice "caused the stars to dance," [7] and who enjoyed a reign of 130 years.[8] Early Chinese history offers many examples of

[1] J. Dyer Ball, *Things Chinese*, p. 424.

[2] Se-Ma Ts'ien, *Mémoires historiques*, ed. Chavannes, p. 7; H. Doré, *Recherches sur les superstitions en Chine*, xii, pp. 1070 sq.; J.-A.-M. de M. de Mailla, *Histoire générale de la Chine*, vol. i, pp. 5 sq.

[3] M. Martini, *Sinicae Historiae*, p. 12; M. de Mailla, *loc. cit.*

[4] *Kwang-Zze*, vi. 1. 6, *The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxxix, p. 244.

[5] M. de Mailla, *Histoire générale de la Chine*, vol. i, p. 5.

[6] The great Yao, the first Chinese monarch who can lay any claim to historicity, was the son of the princess K'ing Tu, who gave birth to him fourteen months after seeing a dragon: no father is mentioned. The Chang dynasty descended from Princess Kien-Tsi; the Tchou dynasty from Princess Kiang Yun, who gave birth to Wau Tsi ten months (or, according to another account, twenty months) after the death of her husband (H. Cordier, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 196). The Ts'u dynasty descended from Niu Sheou, who gave birth to Ta Ye after being impregnated by a swallow's egg (*ibid.* p. 196). Even the Manchu dynasty followed the general precedent in tracing its descent to a virgin who became pregnant by eating a fruit (H. E. M. James, *The Long White Mountain*, p. 31 n.). Already in the oldest literature those accounts are thought to require some explanation and apology; the author of *She-King* ('The Book of Odes') is careful to assure us that Princess Kiang Yun "was most venerable and of irreproachable virtue. The King of Heaven cast upon her a favourable eye" (*Che-King*, ed. S. Couvreur, p. 452).

[7] *Mémoires concernant les Chinois*, vol. i, p. 102.

[8] A. Gaubil, *Traité de la Chronologie Chinoise*, p. 60. 'Niu' simply means 'woman.' It is strikingly significant of the patriarchal editing of ancient

powerful and masterful empresses who either ruled as regents or forcibly seized the reins of government. Famous among them are the Empress Lu-Kao-Heu (187 B.C.), who ruled with tyrannous and despotic power;[1] Sing-Zche (A.D. 1), "the great and august sovereign empress," who long played the part of king-maker and attempted to found a dynasty of her own;[2] Hou-Zche (A.D. 15), the zealous protectress of Buddhism.[3]

The women of the royal family, where archaic usages survive, constitute an exception to the position of women in China. So great had always been the power wielded by the Empress-mother, that a law was passed, though it seldom appears to have been enforced, decreeing that the mother of the heir-apparent should immediately after his birth be put to death.[4] The Dowager Empress acted as regent on behalf of a minor heir, a right which was also exercised among Tartar princesses.[5] She selected the Empress, or chief wife of the Emperor, his eight Queens, and also his ministers, generally appointing her own brothers.[6] The Empress represented the divinity of the Earth as the Emperor the divinity of the Heavens, and she was "supposed to exert an influence over nature and to possess a transforming power."[7] The great religious sacrifices to Sang-Tien could, however, be performed only by the 'Son of Heaven' himself, and women were rigidly excluded from that supreme function. When the famous adventuress, Hou, worked her way to supreme power, arrogating to herself every title and privilege of the Emperor, she claimed as the crowning step in her ambitious career to perform the great sacrifice. No act of hers caused so much scandal, and when she perpetrated that sacrilege, all men withdrew in order not to be accessory to such a profanation.[8] Yet one of the earliest references to that sacrifice reads: "The Empress Kiang-Yun, together with the Emperor, offered a sacrifice to Shang-Ti";[9] and the Empress mentioned is specially praised for her virtue and for the favour shown to her by heaven.[10] It is then clear that

Chinese myths that some authors, such as the writers of Li-Tseu and Huai Nan-Tseu, actually transform her into a man (W. F. Mayers, in *Notes and Queries on China and Japan*, 1868, pp. 99 sqq.).

[1] Se-Ma Ts'ien, *Mémoires historiques*, vol. ii, pp. 406 sqq.; M. Martini, *Sinicae Historiae*, pp. 281 sqq.

[2] M. du Mailla, *Histoire générale de la Chine*, vol. ii, p. 237.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. v, pp. 242 sqq.; *Mémoires concernant les Chinois*, vol. v, p. 255 sqq.

[4] Song-Yun, *Voyage dans l'Udyāna et le Gaudhāea*, ed. E. Chavannes, p. 6.

[5] N. Prejevalsky, *Mongolia*, vol. ii, p. 160.

[6] J. M. Gray, *China*, vol. i, p. 23.

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] *Mémoires concernant les Chinois*, vol. v, pp. 283, 299.

[9] W. A. Cornaby, art. "God, Chinese," in Hastings's *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. vi, p. 272.

[10] *She-King*, p. 452.

in religious matters the status of women must have undergone a profound transformation. It is, indeed, definitely known that the position of women in China was at one time very different from what it now is, for as late as the third century of our era women could hold office and exercise administrative functions, and that right did not disappear, to give place to their complete seclusion and utter want of education, until the eighth century.[1]

In Japan it might seem on a superficial inspection that customs and views concerning marriage and the position of women are identical with those obtaining in China. A Japanese wife of the upper class, at least before the imitation of European customs had become fashionable, led almost as secluded a life as Chinese women, and was seldom seen by visitors and friends of the husband. Japanese wives took care, indeed, to render themselves as unattractive as possible by dressing in the most sober garb and by blackening their teeth. The demeanour of the Japanese wife towards her husband is quite as servile as that of the Chinese wife; she is expected to wait on him, not to speak unless she is spoken to, to slide the door for him to pass, and to walk a step or two behind him.[2] The Japanese are fond of repeating the familiar Chinese maxims concerning the obedience that is proper to women.[3] But, in spite of those superficial appearances, it is clear even from existing customs and laws that those ideas and usages are merely imitations of the Chinese conception of marriage, and that, in reality, the nature of the institution and the status of the wife differ totally from those which obtain in China at the present day. In contrast with the elaborate Chinese ceremonial, there is practically no marriage ceremony; the only rite consists in partaking together of a few cups of tea.[4] Instead of marriage being regarded as a solemn contract which even death cannot dissolve, there is complete liberty of divorce for both parties; 33 per cent. of Japanese marriages are said to end in divorce, and both parties usually marry again without difficulty or delay.[5] Where there are no sons in a family, and a daughter is the sole heiress, she, when she marries, instead of going to her husband's house, continues in her parents'

[1] H. A. Giles, *China and the Chinese*, p. 197.

[2] Douglas Sladen, *Queer Things about Japan*, pp. 18, 25.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 23; H. Weipert, "Japanisches Familien- und Erbrecht," *Mitteilungen der deutschen Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens*, v, p. 102; O. Hering, "Die Frauen Japans im Spiegel der für sie bestimmten Litteratur," *ibid.*, pp. 16 sqq.; L. W. Küchler, "Marriage in Japan," *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, xiii, pp. 125 sq., 129.

[4] D. Sladen, *op. cit.*, pp. 24 sq.; L. W. Küchler, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

[5] D. Sladen, *op. cit.*, p. 25; *Résumé statistique de l'Empire du Japon*, 1888, p. 12. In the year 1884 there were 38·2 divorces to a hundred marriages, in 1885, 43·7, in 1886, 38·3.

home, and the husband comes to her, and takes up his abode in her house. He assumes her family name instead of her taking his, and becomes, in fact, an adopted son of her parents with partial rights of succession.[1]

It is thought by some that the Japanese aristocracy represent a race of Mongolian conquerors, while the mass of the people belong to a race akin to the Malays. However that may be, the features of Japanese marriage relations which resemble those of China are much more pronounced among the upper classes than among the common people. Among the latter the status of the wife is very generally the reverse of what it is in samurai families; it is she who is treated with deference by the husband, and she exercises her right to dismiss him on the slenderest grounds of dissatisfaction.[2] This, together with the matrilocal marriage customs which are customary in the case of an heiress, would seem to indicate that the aristocratic practice and the ideas correlated with it are recent adoptions of Chinese usages. Some might consider that the matrilocal marriage of heiresses is sufficiently accounted for by the special economic considerations which operate in such a case. But as regards Japanese marriage customs we happen to be in possession of definite historical records. From these we learn that patrilocal marriage did not, as a matter of fact, come into use in Japan until so late as the fourteenth century of our era. Previously to that time it was the universal usage for a woman to remain in her parental home after her marriage; the husband did not take up his abode in her house, but merely paid occasional visits to her. The Japanese family was entirely uterine, the children taking the name of their mother and not of their father.[3] As in other instances, a ceremonial relic of the ancient custom still survives in the obligation of the newly married couple to spend one or two nights in the bride's home.[4] Still older records represent the same condition of things in an even more pronounced degree. There was, properly speaking, no marriage, that is to say, no contract of any kind. Sexual cohabitation constituted marriage, and it is not possible in older Japanese literature to distinguish the relation of wife from that of mistress or concubine. It was customary for men to have wives in various places, and powerful chiefs are described as having a wife in every island and on every headland.[5]

[1] D. Sladen, *op. cit.*, p. 18; Fusamaro Tsugaru, *Die Lehre der Japonisch Adoption*, p. 5 sqq.; Nobushige Hozumi, *Ancestor-worship and Japanese Law*, pp. 133, 162 sq.; Id., *Lectures on the New Japanese Civil Code*, pp. 87, 93; H. Weipert, *op. cit.*, pp. 95, 111.

[2] D. Sladen, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

[3] Kojiro Twasaky, *Das Japanische Eherecht*, pp. 12 sq.

[4] H. Weipert, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

[5] "Ko-Ji-Ki, or Records of Ancient Manners," translated by Basil Hall

Thus we have in Japanese marriage customs and ideas as they exist at the present day, social usages which superficially resemble the exceptionally elaborate and strenuously patriarchal customs of China, and which might easily, with a little further evolution in the same direction, have become identical with them. Yet there is in this instance positive evidence that those customs have evolved from a purely matriarchal and matrilocal form of the relation; and there is, therefore, no difficulty in conceiving how the Chinese customs and principles, which represent the high-water mark of the patriarchal form of marriage and of the subordinate status of women, may have developed similarly out of exactly opposite social relations. In Korea also, marriage customs and the status of the wife are at the present day identical with those obtaining in China. Yet in former times the husband was obliged to take up his abode, for a year or two at least, in the home of his wife; and it was, moreover, his duty to pay his homage to her every morning and testify his submission.[1]

The Semites.

In the Semitic races we come upon peoples apparently organised from of old on the most rigorously patriarchal lines, and the patriarchal clans of the Hebrews, as they appear at the dawn of traditional history, have always stood for the very type of patriarchal organisation and as the ideal paradigm of 'primitive' patriarchal society.[2] Yet the great Semitic scholar, William Robertson Smith, used the social organisation of the Semites as a text for one of the first scientific enquiries into the evolution of marriage, and it was from a study of their customs that he illustrated the transition from matriarchal to patriarchal institutions, drawing thence clues which have greatly assisted in elucidating the social development of other races.

The various terms used to denote kinship-groups and lineage have, among the Semites, as indeed among most peoples, reference to maternal rather than to paternal descent. Thus the word 'rahem,' 'womb,' is very generally used to signify any group of kinsmen, and the ties of kinship in general, and it is even frequently employed in speaking of paternal relations.[3] The word

Chamberlain, *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, x, Supplement, pp. xxxix sq.; Fusamaro Tsugaru, *op. cit.*, p. 33; H. Weipert, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

[1] J. von Klaproth, *Tableaux historiques de l'Asie*, p. 94.

[2] "Le type patriarchal pur," says Baron Eckstein, "d'un contour majestueux, mais d'une rigidité extrême, n'est propre qu'aux Sémites" (Baron d'Eckstein, "La gynécocratie des Cariens," *Revue Archéologique*, 1858, p. 398).

[3] E. W. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, s.v., رحم, vol. iii, p. 1056; J. Wellhausen, "Die Ehe bei den Arabern," *Nachrichten von der königlichen*

'batn,' 'belly,' is similarly used to denote a tribal subdivision, or a tribe in general.[1] The clan or tribe to which a man belongs is also frequently spoken of as his 'mother.'[2] Genealogy was with the Arabs a subject of special study very keenly pursued by specialists, the tribal organisation being the foundation of Arab society, and a man's position in it depending chiefly upon his descent. As at the time of the rise of Islam, from which time most of our Arabic documents date, the principle of patriarchy was strongly established, the Arab genealogists were naturally at much pains to exhibit Semitic descent as patriarchal, and they were not over-scrupulous in fitting facts to the requirements of that system. Nevertheless they were often compelled to recognise that the older Arab clans were metronymic, that is, were named after female and not after male forbears.[3] The patriarchal view which regards the father alone as determining the status of the son did not, indeed, make its appearance among the Arabs until quite late times, when, after the Islamic conquests, they mingled with other nations. "The old ideas of purity of blood," says von Kremer, "gradually lost their force; whilst formerly the greatest importance was attached to nobility of blood not only from the father's side, but also from the mother's, other views began to obtain. Thus in the early days of the Khalifat the son of a concubine was never elected to the throne even if his father had been Khalif, although one Ummayad sought election in those circumstances, but in vain. While in the beginning the sons of concubines were despised, no notice whatever was taken later of descent on the mother's side."[4] Among the Hebrews, who had left the peninsula many centuries before the Arabs, the same situation had arisen long before, and endeavours were made by them to interpret their genealogies in terms of male descent, and to substitute male for female tribal ancestors. Yet even at a comparatively late period the Jewish Rabbis themselves surmised

Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen, 1893, p. 475.

[1] E. W. Lane, *op. cit.*, s.v., بَطْن, vol. i, p. 221; J. Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p. 475; W. R. Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, p. 37; G. A. Wilken, "Eenige opmerkingen naar aanleiding eener critik van mijn 'Matriarchaat bij de oude Arabieren,'" *De verspreide geschriften*, vol. i, pp. 62 sqq.

[2] J. Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, pp. 475 sq.

[3] W. Robertson Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 29. Thus, for instance, "All the children of Ilja," says Abu'l Fadah, "are issue of the above-named lady, Chindif; and they are named after her without reference to their father. They are called Banu Chindif, nor is the name of Ilja mentioned" (Abu'l Fadah, *Historia ante islamica*, ed. H. O. Fleischer, p. 196). So the Banu Mozaina are not named after their father 'Amr, but after their mother (*Ibid.*). So with the Banu 'Oqda (Macrizi, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 9).

[4] A. von Kremer, *Culturgeschichte des Orients*, vol. ii, p. 106.

and acknowledged that, originally, the 'four Matriarchs,' Sarah, Rebecca, Rachel and Leah, had occupied a more important position than the 'three Patriarchs,' Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.[1] The tribe of Levi, according to Robertson Smith, was originally metronymous; it was the tribe of Leah, for whom a husband, Levi, had to be invented.[2] Even Israel, the tribe which gave its name to the whole nation, was originally the tribe of Sarah, Israel being the son of Sarah.[3] As is well known, the tribe of Judah did not belong to the same group as the other Jewish tribes;[4] when it was included in the Hebrew nation that union was represented genealogically by making Sarah, the ancestress of the Beni-Israel, the wife, as well as the sister, of Abraham, and making Israel their son.[5] Even in 'patriarchal' times women built cities, that is, founded families: Sherah "built Beth-Horon the nether, and the upper, and Uzzen-Sherah."[6] It is also scarcely in harmony with a patriarchal order that it should be the mother who names the child, as is almost invariably the case in the Old Testament. That is also the practice among the Arabs.[7]

With the Hebrews the regular practice in early times was, in fact, for the man to "leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife,"[8] that is, to take up his abode with his wife's clan. Isaac takes it for granted that Jacob, when he marries, will dwell with his wife's people.[9] In fact, Jacob lives twenty years in the home of his wives,[10] and when he departs by stealth Laban pursues him and tells him that he has no right to take them away, or even his own children, and claims them as belonging to their mother's

[1] *The Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Berakot*, ed. A. Cohen, p. 107.

[2] W. Robertson Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

[3] *Ibid.* Robertson Smith was, however, perhaps in error in regarding the male 'ancestor' as a pure invention of later times. From analogy with other primitive genealogies and from other considerations it appears probable that the tribal ancestor is often the son of the tribal ancestress. He often becomes also the god of the tribes. Cf. below, vol. iii, p. 83.

[4] *II Samuel*, v. 1, and *passim*.

[5] W. Robertson Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 131 n.

[6] *I Chronicles*, vii. 24.

[7] W. Robertson Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 124, 131. The prevalence among the Jews of the practice of marrying their half-sisters (their father's daughters) or their father's sisters (*Genesis*, xi. 29; *Exodus*, vi. 20; *Ezekiel*, xxiii. 11) points to matrilineal descent as the rule among them in early days; for it is in conjunction with matrilineal descent that such a practice is invariably found, its object being to make the offspring the heir of the father as well as of the mother. It was also usual among the Phoenicians (Achilles Tatius, *Heroticon*, i. 3).

[8] *Genesis*, ii. 24.

[9] *Ibid.*, xxviii. 2 sq.

[10] *Ibid.*, xxxi. 38.

father.[1] Samson's wife remains with her own people;[2] Joseph's children by his Egyptian wife have to be adopted before they can be regarded as belonging to his tribe.[3] The practice of matrilocal marriage passed away with the development of marital power when the Jews became settled in Canaan; but it survives to this day among the Bedawi of Arabia. There is scarcely any need of the testimony of Ibn Batuta that in the fourteenth century the women of Zebid did not follow their husbands,[4] for with the true Bedawi marriage is almost never other than matrilocal; the women do not leave their tribe unless carried away by force. "The wild men," says Burton, "do not refuse their daughters to a stranger, but the son-in-law would be forced to settle amongst them."[5] The poet Omm Kharija contracted marriages with more than twenty tribes, which means that the practice of the Arab nomads was similar to that which we find among the Tibbu tribesmen, and which is common in Africa.[6] The poet Maidani sings: "My heart is towards the tribe, for my soul is held among them in hostage by the best of wives."[7] Even after the introduction of patrilocal marriage in the more advanced communities, contracts were sometimes drawn up stipulating that the wife should remain with her own people.[8]

Ammianus Marcellinus noted that in his day the common marriage ceremony among the Arabs consisted in the presentation by the woman to the man of a spear and a tent.[9] The former was a symbolic injunction to defend her and her tribe, the latter, as among the populations of Central Asia, was the woman's own home. The tent has always been regarded by the Arabs as the special property of the woman, and indeed the word 'tent' is commonly used, in the same way as the word 'harîm,' as a synonym for a woman. A man generally refers to his wife as "the owner of the tent," or "of the house."[10] Among the Bedawi of the

[1] *Genesis*, xxxi. 26, 31, 43.

[2] *Judges*, xv. 1. That this was the general rule in the early days of the Canaanite occupation may also be inferred from *Judges*, iii. 5–6. On joining the tribe of his wife a man naturally served the gods of his wife's tribe.

[3] *Genesis*, xlviii. 5.

[4] W. Robertson Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 79; Ibn Batuta, ed. C. Défrémery and B. R. Sanguinetti, vol. ii, p. 168.

[5] R. F. Burton, *Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to Al-Medinah and Meccah*, vol. ii, p. 84. Cf. J. L. Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins and Wahabys*, p. 269.

[6] W. Robertson Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 86. See above, pp. 282, 285.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 80.

[8] *Ibid.*

[9] Ammianus Marcellinus, xiv. 4; W. Robertson Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

[10] J. Wellhausen, "Die Ehe bei den Arabern," *Nachrichten von der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augustus-Universität zu Göttingen*, 1893, p. 444.

Sinaitic peninsula at the present day, the tent is essentially the women's dwelling-place; a man scarcely ever sleeps in a tent, but usually lies down under the shelter of some bush or rock.[1] Even the Prophet had no other home than his wives' various houses, and it is mentioned that on one occasion when he had quarrelled with all of them he had no place where he could sleep.[2] An Arab author mentions that the women of Jahiliya could dismiss their husbands by merely turning their tent round.[3] The same custom which Ammianus noted obtains at the present day. Among the Bedawi of Mesopotamia a special tent, called 'hofah' is erected for the newly married couple.[4] The part which the tent, or 'huppah,' played in Jewish marriage was so important that it gave its name to the whole transaction. The ordinary expression for "to get married" was "to go into the 'huppah'"; this was the essential act of the marriage ceremony, and the marriage was not regarded as concluded, nor was the bride-price due, until it had taken place.[5] When the practice of the husband visiting his wife in her tent gave place to patrilocal marriage, he, nevertheless, did not bring his bride immediately into his own house, but a special tent, which was presented by the bride's family, was erected to represent the woman's home.[6] 'Huppah,' 'the tent,' is still the ordinary term for the marriage ceremony among the Jews; and until quite lately, and for aught I know even at the present day in some countries, the 'huppah' was represented in every Jewish marriage by a canopy under which the bride proceeded to and from the synagogue.[7]

Thus among all Semites the practice of matrilocal marriage, which is the essence of the matriarchal organisation of society and which inevitably carries with it all other features of that social order, preceded other social and marriage practices. And we find, in fact, unmistakable indications that in ancient times the position and influence of women, both among the Jews and in Arabia, corresponded with that type of social organisation. What is perhaps the oldest existing fragment of Hebrew literature

[1] W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Social Life in Ancient Egypt*, p. 74.

[2] J. Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p. 445.

[3] W. Robertson Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

[4] A. M. St. Elie, "La femme du désert autrefois et aujourd'hui," *Anthropos*, iii, p. 185.

[5] J. Selden, *Uxor ebraica*, vol. i, pp. 132 sq., 136 sq. The common Biblical phrase, "he went in unto her," has not, as is popularly supposed, the meaning of 'innivit feminam,' but means "he went into her tent," as is clearly shown by *II Samuel*, ix. 4: "she went in unto him."

[6] *Isaiah*, iv. 5; *Psalms*, ix. 6; *Ecclesiastes*, iv. 11; *Talmud*, *Sanhedrim*, 108a, *Berakot*, 25b, *Sotah*, 12b.

[7] Kaufman Kohler, art "Huppah," in *The Jewish Encyclopaedia*, vol. vi, pp. 504 sqq.

represents the Hebrew tribes as led by a woman ;[1] among the Arabs likewise several of the 'Judges' were, like Deborah, chieftainesses.[2] Queens, from the 'Queen of Sheba' to Zenobia and her sister Zebba,[3] occupy a prominent place throughout early Arabian history. In every one of the references to Arabian kingdoms in the historical inscriptions of Assyria it is with a queen that we have to do. Tiglath-Peleser III, Sargon II, each meet with a queen in their expeditions against the kingdoms of Arabia ;[4] Esahraddon appointed to the throne of Arabia a queen, Tabua, who had been brought up at the court of Assyria.[5] The position of those queens appears to have been even more exalted than that of the African queens which we shall come upon. Their husbands were merely their consorts.[6] The queens of the Sabaean kingdom exercised a rule at least equal to that of their husbands. That, we know, was the case with the queens of the later Nabataean kingdom ; for on their coins the queens figure side by side with their husbands as co-rulers.[7] "The female sex rules among the Sabaeans," says Claudian, "and a large proportion of the barbarians is under the armed domination of queens."[8]

Women in ancient Arabia were commonly the owners of wealth ; they possessed large flocks and herds, and their husbands so commonly acted as the herdsmen of their wives' flocks that the phrase "I will no longer drive thy flocks to pasture" was an habitual formula of divorce.[9] Muhammad himself was enabled to carry out his mission thanks only to the wealth which he acquired from his first wife Khadija, who was engaged in lucrative traffic and owned landed estates.[10] We constantly come upon in pre-Islamic

[1] *Judges*, iv–v.

[2] G. Freytag, *Arabum Proverbia*, vol. ii, p. 56 n.

[3] That Zebba, who is famous in Arab tradition, was a duplication of Zenobia, or Zaynab, as de Perceval thinks, does not appear probable considering that the two are mentioned both by Roman and Arabian writers (see A. P. Caussin de Perceval, *Essai sur l'histoire des Arabes avant l'Islamisme*, vol. ii, pp. 28 sqq.).

[4] R. W. Rogers, *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, vol. ii, pp. 133–135 164, 213 sq.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 232.

[6] Sir Gaston Maspéro appears to be in error when he says that Queen Tabua was given as wife to King Hazael (*The Passing of the Empires*, p. 358), for the text of the cylinders (A. and C., iii. 14) expressly attributes to her dominion over the country.

[7] H. Winckler, *Völker und Staaten des Alten Orients : Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens*, vol. i, p. 267.

[8] Claudian, in *Eutropius*, i. 820 : "Sabaeis imperat hic sexus, reginarumque sub armis barbariae magna pars jacet."

[9] G. Freytag, *Arabum Proverbia*, vol. i, p. 498 ; W. Robertson Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

[10] Sir W. Muir, *The Life of Mahomet*, pp. 22 sq. Caetani remarks that the position of Muhammad in relation to Khadija, "a relic of the old

and early Islamic literature women like Mawia bint Afzar, who is described as "rich, beautiful and entirely her own mistress. She married the man who succeeded in pleasing her, and separated from him when her fancy changed." But, although she was courted by the most famous warriors and poets of the age, her choice was never frivolously determined, but distinguished the highest talents and the noblest characters.[1] There is, indeed, nowhere to be found in the whole range of human records a nobler type of dignified yet unfettered, free yet self-respecting, womanhood than the woman of ancient Arabia up to the time of decline and fall of Saracenic civilisation. The Spartan mother did not equal her in heroism; no title was more highly prized by her than that of 'munjibat,' that is, 'mother of the heroes.'[2] To her son, besieged in Mecca and about to surrender, Asma bint Abu Bakr sends the message: "Rather die as a brave man than live as a coward." A wounded warrior, Rabŷa ibn Mukaddam, withdrawing from the fray to the women's convoy, says to his mother: "Umm Sayyar, thou art mortally wounded in the person of thy son; dress my wound and give me water." "My child," replies the mother, as she dresses the wound, "if thou drinkest thou diest this instant; hasten, rather, and charge the enemy once more."[3] The women were always close behind the warriors in a battle, serving them drinks, dressing their wounds, and exciting them by songs and music; "If you are not able to defend us," they said, "you are not our husbands."[4] More than once they rallied them to victory; and many an Arab woman personally led the men to battle. As late as the time of Rashid, Arab maidens fought on horseback and commanded troops; and royal princesses clad in mail fought under Mansur against the Byzantines.[5] Yet those proud amazons were not barbaric viragoes, but cultivated beauty, grace and elegance, and all the accomplishments of their age. The record of their sentiments is contained in their own impassioned poems, which form a considerable portion of pre-Islamic poetry and include some of the most beautiful examples. The tent of many an Arab woman, among whom Umm Jundab is particularly famed, was the scene of tournaments of song in which they acted as critics and judges.[6] Like archaic Greece, ancient

matriarchy," must have been somewhat galling to a high-spirited man like the prophet (L. Caetani, *Studi di Storia Orientale*, vol. iii, p. 22).

[1] A. P. Caussin de Perceval, *Essai sur l'histoire des Arabes avant l'Islamisme*, vol. ii, pp. 613 sqq.

[2] Id., *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 417.

[3] Id., *op. cit.*, vol. ii, pp. 544 sq.

[4] *Mu'allaqa* of Amr ibn Kulthum, ap. Caussin de Perceval, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 391.

[5] Ameer Ali, Syed, *A Short History of the Saracens*, p. 455.

[6] C. P. Caussin de Perceval, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, pp. 314 sqq.

Arabia had its 'Seven Sages,' but they were women,[1] and Arab tradition tells of the Sibyer priestesses and hakimāt of ancient Arabia.[2] It is little wonder that Arab women inspired the men with an intense, romantic, sacred devotion. Of the wild Bedawi, Burton says that two things tend to soften their ferocity, intercourse with citizens and the social position of women among them.[3] For the Arab, the tribe to which he was so passionately devoted meant the women of the tribe, his mother, his sisters, his wives. His function as a warrior was by him chiefly regarded as the defence of the women. When a tribe was hard-pressed it sent for help to a neighbouring tribe, and its message was accompanied by locks of the women's hair—an appeal which never failed to bring the desired assistance.[4] A tribe being surrounded on all sides, four of the women rode out towards the attackers, and called out: "This side is under my protection." The raiders retired empty-handed, and excused themselves to their tribesmen at home, saying: "The dignity of woman is as the brightness of the sun in the heavens; as to sovereigns we owe respect and consideration to women."[5] The most solemn oath of the Arab is "by the honour of my women."[6]

Ancient Egypt.

In the venerable civilisation of Egypt, which has contributed so largely to the material and intellectual culture of the western world, we have not to seek for vestiges and indications of a former matriarchal social order surviving amid changed conditions, for in truth, down to the time when a dynasty of Greek rulers sought to introduce foreign usages, the hoary and conservative society of the great African kingdom never lost its essential matriarchal

[1] Wacyf Boutros Ghali, *La tradition chevaleresque chez les Arabes*, pp. 100 sq.

[2] A. M. St. Élie, "La femme du désert autrefois et aujourd'hui," *Anthropos*, ii, p. 60.

[3] R. F. Burton, *Pilgrimage to Al-Medinah and Meccah*, vol. ii, p. 89.

[4] E. M. Quatremère, *Mélanges d'histoire et de philologie orientale*, pp. 225 sq.

[5] G. Daumas, *La femme arabe*, pp. 57 sq. An inviolable 'right of asylum' belonged to every woman, and it was a recognised law that any man whom a woman declared to be under her protection was safe (see Quatremère, *loc. cit.*). The principles and ideas of 'chivalry' which redeemed the status of women in the early Middle Ages were greatly developed by contact with the Arabs, who transmitted to barbaric Europe every other germ of civilisation. Will the debt, obstinately and persistently ignored and belittled by the tradition of religious prejudice, ever be acknowledged? See Anne and Wilfrid Blunt, *The Seven Golden Odes of Pagan Arabia*, Introduction, p. 14; R. A. Nicholson, *Literary History of the Arabs*, p. 88; R. Burton, *Pilgrimage*, vol. ii, pp. 88 sqq.; and my *The Making of Humanity*, pp. 184–221 and 307–309.

[6] R. F. Burton, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 94.

character. A continuous progress towards the displacement of matriarchal by patriarchal institutions and usages is, indeed, clearly traceable from the beginning of historical times through the various phases of Egypt's long career of four thousand years; but to the last the change was never completely effected, and Egypt remained a notable example of a great and highly developed civilisation which retained in a pronounced degree the matriarchal character of primitive societies. We shall have to consider in another place the remarkable features presented by the constitution of the royal family and the rules of succession to the throne of the Pharaohs. We shall see that the functions of royalty in ancient Egypt were regarded as being transmitted in the female line. While every Egyptian princess of the Royal House was born a queen and bore the titles and dignities of the office from the day of her birth, a man only acquired them at his coronation, and could do so only by becoming the consort of a royal princess. It was in the queen, and not in the king, that the mystic or divine virtue attaching to the royal office was thought to reside; and the dependence of the male occupants of the throne upon the queen and the queen-mother for the legitimacy of their title was never lost sight of even by the most powerful and ambitious monarchs.[1] Those features of the constitution of Egyptian royalty are not altogether singular; we shall see that they are substantially identical with those obtaining in all other African kingdoms. Royal families, moreover, naturally tend to preserve a more archaic constitution than the families of ordinary people. The pronounced matriarchal features presented by Pharaonic royalty would, therefore, not be in themselves a sufficient ground for inferring the matriarchal character of Egyptian society as a whole. But, although our information concerning the life of the people is necessarily much more scanty and fragmentary than are the records of royalty, and in spite of the fact that the older Egyptologists, being insufficiently familiar with the data of social anthropology, have very commonly interpreted such facts as are known in terms of the patriarchal conception of society, those features of ancient Egyptian social life differ altogether from the corresponding features of any ancient or modern patriarchal society, and present very clearly the essential outline of a social tradition in the highest degree matriarchal in character.[2]

[1] See below, vol. iii, pp. 37 sqq.

[2] The distortions arising from the assumptions of the patriarchal theory are nowhere perhaps more conspicuous than in Egyptological literature. The facts, however, are sufficiently clear and well established, and the various misrepresentations of them sufficiently obvious to dispense with the need of taking the latter into account. The pre-scientific treatment of Egyptian sociology is, nevertheless, instructive in helping to form an estimate of similar views and methods in other departments of social history. The

The constitution of Egyptian society and of the family was characterised, says Dr. H. R. Hall, by "a distinct preservation of matriarchy, the prominent position of women, and a comparative promiscuity in sexual relations."[1] "Foremost in importance among the distinctive features of the social organisation," says Professor Mitteis, "was the position of women; Egypt from time immemorial was a land of matriarchal right."[2] Descent was reckoned through the mother and not through the father. Thus on funeral stelae of all periods "it is the usual custom to trace the descent of the deceased on the mother's side, and not, as we usually do, on that of the father. We read of 'Ned'emu-sneb, born of Sat-Hathor,' of 'Anhor, born of Neb-onet,' or 'Sebekedo, born of Sent,' but who were the respective fathers we are not told, or they are only mentioned incidentally."[3] "In questions of descent the female line was principally regarded," says Sir William Flinders Petrie. "The mother's name is always given, the father's name may be omitted; the ancestors are always traced farther back in the female than in the male line. The father was only a holder of office, the mother was the family link. Hereditary offices are sometimes traced through a succession of men, but we never meet with a line of solely male descent otherwise."[4] In bilingual

distinctive and fundamental principles of the constitution of Egyptian society are commonly disposed of in voluminous works on the subject with the incidental remark that "the Egyptians allowed their women a remarkable degree of freedom." Theories of 'corruption' abound. The great Champollion, the founder of Egyptological science, actually imagined that the practice of reckoning descent in the female line was a 'corruption' introduced into Egypt by the Greeks! (J. J. Champollion-Fijeac, *Égypte ancienne*, p. 42). M. Bouché-Leclercq, in his elaborate history of the Ptolemies, maintains with considerable heat that the practice of dynastic incest was a 'corruption' first introduced into Egypt by the Ptolemies (A. Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire des Lagides*, vol. iii, pp. 87 sq.). Even Professor Révillout, who by his translations of Egyptian marriage contracts has done more than anyone to exhibit the legal status of women in Egypt, speaks contemptuously of "the matriarchal theory" ("Lettre à l'auteur," in G. Paturet, *La condition juridique de la femme dans l'Égypte ancienne*, p. viii). M. Paturet, in his excellent monograph, ascribes the power of women in Egypt to "abuse and corruption" (G. Paturet, *op. cit.*, p. 30, and *passim*).

[1] H. R. Hall, art. "Family (Egyptian)," in Hastings's *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. v, p. 733. Cf. Id., *The Ancient History of the Near East*, p. 205.

[2] L. Mitteis, *Reichsrecht und Volksrecht in den östlichen Provinzen des römischen Kaiserreichs*, p. 57.

[3] A. Erman, *Life in Ancient Egypt*, pp. 155 sq.

[4] W. H. Flinders Petrie, *Social Life in Ancient Egypt*, p. 119. Cf. J. J. Champollion-Fijeac, *Égypte ancienne*, pp. 41 sq.; A. Mariette-Bey, *Notice des principaux monuments exposés dans les galeries provisoires du Musée d'antiquités égyptiennes . . . à Boulaq*, p. 181; F. Chabas, *Le papyrus magique Harris*, p. 134; E. A. Wallis Budge, *A Short History of the Egyptian People*, p. 205; G. Maspéro, *Life in Ancient Egypt and Assyria*, p. 15;

documents of the Ptolemaic period, written in Egyptian and in Greek, the mother's name alone is given in the Egyptian text; in the Greek translation the father's name alone is given, or both the father's and mother's.[1] The usage of matrilineal reckoning persisted in Christian times and was still in force in the seventh century, on the eve of the Arab conquest.[2] "The maternal uncle is often named as important. The father of the mother was more important than a man's own father."[3] The care and education of a youth commonly devolved upon the father of his mother.[4] As a consequence of the matrilinear rule of descent there were no illegitimate children in Egypt; a child born out of wedlock enjoyed the same civil rights as one born in marriage.[5] All children belonged to the mother, and in case of separation remained with her.[6] The 'nomes,' or primitive local totemic clans the association of which formed the Egyptian nation, were maternal

W. A. Schmidt, *Forschungen auf dem Gebiet des Alterthums*, Part i. *Die griechischen Papyrusurkunden der königliche Bibliothek zu Berlin*, p. 321; E. Révillout, *Cours de droit égyptien*, vol. i, p. 169; J. Lumbroso, *Recherches sur l'économie politique de l'Égypte sous les Lagides*, p. 54; L. Mitteis, *Reichsrecht und Volksrecht in den östlichen Provinzen des römischen Kaiserreichs*, p. 57; J. Nietzold, *Die Ehe in Ägypten zur ptolemaisch-römischen Zeit*, p. 18; E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, vol. i, Part ii, p. 51; H. R. Hall, *The Ancient History of the Near East*, p. 205; P. Pierret, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie égyptienne*, pp. 221 sq. Herodotus, who noted the usage of matrilineal descent among the Lykians, failed to notice it in Egypt. His statement that the custom of the Lykians was one "which no other people has," has been mentioned as indicating the rarity of the usage in the ancient world. What the circumstance shows, on the contrary, is how easily the fundamental social constitution of a people could be overlooked even by an observer so deeply interested in that people as Herodotus was in the Egyptians, and the small value that can be attached to negative evidence. Herodotus was doubtless impressed by the statement of the priests of Thebes, who showed him the statues of 341 of their members who had succeeded in the office from father to son (Herodotus, ii. 144). The priests were the strongest advocates of male rights of succession (cf. below p. 387).

[1] J. Zündel. "Ein greichischen Bücherkatalog aus Aegypten," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, Neue Folge*, xxi, pp. 435 sq.; E. Révillout, "Les régimes matrimoniaux dans le droit égyptien," *Revue Égyptologique*, i, p. 132 n.; L. Mitteis, *Reichsrecht und Volksrecht in den östlichen Provinzen des römisches Kaiserreichs*, p. 57.

[2] L. Mitteis, *loc. cit.*; *Notices et Extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Impériale*, vol. xviii, p. 231.

[3] W. H. Flinders Petrie, *Social Life in Ancient Egypt*, p. 119.

[4] A. Erman, *Life in Ancient Egypt*, p. 156.

[5] Diodorus Siculus, i. 80; C. Wessely, "Studien über das Verhältniss des griechischen zum ägyptischen Recht im Lagidenreich," *Sitzungsberichte der philosophische-historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Wien), cxxiv, p. 51; G. Paturet, *La condition juridique de la femme dans l'ancienne Égypte*, pp. 25 sq.

[6] G. Paturet, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

clans, or motherhoods; the headship of the nomes was hereditarily transmitted through women.[1]

"The family in Egypt," says Sir William Flinders Petrie, "was based on a matriarchal system, the office-holder or farmer who married into a family was a secondary affair; the house and property went with the woman and daughters."[2] "The Egyptian woman of the lower and middle class," says Sir Gaston Maspéro, "was more respected, more independent than any other woman in the world. As a wife, she is the real mistress of the house, her husband being, so to speak, merely a privileged guest."[3] "The most important person in the family," says Dr. Hall, "was not the father, but the mother."[4] The Egyptian wife was called the 'Ruler of the House,' 'nebt-per,' (); there is no corresponding term for the husband. "There is nothing in Egyptian jurisprudence which bears any resemblance to the power of the husband as head of the household."[5] "The word 'husband' is only found introduced in contracts between spouses after the reign of Philopator. When the marriage contract is not forthcoming it is not possible to know whether it is the husband who is referred to, except indirectly, as, for instance, when he appears as the father in a partition of property between the children or in any other act concerning them signed by the mother."[6] In monuments of the Old Empire the wife is represented seated on the same seat as the husband, and with her arm over his shoulder in sign of possession.[7] In a man's tomb the figures of his wife, or wives, are invariably represented, even though he be a widower; but, on the other hand, a widow's tomb does not contain the statue of her deceased consort.[8]

Marriage was matrilocal. Where there were two wives, each

[1] A. Erman, *Life in Ancient Egypt*, p. 92; E. Révillout, *L'ancienne Égypte d'après les papyrus et les monuments*, vol. ii, p. 57.

[2] W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Social Life in Ancient Egypt*, p. 109.

[3] G. Maspéro, *Life in Ancient Egypt and Assyria*, p. 11.

[4] H. R. Hall, art. "Family (Egyptian)," in Hastings's *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. v, p. 733.

[5] G. Paturet, *La condition juridique de la femme dans l'ancienne Égypte*, p. 41.

[6] E. Révillout, "Les régimes matrimoniaux dans le droit égyptien," *Revue Égyptologique*, i, p. 132.

[7] E. Révillout, *L'ancienne Égypte d'après les papyrus et les monuments*, vol. ii, p. 9; G. Perrot and C. Chipiez, *Histoire de l'art dans l'antiquité*, vol. i, pp. 658 sq. The gesture is described by the latter writers as symbolising the dependence of the wife, who leans on the husband for support. But that patriarchal interpretation is excluded by some of the variants of the attitude. Thus the wife of Khā-em-Uast encircles her husband with one arm, and with the other hand actually *supports* the arm in which he holds the emblem of his office (British Museum, No. 41, 603).

[8] E. Révillout, *op. cit.*, pp. 23 sqq.

remained in her own house, the husband visiting them in turn.[1] Not infrequently, especially in the Theban district, there was no cohabitation; both husband and wife remained in their respective homes.[2] This was in all probability the primitive practice. "As late as the XIXth Dynasty there was still surviving the idea that a man was only a boarder in a woman's home."[3] All landed and house property was in the hands of the women; if a man built or acquired a house, it passed immediately to his wife with reversion to the children at her discretion.[4] The women, whether married or single, administered their property personally; the husband was not consulted, and was generally ignorant of his wife's affairs; any interference on his part would, under the Old Empire, have been regarded as illegal.[5] The duty of providing for parents in their old age consequently fell upon the daughters and not upon the sons;[6] and the bride-price which a man had to pay on marriage was sometimes provided, or guaranteed, by his mother.[7]

Marriage does not appear to have been associated with any religious ceremony.[8] It was essentially an economic transaction, and from an early time was made the subject of a written contract drawn up by a law-scribe, and specifying the economic conditions of the association.[9] We possess several hundreds of such contracts dating from the Ptolemaic period, and at least two from the preceding centuries. In both the latter, as well as in many of the later documents, the woman is the sole contracting party, and imposes her conditions on the man. The chief provision runs as follows: "If I leave thee as husband because I have come to

[1] H. R. Hall, art "Family (Egyptian)," in Hastings's *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. v, p. 735.

[2] U. Wilcken, *Griechische Ostraka aus Ägypten und Nubia*, vol. i, pp. 446 sq.; E. Révillout, "Hypothèque légale de la femme et donations entre époux," *Revue Égyptologique*, i, p. 133; G. Paturet, *La condition juridique de la femme dans l'ancienne Égypte*, pp. 54 sq.

[3] W. H. Flinders Petrie, *Social Life in Ancient Egypt*, p. 73.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 74; E. Révillout, *L'ancienne Égypte d'après les papyrus et les monuments*, p. 150.

[5] E. Révillout, "La question du divorce chez les Égyptiens," *Revue Égyptologique*, i, pp. 89, 99; G. Paturet, *La condition juridique de la femme dans l'ancienne Égypte*, pp. 9, 41.

[6] Herodotus, ii. 35; W. H. Flinders Petrie, *op. cit.*, p. 120.

[7] C. Wessely, "Studien über das Verhältniss des griechischen zum ägyptischen Recht im Lagidenreiche," *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Wien), cxxiv, pp. 51 sq.

[8] E. A. Wallis Budge, *A Short History of the Egyptian People*, p. 204.

[9] For evidence of marriage contracts in earlier times, see A. Wiedemann, *Hieratische Texte aus den Museen zu Berlin und Paris*, p. 15; Photius, *Bibliotheka*, p. 338b (ed. Bekker, p. 227).

hate thee, or because I love another man, I shall give thee two and a half measures of silver, and return to thee the two and a half measures of silver which thou now givest me as bride-gift." [1] The wording is identical in both contracts, although there is about two centuries' interval between their dates; so that we have to do with a stereotyped established formula.[2] As will be seen, "the woman could divorce as she pleased, and without giving either reason or motive." [3] Sometimes the husband expressly bound himself not to claim any corresponding right; thus we read in a contract drawn up in the name of the husband: "Thou alone shalt be free to go." [4] In addition to the bride-gift, the man had to make regular yearly payments to the wife and also subsidiary contributions; she generally held a mortgage over one-third of his possessions and earnings, but this was often increased so as to include the whole. A condition of things commonly resulted similar to that which we have noted amongst the Beni-Hamer,[5] the husband being deliberately exploited and his substance entirely appropriated by the wife. "In Thebes the woman generally used her position to obtain possession by acts subsequent to the marriage contract of all the husband's goods. This dispossession was often gradual, but sometimes took place at one sweep in the form of a sale, and included all the possessions, present and future, of the husband. Where, as in Thebes, the domiciles of wife and husband were sometimes separate, the man might find himself in danger of starving. He accordingly took the precaution to stipulate that the wife should 'provide for him during his lifetime, and pay the expenses of his funeral and burial.'" [6] In a love poem of the period of Rameses II, addressed, as was usual in Egypt, by the lady to her beloved, the former opens her heart thus: "O my beautiful friend! My desire is to become, as thy wife, the mistress of all thy possessions!" [7]

[1] W. Spielberg, *Der Papyrus Libbey, ein ägyptischen Heiratsvertrag* (*Schriften der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft in Strassburg*, No. 10), p. 1.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

[3] G. Paturet, *La condition juridique de la femme dans l'ancienne Égypte*, p. 31.

[4] *Ibid.*, *loc. cit.*, and p. 74; E. Révillout, "La question du divorce chez les Égyptiens," *Revue Égyptologique*, i, pp. 91 sq.

[5] See above, p. 325.

[6] E. Révillout, "Hypothèque légale de la femme et donations entre époux," *Revue Égyptologique*, i, pp. 132 sq.; cf. *Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Impériale*, vol. xviii, p. 210; C. Wessely, "Studien über das Verhältniss des griechischen zum ägyptischen Recht im Lagidenreich," *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Wien), cxxiv, p. 50.

[7] G. Maspéro, "Les chants d'amour du papyrus de Turin et du papyrus Harris," *Journal Asiatique*, 8e Série, i, p. 35. Müller, however, on the ground that the rendering is "too prosaic," prefers to interpret the lady's desire

The readiness, and even eagerness, which Egyptian husbands appear to have shown in making over their property to their wives was in all probability due in part to the fact that the property was thus transmitted to their children, for, according to matriarchal usage, it would otherwise have passed not to their own, but to their sister's children. Thus, by a curious paradox, the anxiety to secure patriarchal succession greatly contributed to accentuate the economic power of women. To the same desire to combine inheritance in the male line with the matriarchal organisation of the family was also doubtless due the practice of marrying their sisters, which appears to have been more prevalent in Egypt than among any other people, cultured or uncivilised, which we know.[1] So habitual was the usage that even as late as the second century A.D. unions between brothers and sisters constituted in some districts the great majority of the marriages.[2]

" Among private citizens," says Diodorus Siculus after referring to the matriarchal character of the royal family, " the husband, by the terms of the marriage agreement, appertains to the wife, and it is stipulated between them that the man shall obey the woman in all things." [3] That statement, which has been treated with great contempt by generations of Egyptologists, is now known to be no more than a strictly accurate account. The obedience mentioned by Diodorus is inculcated on the husband as a moral precept in ' the oldest book in the world,' the ' Maxims of Ptah-Hotep,' which date from about 3200 B.C. " If thou art wise," says the ancient sage, " keep thy home. Love thy wife and do not quarrel with her. Feed her, clothe her, anoint her. Caress her, and fulfil all her desires as long as thou livest, for she is an estate which brings much profit. Observe what she wisheth, and that after which her mind runneth ; for thus shalt thou induce her to continue with thee. If thou oppose her, it will mean thy ruin." [4] Many centuries later, during the reign of Rameses II, another Egyptian moralist repeats the same advice ; he counsels the husband to preserve an entirely passive attitude towards his wife.[5] The

as referring to the preparation of the young man's food (W. M. Müller, *Die Liebespoesie der alten Ägypten*, p. 23).

[1] Diodorus Siculus, i. 27 ; W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Social Life in Ancient Egypt*, p. 110 ; E. A. Wallis Budge, *A Short History of the Egyptian People*, p. 204 ; E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, vol. i, Part ii, p. 51 ; B. Stern, *Ägyptische Kulturgeschichte*, p. 206 ; C. Wessely, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

[2] U. Wilcken, " Arsinotische Steuerprofessionen aus dem Jahre 189 a. Chr. und verwandte Urkunde," *Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1883, vol. ii, p. 903 ; L. Mitteis, *Reichsrecht und Volksrecht in den östlichen Provinzen des römischen Kaiserreichs*, p. 53.

[3] Diodorus Siculus, i. 27.

[4] P. Virey, *Études sur le papyrus Prisse, le livre de Kagimna et les leçons de Ptah-hotep*, pp. 67 sq.

[5] F. Chabas, *Les maximes du scribe Ani* (*L'Égyptologie*, ii), p. 109.

marriage contracts which we possess conform exactly to the description given by Diodorus. Indeed he, if anything, somewhat understates the case. The tone of almost abject servility which pervades those documents is incredible. "I acknowledge thy rights of wife," so runs one of those contracts; "from this day forward I shall never by any word oppose thy claims. I shall acknowledge thee before anyone as my wife, but I have no power to say to thee: 'Thou art my wife.' It is I who am the man who is thy husband. From the day that I become thy husband I cannot oppose thee, in whatsoever place thou mayest please to go. I cede thee . . . (here follows a list of possessions), that are in thy dwelling. I have no power to interfere in any transaction made by thee, from this day. Every document made in my favour by any person is now placed among thy deeds, and is also at the disposal of thy father or of any relatives acting for thee. Thou shalt hold me bound to honour any such deed. Should anyone hand over to me any moneys that are due to thee, I shall hand them over to thee without delay, without opposition, and in addition pay thee a further twenty measures of silver, one hundred shekels, and again twenty measures of silver."[1] "Thou assumest full power over me to compel me to perform these things," declares another similar contract.[2] "What would Diodorus have said," remarks Professor Révillout, "had he known those contracts by which in ancient times complete cession of all the husband's property to the wife commonly took place!" A papyrus dating from the reign of Rameses II recites the abject supplications of a Theban husband to his dead wife, of whose ghost he is still in dread. "This little papyrus," says M. Chabas, "is one of the most curious that we know." The terrified widower grovels before the deceased lady, whom he calls 'The Perfect Spirit,' and ventures to complain of the maltreatment he has received at her hands. He urges the consideration which he has shown her throughout her life. He submits that he never neglected her when he acquired an exalted position in the household of Pharaoh, but that he complied with all her whims, and never received anyone in audience except such as she approved of. "Whatever they brought to me, I placed it before thee. I never hid away anything for myself."[3] Can we wonder at the gibes of the Greeks at the 'topsy-turvy world' of Egypt and its henpecked husbands?[4] Yet, although we come upon instances

[1] G. Paturet, *La condition juridique de la femme dans l'ancienne Égypte*, pp. 72 sq.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 56.

[3] F. J. Chabas, "Notice sommaire des papyrus hiératiques," in C. Leemans, *Monuments égyptiens des Musées des Pays-Bas à Leide*, vol. ii, p. 19.

[4] Herodotus, ii. 25; Sophokles, *Oedip. Colon.*, 337; Nymphodorus, in *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* (ed. Müller), vol. ii, p. 380; Antiphanes and Aankandrides, cited by Athenaeus, vii. 299; Pomponius Mela, i. 9. 6.

of gross abuse of her power on the part of the wife, as when a husband, after tolerating for a long time the presence of his wife's lover in the house, is ultimately driven away and turned out of house and home,[1] the regimen gave rise in general to the happiest results. The Egyptians, who knew no other kind of home relations and were, as Ptah-Hotep so clearly explains, accustomed to dread the consequences of any foolish neglect, were devoted and affectionate husbands. "The affections of the Egyptians centred in their homes and in their wives and children. The married woman . . . ruled her house and family with a benevolent, but despotic, power." [2]

"The prominent position of the women in the family," remarks Dr. Hall, "led generally to a prominent position of women in Egypt." [3] "No people, ancient or modern," says W. Max Müller, "has given women so high a legal status as did the inhabitants of the Nile valley." [4] Whether single or married, from the earliest age, a girl or woman had the fullest legal rights and could enter independently into any transaction.[5] The institution of guardian was entirely unknown in Egypt, and neither father, brother nor any other relative had the right to interfere, any more than had the husband, in any transaction carried out on her own account by a woman.[6] Indeed, while the husband could not act on behalf of his wife, the latter might act as surety for her husband.[7] An inscription of the time of Rameses III declares that "the foot of an Egyptian woman could wander wheresoever she pleased, and no one could oppose her." [8] "In Egypt," says Herodotus, "the

[1] E. Révillout, "La question du divorce chez les Égyptiens," *Revue Égyptologique*, i, p. 96.

[2] E. A. Wallis Budge, *A Short History of the Egyptian People*, pp. 203, 205.

[3] H. R. Hall, art. "Family (Egyptian)," in Hastings, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. v, p. 733.

[4] W. Max Müller, *Die Liebespoesie der alten Ägypten*, p. 6.

[5] K. Wessely, "Studien über das Verhältniss des griechischen zum ägyptischen Recht im Lagidenreiche," *Sitzungsberichte der philosophische-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Wien), cxxiv, p. 49; G. Paturet, *La condition juridique de la femme dans l'ancienne Égypte*, pp. 6, 9, 41.

[6] K. Wessely, *loc. cit.*; Id., in *Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyri Erzherzog Rainer*, vol. iv, pp. 162 sq.; G. Paturet, *op. cit.*, pp. 8 sqq.; E. Révillout, *Chrestomathie démotique*, pp. 162 sqq.; F. Robiou, *Mémoire sur l'économie politique, l'administration et la législation de l'Égypte au temps de Lagides*, pp. 235 sq.; J. Nietzold, *Die Ehe in Aegypten zur ptolemaisch-römischen Zeit*, p. 30; L. Mitteis, *Reichsrecht und Volksrecht in den östlichen Provinzen des römischen Kaiserreichs*, pp. 54, 220.

[7] K. Wessely, "Die griechischen Papyri der kaiserlichen Sammlungen Wiens," *XI Jahresbericht des königliches-kaiserliches Franz-Josef-Gymnasium*, p. 14; G. Paturet, *La condition juridique de la femme dans l'ancienne Égypte*, p. 42.

[8] B. Stern, *Ägyptische Kulturgeschichte*, p. 205.

women go in the market-place, transact affairs and occupy themselves with business, while the husbands stay at home and weave."[1] And in fact under the Old Empire almost any career appears to have been open to a woman. Before and after marriage she might become a priestess.[2] We have full details of the career of a woman who, beginning as a clerk in her father's office, was promoted to various administrative posts, and became governess of the Fayum, and, what appears more remarkable, commander-in-chief of the western military district. To this was added later the governorship and the military command of Kynopolis and the eastern frontier, and she became one of the most important and wealthiest personages in the realm.[3]

A continuous tendency towards the restriction of those matriarchal privileges is, however, clearly exhibited throughout the social history of Egypt. During the first dynasties the names of the women exercising the full functions of priestesses are exceedingly numerous. After the XIIth Dynasty, apart from the sacerdotal functions exercised 'ex officio' by princesses of the royal family, and the secondary religious offices commonly held by women, there is not a single example of a priestess to be found.[4] It would thus appear that, as among the savages of Australia, Melanesia, Tierra del Fuego, and as with many other primitive peoples, the first step in the limitation of the primitive status of women was associated with the arrogation by the men of the monopoly of religious and magic functions. In later times the husband is found administering the estate of the wife in her name.[5] The freedom of divorce at will, claimed in earlier times by the wife, is in Ptolemaic times claimed by the husband, the same formula being used with the parts reversed.[6] But even when Greek legal usages were introduced under the Ptolemaic Dynasty, they remained for the most part a dead letter, and to the very end Egyptian society retained the indelible stamp of its immemorial matriarchal constitution. "The national juridic usages of Egypt," says Dr. Mitteis, "endeavoured to resist the influence of Hellenism, and did in fact successfully withstand that influence throughout the whole period when Hellenism ruled,

[1] Herodotus, ii. 35. Cf. Diodorus Siculus, iii. 51.

[2] E. Révillout, *L'ancienne Égypte d'après les papyrus et les monuments*, vol. ii, pp. 57, 80.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 26 sqq.

[4] E. Révillout, *loc. cit.*

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 151. Id., "L'omnipotence des femmes." *Revue Égyptologique*, i, p. 138.

[6] A. Erman and F. Krebs, *Aus den Papyrus der königlicher Museen*, pp. 110, 111; W. Spiellberg, *Der Papyrus Libbey, ein Ägyptischen Heiratsvertrag*, p. 7; G. Paturet, *La condition juridique de la femme dans l'ancienne Égypte*, p. 53.

and down to the time of the Islamic conquest. The characteristic features of Egyptian marriage laws appear to have endured with great obstinacy." [1]

The Aegean and Greece.

The culture of those Hellenic lands whence came the travellers who made merry over the henpecked condition of Egyptian husbands and the foreign rulers who sought to introduce patriarchal usages into Egypt had itself formerly been, as some of the foremost authorities on primitive Greece feel compelled to conclude, even more pronouncedly matriarchal in character than was Egyptian society at the time of Herodotus or of Diodorus.[2] Herodotus noted, as we have seen, that the Lykians reckoned descent in the female and not in the male line, and he adds that children followed the condition of their mother and not that of their father.[3] The statement is confirmed by Nymphis of Heraklea.[4] In the 'Iliad,' in fact, the leader of the Lykians, Sarpedon, is represented as having inherited the crown according to matrilinear rules of succession from his mother, while in accordance with patriarchal usage his cousin Glaukos should have been the heir;[5] and Bellerophon acquires a title to the throne by marrying a royal princess.[6] Heraklides Ponticus says that the Lykians were from of old under the rule of the women.[7] Nicholas of Damascus, a later writer who had access to books which are now lost, tells us that "amongst the Lykians the women are honoured more than the men," and adds the information that not only kinship, but also the transmission of property, followed the matriarchal rule, the daughters inheriting from their mothers.[8] The evidence of monuments and inscriptions, though scanty—most Lykian monuments at present known to us are of late date, belonging to the Persian and Roman periods—corroborates that information. On several the

[1] L. Mitteis, *Reichsrecht und Volksrecht in den östlichen Provinzen des römischen Kaiserreichs*, p. 57, 59.

[2] H. R. Hall, art. "Family (Egyptian)," in Hastings, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. v, p. 733; Id., *Ancient History of the Near East*, pp. 47 sq.; R. Paribeni, "Il sarcofago dipinto di Haghia Triada," *Monumenti Antichi pubblicati per cura della Regia Accademia dei Lincei*, xix, p. 79.

[3] Herodotus, i. 173.

[4] Plutarch, *De mulierum virtute*, 9.

[5] Homer, *Iliad*, vi. 196–199. The anomaly, from the point of view of patriarchal usages, was noticed by the ancients (Eustathius, *ad. loc.* Cf. J. J. Bachofen, *Das Mutterrecht*, p. 394; J. G. Frazer, *Pausanias*, vol. iv, p. 120).

[6] Homer, *Iliad*, vi. 192 sq.

[7] Heraklides Ponticus, in *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* (ed. Müller), vol. ii. p. 217.

[8] Nicholas Damascenus, *ibid.*, vol. v, p. 461.

mother is named, while the father is not mentioned. As late as the second century A.D. a certain Eutuches is called " son of Claudia Velia Procta " ; no father is named.[1] As in Egypt, birth out of wedlock did not constitute illegitimacy and entailed no civil disability.[2] The women had the right of divorce, and appear to have freely used it. In one instance a father stipulates with a woman to whom his son is about to be married that she shall not divorce him.[3] That property was largely in the hands of the women is evidenced by their activity as builders ; it was amongst them a prevalent custom to build monumental tombs for themselves and their husbands during their lifetime.[4]

The Lykians, who are referred to as ' Lukki ' in the Egyptian diplomatic correspondence of the XVIIIth Dynasty found at Tell-el-Amarna,[5] appear to have formerly ranged over a considerable portion of western Anatolia.[6] Amongst the secluded population of Lykia proper, walled in and isolated by the Taurus mountains, primitive usages that had passed away in more frequented regions persisted until the time of Herodotus.[7] Notwithstanding his statement, there is, however, every reason to think that there was nothing peculiar to the Lykians in the matriarchal character of their social organisation.[8] The dynastic history of their close kinsmen and neighbours, the natives of Karia, Herodotus' own country, affords pretty clear evidence that similar usages were native amongst them.[9] Amongst the Lydians, we are definitely

[1] O. Treuber, *Geschichte der Lykier*, pp. 123 sq.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 124.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 123, referring to *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, No. 4215.

[4] *Ibid.* ; *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, Nos. 4303 h^4, h^{10}, 4300 g. Cf. H. Thiersch, " Gjölbaschi und lykischen Mutterrecht," *Jahrbuch des kaiserliches deutsches archäologischen Instituts*, xxii (1908), pp. 235 sqq.

[5] H. Winckler, *The Tell-el-Amarna Letters*, 28 ; H. R. Hall, " Keftiu and the Peoples of the Sea," *Annual of the British School at Athens*, viii., p. 176.

[6] O. Treuber, *op. cit.*, pp. 13 sqq.

[7] Cf. P. Kretschmer, *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*, p. 372.

[8] Cf. E. Szanto, " Zum lykischen Mutterrecht," in *Festschrift für Otto Benndorf*, p. 259.

[9] Artemisia, the eldest daughter of Hekatomnos, succeeded her father on the throne of Karia, and married her brother Mausolos, to whom, after his death, she erected the famous Mausoleum. She abdicated in favour of her sister Ada, who married her younger brother Hidieos, " according to Karian custom." She governed alone after his death, " for it was the custom that women should rule equally with men " (Arrian, *Expeditio Alexandris*, i. 23 ; Dionysus Siculus, xvii. 24 ; Aristotle, *Politika*, ii. Cf. Baron d'Eckstein, " Les Cares, ou Cariens de l'antiquité. La gynécocratie des Cariens," *Revue Archéologique*, 1859, pp. 445 sqq.). The practice of dynastic incest, by which male succession is combined with matrilinear succession, is one of the surest indications of the latter usage. Artemisia conquered the islands of Rhodes, Herakleia and Latmos (Vitruvius, ii. 8, 14 sqq. ; Demosthenes, *De Rhod. libertat.*, 193, 197 sq. ; Polyaenus, viii. 53. 4). Another Artemisia,

told, " the men are subject to female domination." [1] The Lydian women chose their own husbands and disposed of themselves as they pleased before marriage.[2] Their royal house was traditionally traced to an Amazonian foundress, Omphale, whose husband was her slave and was subjected to every indignity ; [3] the throne went with the queen and not with the king.[4]

Reports concerning the Mysians, a branch of the Lydians,[5] and " kinsmen of the Karians," [6] who are mentioned (as Masa) in conjunction with the Lykians in Egyptian inscriptions of the time of Rameses II,[7] are also strongly suggestive of a matriarchal order of society. Their hero Telephos, a ' virgin-born ' foundling, is represented as seeking to discover his mother ; as to his father he is not concerned.[8] The Mysian women fought on horseback under the command of their queen.[9]

queen of Karia, is famous for the prominent part she took as an ally of Xerxes in his expedition against Greece. Her spirited leadership of her naval contingent led him to remark that his men had behaved like women and his women like men (Herodotus, vii. 99, viii. 87 sq., 93, 103 ; Pausanias, iii. 11. 3 ; Lysistrata, 675 ; Justin, ii. 12. 23 ; Suidas, s.v., *Ἡρόδοτος*).

[1] Klearch, in Athenaeus, xii. 11. Cf. Servius, ad Aeneid, i. 658. Klearch's statement is accompanied by a complete enunciation of Bachofen's theory of female revolt. " The rule of women," he says, " is always the result of the forcible revolt of the female sex against previous subjugation." The revolt of the Lydian women was supposed to have been led by Omphale. As Omphale is but another name for the primal Great Goddess, the ' revolt ' must have dated from very ancient times. It was not in this instance motived, as Bachofen supposes, by the loose sexual morality of the men, for Lydian women were notorious for their licentiousness.

[2] Herodotus, i. 93 ; Strabo, xi. 16 ; Klearch, in Athenaeus, xii. 11 ; Aelian, *Variae historiae*, iv. 1.

[3] Athenaeus, xii. 11 ; Diodorus Siculus, iv. 31 ; Apollodorus, ii. 6. 3 ; Joannes Lydus, *De magistratibus*, iii. 64 ; Ovid, *Heroides*, ix. 55 sqq. ; Lucian, *Dialogi deorum*, xiii. 2 ; Statius, *Theb.* x. 646 sqq.

[4] Herodotus, i. 7 sqq. ; Nicholas Damascenus, in *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* (ed. Müller), vol. iii, p. 380. Herodotus, in speaking of the ancient kings of Lydia that reigned long before his time, assumes that the " son succeeded the father " (i. 7 sq.) ; but his own narrative of the mode of succession of Gyges, which he derived from " Antilochos, the Parian, who lived at the same time as this event," and the similar mode of succession in the instance of Spermos, can leave little doubt that his assumption was erroneous (cf. J. G. Frazer, *The Magical Origin of Kings*, pp. 242 sq.).

[5] Herodotus, vii. 74.

[6] *Ibid.*, i. 171. Lydus, Mysus, and Car were said to be brothers, and the Mysians and Lydians shared with the Karians the temple of Zeus Carios at Mylasa (*loc. cit.*).

[7] W. Max Müller, *Asien und Europa nach altaegyptischen Denkmälern*, pp. 355 sq.

[8] Hyginus, *Fabulae*, xc. c.

[9] Philostratus, *Heroica*, ii. p. 93, ed. J. F. Boissonade (ed. Olearius, p. 690), after Protesilaos.

In the same passage in which he refers to the matriarchal constitution of the Lykians, Herodotus informs us that they were a colony of Kretans. "The Lykians were originally natives of Krete. . . . When a dispute broke out between Sarpedon and Minos, the sons of Europa, concerning the throne, Minos prevailed and banished Sarpedon and his followers, who, being thus driven from their motherland, passed over into Asia, to the land of Milyas, for the country now occupied by the Lykians was formerly called Milyas. . . . In process of time they changed their ancient name and called themselves Lykians." [1] The tradition is amply confirmed by the evidence of archaeology, language and place-names; [2] as is also the identity of their kinsmen, the Karians, who were also "subjects of Minos," [3] with the Kretans.[4]

The marvellous remains of the great civilisation of Krete, the discovery of which has completely changed our perspective of the origins of Greek and of European culture, and doubled the age of the latter, afford a mute testimony, perhaps more eloquent and striking than the statements of ancient writers,

[1] Herodotus, i. 173. Cf. vii. 92; Strabo, xii. 8. 5; xiv. 3. 10; Diodorus Siculus, v. 59, 84; Pausanias, vii. 3. 7; Thucydides, i. 8; Pomponius Mela, i. 16.

[2] C. Hoeck, *Kreta*, vol. ii, pp. 328 sqq.; O. Treuber, *Geschichte der Lykier*, pp. 19 sq.; H. R. Hall, "Keftiu and the Peoples of the Sea," *Annual of the British School at Athens*, viii, p. 179; R. M. Burrows, *The Discoveries in Crete*, pp. 123, 155, 201 sq. The houses represented on the famous 'Disk of Phaistos' are identical in architecture with the Lykian tombs (A. J. Evans, *Scripta Minoa*, vol. i, pp. 24 sqq.; H. R. Hall, "A Note on the Phaistos Disk," *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xxii, pp. 119 sqq.

[3] Herodotus, i. 171.

[4] A. J. Evans, "Mycenean Tree and Pillar Cult and its Mediterranean Relations," *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xxi, pp. 108 sq.; Id., "The Minoan and Mycenean Element in Hellenic Life," *ibid.*, xxxii, p. 279; D. Mackenzie, "Cretan Palaces and the Aegean Civilisation, II," *Annual of the British School at Athens*, xii, pp. 216 sqq.; R. M. Burrows, *op. cit.*, pp. 141 sq.; A. Fick, *Vorgriechische Ortsnamen*, pp. 1 sqq.; W. Dörpfeld, "Die Kretischen Paläste," *Mitteilungen des kaiserlich deutschen archäologischen Instituts. Athenische Abteilung*, xxxii, pp. 576 sqq.; H. R. Hall, "The Two Labyrinths," *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xxv, p. 323; Id., review of "The Excavations at Phylakopi," *The Classical Review*, xix, p. 81. The hypothesis in which the tradition was reversed and Kretan culture was represented as having been derived from Karia, a view once fairly popular, especially amongst German scholars inspired by 'Aryan' and 'Indo-Germanic' doctrines (W. Dörpfeld, *loc. cit.*; A. Furtwängler, *Antike Gemmen*, vol. iii, p. 15; F. Duemmler and F. Studiniczka, "Zu Herkunft der mykenischen Cultur," *Mitteilungen des kaiserlich deutschen archäologischen Instituts. Athenische Abteilung*, xii, pp. 1 sqq.), has been finally put out of court by the explorations of Messrs. Paton and Myres, who have conclusively proved that the culture of Karia is considerably posterior and not anterior to that of Krete (W. R. Paton and J. L. Myres, "Karian Sites and Inscriptions," *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xvi, p. 270).

as to the matriarchal character of society among the Kretans and their colonists. No feature in the wealth of pictorial remains of that civilisation which has been brought to light during the first years of the present century is more conspicuous than the paramount place occupied by women, and the picture of Minoan Krete which they present is that of a veritable 'Isle of Women.' The enormous predominance of female over male figures is without parallel in the art of any time or country. Not only are Kretan divinities almost exclusively feminine, as are also the innumerable votive figures, but women alone figure as priestesses in religious ceremonies. Those characteristics are equally marked from the most ancient neolithic times to the height of Minoan culture. "At the dawn of civilisation woman sheds through religion a light so brilliant that the figures of males remain ignored and in shadow."[1] On the great sarcophagus of Haghia Triada the sacrifice is being performed entirely by women, the men being attendant musicians and porters.[2] "It may be admitted without reserve," remarks Dr. Mosso, "that at this epoch, that is to say, about 1500 B.C., Minoan religion had preserved its matriarchal character. The supremacy of woman in religion was thus maintained until Mykenean times."[3] And, as the same writer elsewhere remarks, "the predominance of woman in religious functions, together with the fact that the idols are almost exclusively feminine, suggests that in Minoan times women played a preponderating directive part both in religion and in the family."[4] That prominence is, in fact, no less apparent in scenes of secular life. The art of ancient Krete as a whole is marked by "the contrast between the importance of the functions exercised by the women and the relatively humble character of the offices assigned to the men."[5] There are numerous representations of men in Minoan art, but they one and all picture them as engaged in subordinate occupations; there are cup-bearers, pages, musicians, bull-fighters, harvesters, sailors, soldiers—not a single pictorial presentment exists representing a king, prince or hero, and devoted to the glorification of a man, or showing him in an attitude of

[1] A. Mosso, *Le origini della civiltà mediterranea*, p. 118. Cf. R. M. Burrows, *The Discoveries in Crete*, p. 115; C. Tsountas and J. I. Massatt, *The Mycenean Age*, p. 302.

[2] R. Paribeni, "Il sarcofago dipinto di Haghia Triada," *Monumenti Antichi pubblicati per cura della Reale Accademia dei Lincei*, xix, p. 79, Plates i, ii.

[3] A. Mosso, *op. cit.*, pp. 128 sq.

[4] Id. *Escursioni nel Mediterraneo e gli scavi di Creta*, p. 223. We shall have to return elsewhere to the religious aspect of Kretan and Mykenean matriarchy (see vol. iii, pp. 118 sqq.).

[5] R. Paribeni, "Il sarcofago dipinto di Haghia Triada," *Monumenti Antichi, Accademia dei Lincei*, xix, p. 79.

domination or a position of exaltation. The female figures, on the other hand, bear invariably in their countenance and attitude the stamp of that self-possessed independence which, in primitive matriarchal societies, is one of the surest indices of their status. "There is no question of a rigorous separation of the sexes." [1] The Greeks of the classical age were aware that, in opposition to their own usages, "it was the custom in Krete that the women also should attend spectacles." [2] Apparelled in elaborate and richly embroidered garments of ultra-modern fashion—divided skirts with variegated, peaked flounces were among their vogues [3]—contrasting with the plain loin-cloth worn by the men, Minoan women are seen mixing freely with the latter in scenes of festival, or surveying spectacles from balconies and terraces.[4] Their apartments are luxuriously adorned, and fitted with bathrooms and 'all modern conveniences.' [5] Elsewhere they are seen riding in chariots driven by female charioteers.[6] "This social position of the women is in marked contrast with the customs of all the ancient peoples that are known to us." [7] "It is certain," remarks Dr. Hall, "that they must have lived on a footing of greater equality with the men than in any other ancient civilization." [8] Of special interest is the representation of the 'Queen's Procession' in the palace of Knossos, of which unfortunately only the lower portion is preserved. It appears to represent a payment of tribute, and the procession is received by two female figures, the foremost of which is, according to Sir Arthur Evans, "a queen surely, in richly embroidered robe." [9] "Probably in Minoan Krete," says Dr. Hall, "women played a greater part than they did even in Egypt, and it may eventually appear that religious matters, perhaps even the government of the State as well, were largely controlled by women." [10] Klidemos tells us, in fact, that after the death of Deukalion, the

[1] A. J. Evans, "The Palace of Knossos, 1902," *Annual of the British School at Athens*, viii, p. 45.

[2] Plutarch, *Vita Thesaei*, 18.

[3] *Monumenti Antichi, Accademia dei Lincei*, xiii, Plate x.

[4] A. J. Evans, "Knossos. The Palace," *Annual of the British School at Athens*, vi, pp. 46 sq.; *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xxi, Plate v.; D. Mackenzie, "Cretan Palaces," *Annual of the British School at Athens*, xii, p. 248; *Ἀρχαιολογικη Ἐφημερις*, 1912, Plates xviii, xix.

[5] A. J. Evans, "The Palace of Knossos," *Annual of the British School at Athens*, viii, pp. 45 sqq.

[6] R. Paribeni, "Il sarcofago dipinto di Haghia Triada," *Monumenti Antichi, Accademia dei Lincei*, xix, p. 58, Plate iii.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 79.

[8] H. R. Hall, *The Ancient History of the Near East*, p. 48.

[9] A. J. Evans, "Knossos: the Palace," *Annual of the British School at Athens*, vi, pp. 12 sq.

[10] H. R. Hall, *The Ancient History of the Near East*, pp. 47 sq.

throne passed to Ariadne, who concluded a treaty of peace with Athens.[1]

Marriage in Krete was matrilocal, as appears from Strabo,[2] and from the famous laws inscribed in the seventh century B.C. on the walls of the temple of Gortyna.[3] Those laws belong to a definitely patriarchal society, but they contain many traces of older usages which stand in contrast with the institutions and juridic conceptions of later Greece. The mother's brother occupies an important position, and upon him, in the absence of the father, devolves the care and upbringing of his sisters' children.[4] In Mykenae, when Eurystheos went forth against the Heraklides, it was his mother's brother, Atreos, who took charge of the government; and thus was founded the dynasty of the Atreids.[5] A man's property passed to his children; but in the absence of children his sister's children are also mentioned amongst his heirs.[6] Both men and women inherited,[7] and from the attention which the legislation devotes to heiresses it appears that house and land property was frequently in the hands of the women.[8] A woman, on marriage, retained full control of her property, whether inherited or acquired, and the husband had no right to deal with it in any way;[9] the children inherited both from their father and from their mother.[10] The wife, like the husband, had the right of divorce at her pleasure.[11]

Krete was the most brilliant focus of a culture which, during prehistoric times and during that period which is now generally spoken of as 'Mykenean,' and which is reflected in a somewhat distorted form in the traditions of the 'heroic' age, was common to all the peoples of the Aegean, whom the Greeks called Pelasgians, or 'The Peoples of the Sea.' We find it with the same characters throughout western Anatolia as far as the Troad, in the Kyklades, and on the mainland of Greece at Argos, Tiryns, Mykenae, where the 'Achaean' conquerors were in turn conquered by the superior native culture which they adopted, and which laid the foundation

[1] Plutarch, *Vita Thesaei*, 19.

[2] Strabo, x. 20. 483.

[3] F. Bücheler and E. Zitelmann, 'Das Recht von Gortyn," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, xl, *Erganzungsheft*, p. 30; cf. pp. 19 sq. (ii. 20 sqq.), where, in mentioning the places where adultery is likely to be committed, the woman's paternal home is mentioned first, then her brother's, and lastly her husband's.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 24 (iv. 22), 30 (vii. 19), 109, 114, 133.

[5] Thucydides, i. 9.

[6] F. Bücheler and E. Zitelmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 26 sq. (v. 17 sqq.), 135.

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 23 sqq. (iv, 10 sqq., 14 sqq., 18 sqq.).

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 30 (vii, 15 sqq.), 149 sqq.

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 115 sqq.

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 24 (iv. 23 sqq.), 135.

[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 20 sq. (ii. 45 sqq.), 118.

of Hellenic civilisation. Those various Aegean peoples were culturally, linguistically, and doubtless ethnically one.[1] Lykians, Karians, Lydians are all one race.[2] The Lykians belonged to "the typical race of Asia Minor,"[3] and, according to Pauli, were the most typical and original representatives of that race.[4] The Kretan and the Kykladic populations are likewise identical.[5] The same race peopled not only the Aegean, but in all probability the greater part of the Mediterranean coasts, where prehistoric cultural development presents exactly the same features which we find in Krete; and the prehistoric peoples who decorated the caves of northern Spain were probably the kinsmen of the artists of Knossos.[6] Every advance in our knowledge tends to confirm the view that the neolithic race of the Mediterranean came from Africa, driven by the desiccation of the once fertile Sahara at a time when land-bridges still spanned the inland sea.[7] The Berbers

[1] P. Kretschmer, *Einleitung in die Geschichte der Grieschischen Sprache*, pp. 406 sq., 401 sqq.

[2] C. Pauli, "Eine vorgriechische Inschrift von Lemnos," *Altitalische Forschungen*, vol. i, pp. 49 sqq.

[3] H. R. Hall, *The Oldest Civilisation of Greece*, p. 90. Cf. F. von Luschan, "Beiträge zur Anthropologie von Kreta," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xlv, pp. 389 sq.

[4] C. Pauli, *op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. 72 sqq.

[5] See D. Mackenzie, "Cretan Palaces," *Annual of the British School at Athens*, xii, p. 218.

[6] Cf. A. J. Evans, "Further Discoveries of Cretan and Aegean Script, with Libyan and Proto-Egyptian Comparisons," *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xvii, pp. 385 sqq.; D. Mackenzie, "Cretan Palaces," *Annual of the British School at Athens*, xii, pp. 229 sqq.; P. Orsi, "Pantellaria," *Monumenti Antichi, Accademia dei Lincei*, ix, pp. 502 sqq.; A. Mosso, *Le origini della civilità Mediterranea*, pp. 116 sq.; C. Pauli, "Eine vorgriechische Inschrift von Lemnos," *Altitalischem Forschungen*, vol. ii, Part i, pp. 79 sqq.; Fr. Hommel, "Neue Werke über die älteste Bevölkerung Kleinasiens," *Archiv für Anthropologie*, xix, 1890, p. 260; L. Hopf, *The Human Species*, p. 42.

[7] The theory of the African origin of the Mediterranean peoples was advanced by Professor Sergi before the archaeological discoveries which have so abundantly contributed to confirm it were made (G. Sergi, *The Mediterranean Race*; Id. *Europa, l'origine dei popoli europei e loro relazioni coi popoli d'Africa, d'Asia e d'Oceania*). It is noteworthy, though I have not seen it noted, that many years before, in 1859, Baron d'Eckstein dwelt at length upon the intimate connection suggested to him by the social organisation of southern Anatolian peoples with the peoples of Northern Africa (Baron d'Eckstein, "Les Cares ou Cariens de l'antiquité," *Revue Archéologique*, 1859, pp. 445 sqq.). The African origin of the Mediterranean populations, which may now be regarded as generally accepted, has no more convinced advocates than the discoverers of Kretan civilisation, Sir Arthur Evans and Dr. Duncan Mackenzie (see articles mentioned in preceding note). The extensive land-bridges indicated by geology are not hypothetical; bones of a hippopotamus, charred by fire and lying by the side of neolithic pottery, have been found in Malta, proving that in neolithic times large rivers,

and Tuareg would thus be the surviving African relatives of the race which gave birth to European culture, a view which derives interesting confirmation from the fact that the archaic writing, the knowledge of which is preserved to this day by Tuareg women, presents the most striking similarity to the scripts of Minoan Krete and the Aegean.[1]

It would, apart from all direct evidence, be intrinsically difficult to conceive that the various branches of the same race, so closely identical in culture, should have differed radically from one another in the character of their social organisation. When we find a complete matriarchal system of social institutions expressly noted among the Lykians, it would require strong evidence to lead us to believe that the original social institutions of other members of the same race were patriarchal. But all evidence points, on the contrary, the other way. The prominence of female figures so characteristic of Aegean art is no less pronounced in the neolithic art of the whole Mediterranean region. There is, in fact, not a single male idol to be found before the Bronze Age.[2] In the remains of Mykenean

such as could only occur on an extensive continent, existed where there is now but a small island (A. Issel, "Malta, residuo di terra sommersa," *Rivista marittima*, 1874, p. 116; A. Mosso, *Le origini della civiltà Mediterranea*, p. 325).

[1] A. J. Evans, "Further Discoveries in Cretan and Aegean Script with Libyan and Proto-Egyptian Comparisons," *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*. xvii, pp. 387 sqq. From Sir Arthur Evans's article I extract the following sentences: "The later Libyans possessed an independent system of writing. which had taken such a strong hold on their national life that it maintained itself intact side by side with the intrusive systems of the Carthaginian, the Roman, and even the Arab conqueror, and survives to this day, essentially unchanged, in the alphabet known as 'Tifinagh,' of the Tuaregs. The diffusion of these Libyan records is very wide, extending at least sporadically as far as Sinai in one direction, and the Canary Islands in the other. The survival among the modern Tuaregs of this old Libyan form of writing is a phenomenon of great retrospective utility. The Tuareg alphabet has preserved almost intact the great majority of the old letter-forms, together with their values. The fact that throughout the course of over two thousand years, the Berber letters have remained practically unchanged, removes the improbability of their having retained their shape for a much longer period. The comparisons between the early Cretan and Aegean characters and those of Kahun, Naqada, and Abydos on the one hand, and of the Libyan alphabet and the modern Tifinagh on the other, show a very real amount of correspondence. These correspondences become the more significant when taken in connection with the other indications of a very early and direct interrelation between Crete, the Nile Valley, and the opposite Libyan coasts. The conclusion to which they seem to point is that the Cretan and Aegean linear script must in a certain sense be regarded as a branch of a very ancient stock, having a wide North-African extension."

[2] A. Mosso, *Le origini della civilitàMediterranea*, pp.110. Cf. *Ibid.*, pp.117, 118; E. Piette, "La station de Brassempouy et les statuettes humaines de la période glyptique," *L'Anthropologie*, vi, pp. 128 sqq.; S. Reinach, "Statuette

civilisation on the mainland of Greece proper the prominence of women is no less marked than in the art of Krete. Indeed, Dr. Rodenwaldt states that this predominance is more pronounced in continental Greece than it is in Krete, and he points out that whereas in the Kretan frescoes women are accompanied or assisted by men, in the Mykenean palaces of the Peloponnesus "we see everywhere women, and women only, taking part in religious cult."[1] The 'Queen's procession' of Knossos and the sarcophagus of Haghia Triada have their counterpart in the great frieze of the palace of Tiryns, which represents a procession of gorgeously dressed priestesses carrying richly engraved caskets.[2] There are some half-dozen similar frescoes in the palaces of Argos. In the northernmost Aegean, among the Tyrsenians of Lemnos, of pure Pelasgian race,[3] with whom so many myths of extreme female ascendancy are connected,[4] the reports of even late date assert that "female descent was noble."[5]

At the opposite extremity of the Mediterranean our literary documents bear even more emphatic witness than in reference to Anatolia to the matriarchal character of society. "Among the Cantaberians," says Strabo, "the men bring dowries to the women. With them the daughters alone inherit property. Brothers are given away in marriage by their sisters. In all their usages their social condition is one of gynaecocracy."[6] Notable survivals of that condition lingered until quite recently in the Pyrenees. All property passed to the eldest child, whether son or daughter. In the latter case the husband took up his residence in the house of his wife, but acquired no rights over her property.[7]

de femme nue découverte dans la grotte de Menton," *ibid.*, ix, pp. 26 sqq.; G. Sergi, *Europa*, pp. 168 sqq.; A. Mayr, *Die vorgeschichtlichen Denkmäler von Malta*, pp. 701 sq.; Id., *Die Insel Malta in Altertum*, pp. 12 sqq., 49; M. Hoernes, *Urgeschichte der bildenden Kunst*, pp. 46, 192; F. Fiala and M. Hoernes, *Die neolitische Station von Butmir bei Sarajevo in Bosnien*, vol. ii, p. 3.

[1] G. Rodenwaldt, in *Tiryns. Die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen des Instituts (Kaiserlich deutsches archaeologischen Institut in Athen)*, vol. ii, *Freske der Palastes*, pp. 92 sq.

[2] *Ibid.*, Plate xii.

[3] Thucydides, iv. 109; Herodotus, v. 26, vi. 136; G. Karo, "Die Tyrsenische Stele von Lemnos," *Mitteilungen des kaiserlich deutschen archäologischen Instituts. Athenische Abteilung*, xxxiii, pp. 65 sqq.; E. Nachmanson, "Die vorgriechischen Inschriften von Lemnos," *ibid.*, pp. 47 sqq.; J. L. Myres, "A History of the Pelasgian Theory," *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xxvii, pp. 192 sq.

[4] Hyginus, *Fabulae*, xv.; Scholiast to Apollodorus, i. 29; Valerius Flaccus, ii. 113.

[5] Valerius Maximus, iv. 63.

[6] Strabo, iii. 165.

[7] E. Cordier, "Le droit de famille aux Pyrénées," *Revue historique du droit français et étranger*, v (1859), pp. 279 sqq.

It has frequently been suggested that, while the aboriginal, or 'Pelasgian,' populations of the Aegean were matriarchal in their social organisation, the invading conquerors, or Hellenes proper, "brought with them as a precious possession the patriarchal system." [1] It is exceedingly doubtful whether there existed any fundamental ethnical difference between the populations which had inhabited the Aegean from neolithic times and the Greeks. If the distinction be logically adhered to, we must then regard the Athenians as not Greek. They always insisted that they were 'autochthonous,' and we are told in so many words that they were 'Pelasgians.' [2] The Dorians (whom alone Herodotus calls 'Hellenes') certainly came to the Peloponnesus from the north, but there is no evidence that their northern habitat was any farther north than Epirus, or at most the southern shores of the Danube, a region where we find the neolithic culture of Butmir identical with that of Krete, and the first great European iron culture of Hallstatt. The Greeks were, like all Aegean peoples, dolicocephalic, and not, like Germans and Asiatics, brachycephalic.[3]

[1] C. H. and H. B. Hawes, *Crete, the Forerunner of Greece*, p. 142.

[2] Herodotus, i. 56; Thucydides, i. 2.

[3] The assumption that the Greeks, or 'Achaeans,' were a separate race from the Aegeans is based upon the 'Aryan' or 'Indogermanic' doctrine, a speculation which has invariably misled wherever it has been taken as a guide, and which has now crumbled down from every aspect. Much used to be made of the circumstance that some Achaean heroes are called 'xanthos' in Homer. But 'xanthos' does not necessarily mean blond. The term appears to have been used as elastically as the English word 'fair.' It is not by any means applied exclusively to Achaean heroes. Rhadamanthos, the brother of Minos, is called 'xanthos'; Ariadne is called 'xanthe'; few scholars at the present day are prepared to regard Minos and Ariadne as fair northerners. Nay, Demeter herself, the most typical Pelasgic goddess, is called 'xanthe' (see Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, s.v.). 'Xanthos' was a common name among the Lydians (Athenaeus, xii. 11, and often). The epithet is, in fact, used indiscriminately without reference to race. Nowhere, either in Homer or elsewhere, are we told that the Achaeans were fair, or is the epithet 'xanthoi' applied to them. Homer constantly refers to the hair of the Achaeans; his favourite epithet for them is 'long-haired.' But nowhere, although he is particularly fond of colour-epithets, does he in his frequent references to their hair, or in any other connection, allude to its being blond. It is a proverbial axiom that no argument can be founded on the silence of Homer; but that is not to say that one can be based upon his supposed testimony where he is absolutely silent. The only substantial argument in support of the racial difference between 'Pelasgians' and 'Achaeans' is that of language. To judge from such fragments as we have, Pelasgian speech does not sound like Greek. But, in the first place, we do not know Pelasgian, and until Minoan and other Aegean script has been deciphered, we are not in a position to judge how far the language of the Aegean peoples did really differ from Greek. The Greeks themselves constantly exaggerated differences of race and language, which we should regard as trifling tribal and dialectical differences. Kretschmer thinks that the language of the Lykians, of which we have more numerous specimens

Be that as it may, the invading peoples are typically, if not exclusively, represented by the Dorians. The Spartans appear to many, as they did to Pater, "the embodiment of the specially Hellenic elements in Hellenism."[1] Their social organisation, which so greatly excited the interest of the autochthonous Athenians of later days, and which was set down to the 'legislation' of a mythical Lykurgus, was not the product of any progressive development or of the adoption of extraneous usages, but of the most stubborn conservatism, and, as Ottfried Müller remarks, "preserved most rigidly, and represented most truly, the customs of the ancient Greeks."[2] Yet nothing could be farther removed from, or less suggestive of, the principles of a patriarchal society than those customs. They were so similar to those of ancient Krete that it was the current view that they had been borrowed from the Kretans.[3] They present a picture which reminds the ethnologist of nothing so much as of the social organisation of the North American Indians. Spartan marriage customs hark back to some of

than of other Aegean dialects, was 'Indogermanic,' that is, allied to Greek (W. Kretschmer, *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechische Sprache*, p. 372). George Meyer came to the same conclusion as regards Karian speech (G. Meyer, "Die Karier; ein ethnographischlinguistische Untersuchung," *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen*, vol. x, pp. 200 sqq. See, however, contra, W. Kretschmer, *op. cit.*, p. 377; C. Pauli, "Eine vorgriechische Inschrift, von Lemnos," *Altitalische Forschungen*, vol. i, p. 54). Bugge is of the same opinion as regards the Pelasgic speech of Lemnos (S. Bugge, *Der Ursprung der Etrusker durch zwei lemnische Inschriften erläutert*, p. 52); and Professor Conway holds the same view with reference to the Kretan inscription of Praisos (W. M. Conway, "The Pre-Hellenic Inscriptions of Praesos," *Annual of the British School at Athens*, viii, pp. 141 sqq.). In the second place, the northernmost branches of the Aegean race might very well have acquired a foreign speech or have considerably modified their own. No element of culture is more modifiable than language, and no class of evidence more unreliable as regards ethnic affinities. More than half the people of western Europe speak languages which they have acquired from foreign races. That the Mediterranean race extended far to the north—as far as Britain and Ireland in the west—is known and recognised even by German scholars. The 'Pelasgians,' according to Pauli, extended to the Danube, to Dacia, to Pannonia (C. Pauli, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 79); the skulls of neolithic tombs on the Rhine, where the population is now brachycephalic, are dolicocephalic and recognised as belonging to the Ligurian branch of the Mediterranean race (C. Mehlis, "Die Ligurerfrage," *Archiv für Anthropologie*, xxvi, pp. 71 sqq., 1064; W. Deecke, in *Jahrbuch für Geschichte, Sprache und Literatur Elsass-Löthringen*, x, pp. 1 sqq.; cf. L. Hopf, *The Human Species*, p. 42). It is not without significance that the Dorian invasion, upon which so much theorising as to "northern invaders" has been built, was invariably spoken of by the Greeks as "the *return* of the Heraklides."

[1] W. Pater, *Plato and Platonism*, p. 201.

[2] C. O. Müller, *The History and Antiquities of the Doric Race*, vol. ii, p. 400; cf. pp. 3 sqq.

[3] Aristotle, *Politica*, vii; Strabo, x. 17. 18.

the most primitive forms of sexual organisation. The women and girls were entirely unrestricted both in their social and sexual relations, and were free to dispose of themselves as they pleased before marriage; virginity, consequently, was not demanded of a bride.[1] Children born out of wedlock were called 'parthenioi,' that is, 'virgin-born,' and were regarded as in every respect equal to those born in wedlock, although, as Justin says, "they had no father."[2] So customary were such extra-connubial relations that at the time of Argesilaos, the Spartans who 'had no father' actually exceeded in number those born in regular wedlock.[3] At the time of the first Messenian war it was found impossible to provide them all with land, and a number of 'virgin-born' Spartans accordingly emigrated and founded the city of Tarentum.[4] The Spartans practised fraternal polyandry.[5] Those are not the social customs which we associate with the patriarchal order of society, but are features commonly found in certain phases of matriarchal society, and are, in fact, identical with the usages of the Iroquois and Hurons, and other warlike matriarchal North American tribes. The position of women in conservative Sparta differed completely from their condition in other parts of Greece during the historical age. They were, says Plutarch, "the only women in Greece who ruled over their men."[6] "Spartan mothers," remarks Ottfried Müller, "preserved a power over their sons when arrived at manhood, of which we find no trace in the rest of Greece."[7] They were commonly consulted on political questions;[8] and not only could they inherit and bestow property on their husbands as heiresses,[9] but nearly all property in Sparta was, in fact, in their hands.[10]

As we should expect, with those matriarchal features of Spartan society went the custom of matrilocal marriage. The Spartan Penelope, it is true, follows in the myth of Odysseus her husband to his home, but in the Spartan version of the story she is represented as breaking through, in doing so, the usage to which she was expected to conform.[11] And it was, in fact, the general practice for the Spartan wife to remain, at least for a period, in her maternal

[1] Aristotle, *Politic.*, viii. 6. 2,3; Justin, iii. 4; Hesychius, cited by Dion Chrysostom, *Oratio* vii, p. 273; Suidas, s.v. *παρθενίοι*.

[2] Justin, *loc. cit.*; cf. i. 6.

[3] Xenophon, *Hellenica*, v. iii. 9.

[4] Justin, *loc. cit.*

[5] See below, p. 693.

[6] Plutarch, *Lycurgus*, xiv.

[7] C. O. Müller, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 308.

[8] Plutarch, *Agis*, vi.

[9] Herodotus, vi. 57; Aristotle, *Politic.*, ii. 6. 11; O. Müller, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 206.

[10] Aristotle, *loc. cit.*; Plutarch, *Agis*, vi, *Kleomenes*, i.

[11] Pausanias, iii. 20. 10, 11.

home, where she was visited by her husband.[1] "That this usage was retained to the last days of Sparta may be inferred from the fact that the young wife of Panteos was still in the house of her parents, and remained there, when he went with Kleomenes to Egypt."[2] Even where a bride was removed, after a time, to her husband's house, it was customary for her mother to remain with her and to follow her to her new home.[3]

The Lokrian colony of Cape Zephiros, one of the most ancient Greek settlements in southern Italy, was also regarded, like Sparta, as having preserved more archaic usages than other Hellenic States. The code of laws for which it was famed[4] was, in fact, reputed to have been the first of any Greek laws to be committed to writing.[5] And, in truth, certain usages of ritual sexual licence, quite opposed to the sentiments of most Greek communities in historical times, survived until a late date among the Epizephirian Lokrians.[6] Their laws, like those of Sparta, were ascribed to a mythical legislator, Zaleucos,[7] who, probably owing to the character of those laws, was fancifully supposed to have been a disciple of that feministic philosopher Pythagoras, although as a matter of fact even tradition assigned to him a far older date.[8] Of the Epizephirian Lokrians we are told that amongst them "all fame and honour attaching to descent is derived through the women, and not through the men. Those families alone are accounted noble which belong to the so-called 'Hundred Houses.' These 'Hundred Houses' are those which were already distinguished among the Lokrians before they sent out the colony." An aetiological myth was adduced to account for the fact that "nobility is with them transmitted by the women."[9]

Current tradition in Athens represented the forms of marriage and the status of women in primitive times as having been entirely different from those which obtained in the historical age. It was said that, in primitive Athens as with the 'virgin-born' citizens of Sparta, the men had no fathers: "at one time because of the general promiscuity, men did not know their own fathers."[10]

[1] Plutarch, *Lycurgus*, xv.; *Lacedem. Apothegm.*, p. 224; Xenophon, *Resp. Lacedem.*, i. 5.

[2] C. O. Müller, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 293. Cf. Plutarch, *Kleomenes*, xxxviii.

[3] C. O. Müller, *loc. cit.*

[4] Strabo, vi. p. 200; Demosthenes, *Contra Timocratem*, p. 743; Diodorus Siculus, xii. 20 sq.; Pindar, *Olympic*, x. 17; Scholiast, *ad loc.*

[5] Strabo, vi. p. 259; Clemens Alexandrinus, vol. i, p. 309.

[6] See below, vol. iii, p. 202.

[7] Strabo, xiii. p. 600; Polybius, xii. 16.

[8] Diogenes Laertius, viii. 16; Iamblichus, vii. 24, 27, 30; Suidas, s.v.; Seneca, *Epistolae*, xc. Cf. R. Bentley, *Dissertation on the Epistles of Phalaris*, pp. 334 sqq.

[9] Polybius, xii. 5. 6.

[10] Klearch, cited by Athenaeus, xiii. 2.

Marriage—that is, of course, patriarchal marriage—was said to have been 'instituted' by Kekrops, the mythical king who preceded Deukalion; he "was the first who joined men and women together in matrimony."[1] He was, therefore, surnamed 'diphues,' 'of a double nature,' for before him, children had a mother, but no father; they were unilateral. Aeschylus, in his 'Eumenides', assumes the tradition, and represents the change from the 'ancient law' to that of the 'new gods' as chiefly manifested in the different way of viewing the relation of maternal and paternal kinship.[2] The tradition of the contest between the 'old gods' and the 'new gods,' to which the play of Aeschylus refers, gave a detailed account of the concomitant changes which were understood to have taken place in the civic status of the women. The famous contest between Athene and Poseidon for the possession of the city was, according to the account of Varro which has ben preserved by St. Augustine, decided by the votes of the Athenian citizens; but in the 'ecclesia,' or popular assembly of those days, not only the men, but also the women voted. The latter voted for Athene, while the men voted for Poseidon, and the number of the women exceeding that of the men by one, the victory went to Athene. Poseidon vented his anger by flooding the land; and, in order to pacify him, the following punishment was inflicted upon the women: "That in future they should be disfranchised, that no child should receive the name of its mother, and that women should no longer be regarded as Athenian citizens." "Athene," comments Augustine to point out his moral as to the impotence of pagan deities, "afforded no assistance to her votaries; they henceforth lost the power of voting, and their children ceased to assume the name of their mothers."[3]

Those current Athenian traditions are not, of course, historical records, and they may be regarded as mythical in the same sense as the contest between Poseidon and Athene is mythical. But no mythologist nowadays has any doubt that the latter is not a pure gratuitous fancy, but represents an actual conflict between native and foreign cults.[4] It would be even more difficult to imagine why a people organised on strictly patriarchal principles, and among whom the status of women was lower than in any other western civilised country, should come to devise a theory

[1] Justin, ii. 6. 7; Klearch, *loc. cit.*; Suidas, s.vv. *Προμηθευς* and *Κέκροψ*; Charax, in *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, vol. iii, p. 638; John of Antioch, *ibid.*, vol. iv, p. 547; J. Tzetzes, *Scholia on Lycophron*, iii; Id., *Chiliades*, v. 659 sqq.

[2] See below, vol. iii, pp. 155 sq.

[3] Augustin, *De civitate Dei*, xviii. 9. A similar account is given by Strabo of the former position of women in Boeotia (ix. 402).

[4] L. R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States*, vol. i, pp. 270 sq.

of primitive matriarchy which many modern scholars, in spite of the strongest evidence, have shown the utmost reluctance to accept.[1] Those traditional reports, which taken by themselves would not constitute sufficient ground for any definite conclusion, are in entire harmony with those to which we are led by a considerable body of evidence. We shall see in another place that there can be little doubt that in primitive Greece the religious functions connected with the agricultural life of the people were exercised chiefly, if not exclusively, by the women;[2] and if any decision on a question of cult were submitted to a plebiscite, it would certainly not have been the women who would have been excluded from voting on such a question. The chief civic function in connection with such religious public activities continued even in historical Athens to be exercised, not by the male magistrate, or chief 'archon,' but by a special female functionary, the 'queen archon,' assisted by a council of matrons.

Gods and heroes are commonly referred to in Greek genealogies by the names of their mothers, as 'Apollo, the son of Leto,' 'Dionysos, the son of Semele,' 'Herakles, the son of Alkmene,' 'Achilles, the son of Thetis,' and so forth. It is true that they are also regarded as the sons of Zeus, the universal Father; but Zeus, as in some districts Poseidon, merely plays the part of a unifying principle, which served to connect the various local gods and heroes with the Olympus of a later theology, or represented a fertilising principle in general. Such gods and heroes were in fact 'virgin-born,' that is to say, they were in the same case as the Athenians are reported to have been before Kekrops 'instituted marriage'; they did not know their fathers. Even where a father is distinctly referred to in connection with a Greek hero, a prominence is given to his mother which is quite foreign to the usage of historical times, and which leads one to suspect in many instances that the father's name is an addition of later times. Jason, for instance, is expressly stated to be 'virgin-born.'[3] The heroes of the oldest Greek sagas, the Argonauts, or, as they were more commonly called, the Minyans, all trace their descent through

[1] It has been jocularly remarked that the tradition reported by Varro is merely the opinion of some anthropologist who lived two thousand years ago (H. J. Rose, "On the alleged Evidence for Mother-right in Early Greece," *Folk-lore*, xxii, p. 289). The simile is not quite correct, for the tradition referred to is not the personal view of an individual writer, but part of a general body of opinion to the same effect. But if the facetious comparison were applicable, it would certainly be a remarkable fact that such an ancient anthropologist should have been so much freer from the universal prejudice against conceiving social conditions differing from existing ones than so many modern anthropologists in our own scientific age.

[2] See below, vol. iii, pp. 123 sqq.

[3] Apollodorus, iii. 9. 2.

women to a common ancestress, Minya, or to Klymenes, the mother of Jason, who was "the daughter of the daughter of Minya."[1] Although the 'Catalogues of Women' referred to by Greek writers are unfortunately lost, early Greek genealogies are in fact little else than 'Catalogues of Women.' The relationship between Theseus and Herakles, to which so much importance is attached in archaic Athenian tradition, is traced through women, their mothers, Aithra and Alkmene, being regarded as daughters of Hippodamia.[2] In primitive Greece the women did, as a matter of fact, give their names not only to their children, as the Athenian tradition mentions, but to their families, clans and tribes. Thus the Athenians claimed to be descended from Atthis, the daughter of Kranaos;[3] the Spartans from Sparta, the daughter of Eurotas;[4] the Thebans and the Aeginetans from the two sisters Thebe and Aegina,[5] and so forth. In fact, "every little valley community was apt to count its descent from some local ancestress."[6] The very grammatical form of Greek family or tribal names, ending in '-ida,' is a purely feminine form, and, in the south-western dialects at least, those names were declined as feminine names; they apply to women, not to men.[7] Later traditions frequently substituted obscure male eponyms for the original eponymae, but that very anxiety to adapt the primitive usage to later conceptions bears witness to the significance of the former. The Ionians were supposed to be called after a certain 'Ion,' the 'grandson of Helen'; but the true eponyma of the Ionians is revealed by the fact that the Ionian Sea, which manifestly derived its name from the neighbouring Ionian settlements, was understood to be named after Io.[8]

[1] Hyginus, *Fabulae*, xiv. pp. 32 sqq. (ed. T. Munckerus); Scholiast to Pindar, *Pythic*, iv. 253, 255.

[2] Plutarch, *Vita Thaesei*, vii.

[3] Justin, ii. 6.

[4] Pausanias, ii. 29. 2; Pindar, *Nem.*, viii. 7 sqq.

[5] Herodotus, v. 80 sq. Similarly, the inhabitants of Lyktos, in Krete, claimed kinship with Athens and Sparta through women only; the male line of descent being entirely ignored (Plutarch, *De mulier. virt.*, 272).

[6] G. Murray, *The Rise of the Greek Epic*, p. 41. Among other eponymae are Messene (Pausanias, iv. 1. 2); Daulis (Id., x. 4. 5); Salamis (Id., i. 55. 2: "It is said that it first got its name from Kychreos, who called it after his mother Salamis"); Corinth, which was formerly called Ephyre (Hyginus, *Fabulae*, cclxxv. p. 333; Scholiast to Pindar, *Nem.*, vii.; Eustathius, ad *Iliad*, p. 219). All names of cities are, in fact, feminine; and 'arbitrary gender' originally stood in Greek, as in all other languages, for a definite presentation corresponding in sex to the gender. Masculine mountains and rivers were conceived as male gods, while cities and islands were represented by female eponymae.

[7] Cf. H. M. Chadwick, *The Heroic Age*, p. 359 n.

[8] Aeschylus, *Prometheus*, 840; J. Tzetzes, ad *Lycophr. Alex.*, 630; Stephanus Byzantinus, s.v.; Eustathius, on *Diogenes Periegetes*, 92.

Similarly the name of the Dorians was vaguely traced to an obscure 'Doras,' or 'Dorieus,' a 'son of Helen';[1] but it appears more probable that the name was derived from the lunar goddess Doris, 'the Engenderer,' the mother of the fifty Nereids, of whom Thetis, the mother of Achilles, was one.[2] Both Ionians and Dorians traced their descent from Helen, the daughter of the Moon, and there can, I think, be little doubt that she was the true ancestress of the Hellenes.

The view of the physiological basis of kinship, which was generally current among Greek thinkers in the classical age, was that the mother had little or no share in the process of generation; the germ or seed proceeded from the father, and the mother's womb was but a suitable receptacle to protect it during its development. The mother was, it was said, little more than a 'nurse'; the father was, strictly speaking, the sole progenitor.[3] That view of the classical age of Greece stands in pronounced contrast not only with older usages, but with the very structure of Greek speech and with legal customs which, in spite of the current theory, persisted in classical Greece itself. In Homer a sharp distinction is drawn between a uterine brother, ὁμογάστριος, and a brother on the father's side, ὄπατρος, and the former relationship is invariably emphasised as the closer and more important.[4] Helen and Briseis mention their uterine brothers only, and in both instances with the expression "whom one mother bare."[5] When Lykaon, Priam's son, is struck down by Achilles intent on avenging Patroklos, he beseeches him to spare him, "since not from the same womb am I as Hector, who killed thy friend."[6] Indeed, in flat contradiction with the ingenious patriarchal theory of physiology of the philosophers in the classical age, the ordinary appellation for 'brother' continued to be 'adelphos,' which means "from the womb," and is therefore a relic from a time when the relationship of brother was reckoned on the mother's side only. The distinction persisted in the most practical and concrete manner in historical times, for, according to Athenian law, a man was at liberty to marry his half-sister on the father's side, but was forbidden to form an incestuous union with his half-sister on the mother's side.[7]

[1] Herodotus, i. 56.

[2] Hesiod, *Theogon.*, 241; Scholiast, *ad. loc.*; Apollodorus, i. 7. 3; Mnaseas, in *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, ed. Müller, vol. iii, p. 154; Aelian, *De natur. animal.*, xiv. 28. etc.

[3] Aristotle, *De generatione animalium*, i. 20. 21; Aeschylus, *Eumenides*, 658–664; Euripides, *Orestes*, 552–554.

[4] Homer, *Iliad*, xi. 257, xii. 371, xxiv. 45; *Odyssey*, iv. 224.

[5] Id., *Iliad*, iii. 235; xix. 290 sq. [6] *Ibid.*, xxi. 95 sq.

[7] Cornelius Nepos, *Vita Cimonis*, i. 1; Plutarch, *Themistokles*, 32; *Leges Atticae*, vii. 1. 2; Philo Judaeus, *De specialibus legibus*, vol. ii, p. 303 (ed. T. Mangey); Scholiast to Aristophanes, *Nebulae*, 1371.

In princely houses, of which alone, of course, traditional records have reached us, it is the women who transmit both titles and property; that is, they remain in the maternal home, and, on the contrary, the sons regularly depart, and marry in some other town princesses whose title they share.[1] That is the form of marriage which Alkinoos proposes to Odysseus: "I should wish," he says to him, "that so goodly a man as thou art and so like-minded with me, would take my daughter to wife, and be called my son, and abide with me; a house and possessions would I give thee if thou wouldst accept and remain."[2] For a princess to follow her husband to his own home, as did Penelope, was thought an unusual innovation in custom.[3]

Professor Gilbert Murray thus briefly sums up the social conditions represented in the heroic age of Greece: "House property belonged to the woman, and descended from mother to daughter. The father did not count—at least not primarily—in the reckoning of relationship. He did count for something, since exogamy, not endogamy, was the rule. The sons went off to foreign villages to serve and marry women in possession of the land there. Their sisters, we have reason to believe, generally provided them with dowries."[4]

We have, in fact, in Athens itself, in historical times, very definite indications that marriage was originally matrilocal. It was the custom that after an Athenian husband had removed his wife to his own home, and spent the wedding night there, the couple should return on the second night to the home of the bride and sleep in the house of her family.[5] That custom, which is similarly observed by many peoples who formerly practised matri-

[1] See J. G. Frazer, *The Magical Origin of Kings*, pp. 239 sq. Sir James Frazer instances the house of Aiacus; his descendants "from the beginning went forth to other lands" (Pausanias, ii. 29. 4). Telamon goes to Salamis to marry a princess; his son, Tenar, goes to Cyprus and marries a princess; her son, Peleos, goes to Phthia and marries a princess; his son, Achilles, goes to Skyros and marries a princess; his son Neoptolemos goes to Epirus and marries a princess. So with the house of Kalydon; so with the Pelopidae. On the other hand, the princesses remain at home, as, for instance, Periboa, the youngest daughter of Eurycmedon, who founds the royal house of Aeolia (*Odyssey*, x. 5–7); Iphidames, who remains at home after marriage (*Iliad*, xi. 225).

[2] Homer, *Odyssey*, vii. 311 sqq.

[3] Pausanias, iii. 20. 10 sq. The Homeric version of the myth of Penelope is full of inconsistencies due to the necessity of adapting it to later ideas (see below, p. 413 n.). Although a stranger in Ithaka, it appears that, like all other queens, she had the power to bestow the kingdom on whom she pleased by bestowing her hand (*Odyssey*, i. 396 sqq.; xv. 518 sqq.; xxii, 49 sqq. Cf. H. M. Chadwick, *The Heroic Age*, pp. 358 sq.).

[4] G. Murray, *The Rise of the Greek Epic*, p. 98.

[5] Pollux, *Onomastikon*, iii. 39.

local marriage, as, for instance, by the Baila of Rhodesia who, within recent times were matrilocal in their marriage usages, can only be interpreted as being derived from the like practice among the ancient Athenians. And, in fact, Athenian marriage never became, even in historical times, thoroughly patrilocal. The law on the subject was extremely peculiar, and although there are countless parallels to it among uncultured peoples whose social organisation is pronouncedly matriarchal, it presents a strange contrast with the marriage laws of other civilised patriarchal societies. The Athenian wife, though she removed to the home of her husband, never became legally regarded as a member of his family and household, but remained for all juridic purposes a member of her parental household and family. She continued under the guardianship of her father, who could at any time take her away from her husband and either bring her back home or marry her to another man.[1] If she had no father, her brother or next-of-kin could exercise the same right, and if, by testament, her legal guardian appointed some other kinsman, however remote, to the office, he could in the same manner take the wife away from her husband without being bound to give a reason.[2] A wife had no claim whatever on any of her husband's property, which might at his death go to a distant cousin without a penny of it passing to his widow; on the other hand, the wife had a right, whenever she left her husband or he died, to take back the whole of her dowry.[3] When the husband died, the widow did not continue to reside in his house, but returned at once to her own people, unless she happened to be pregnant at the time, when she would be permitted to remain until the child was born.[4] It will, I think, be seen that it is quite impossible to conceive those peculiar laws as having developed in the first place in a state of society where the traditional custom was for the husband to transfer the wife to his household, and to become the founder of a patriarchal family in which he should be absolute master; the Athenian law of marriage is evidently derived from usages according to which the wife continued to be, after marriage, a member of her own household and family. The law in historical Athens, although it placed her in a position of strict subjection and deprived her of almost every right, assigned the control to which she was subject to the male members of her own household and not to her husband; she never became a part of the latter's family.[5] In the Islands

[1] Demosthenes, *Contra Spudiam*, i.

[2] Isaeus, *De Aristarchi hereditate*, xxvii.; Demosthenes, *Contra Eubulidem*, xl.

[3] Demosthenes, *Adversus Boeotum*, ii. 6.

[4] Id., *Adversus Macartatum*, li.

[5] A comparison of Attic law with the laws of Gortyna (above, p. 394) shows very clearly how the transition from matriarchal to patriarchal usage

of Greece the many vicissitudes of history have often had but little influence upon the customs and mode of life of the inhabitants,

took place without any fundamental juridic change except in the increased powers of the woman's ' guardian.'

In an article " On the alleged Evidence for Mother-right in Early Greece " (*Folk-lore*, xxii, pp. 27 sqq.), Mr. H. J. Rose has expressed the distaste felt by some classical scholars, happily not now so numerous as they once were, for anthropological views. The reader who cares to peruse the article may be more fortunate than I have been in discovering in his very partial survey some fact or consideration possessing either weight or relevance. As an instance of Mr. Rose's criticisms the following may be noticed. Referring to the Athenian custom of spending the second night after marriage in the home of the bride, he remarks, rejecting the suggestion that it has any connection with a previous custom of matrilocal marriage : " A more probable suggestion is that of Mr. Marett, that the visit is the ceremonial taking off of a tabu. The parents-in-law may have been originally ' hlonipa ' to their son-in-law." ' Hlonipa ' is the Bantu term for the rules of mother-in-law avoidance. Observe the remarkable reasoning : we have exactly the same custom of spending the second night after marriage among several Bantu peoples, such as the Baila of Rhodesia, who are matriarchally organised and with whom marriage was formerly matrilocal. But in order to evade, the conclusion that the Greek custom stood in the same relation to matriarchal usage as with the Bantu, we have recourse to the Bantu ' hlonipa ' which, so far as we know, was quite unknown to the Greeks, and we regard the custom as evidence of the former existence of the latter, while pretending to reject it as ' unscientific ' evidence for the former. But, if the interpretation be, for argument's sake, accepted, it is difficult to see how the case of the Oxford critic is helped by it. For if there is a correlation between two social customs which is established more clearly and definitely than any other by their statistical distribution, it is that between ' hlonipa,' or mother- or parent-in-law avoidance, and matrilocal marriage (see above, pp. 336 sq.). The Japanese have exactly the same custom as the ancient Athenians ; but with them it is known to be a ceremonial relic of matrilocal marriage, and not of ' hlonipa ' (see above, p. 369). Mr. Rose dismisses the maternal genealogies and matrilocal marriages of early Greek heroes with the strange remark that if they are evidence of a matriarchal social order, similar evidence may be found among most peoples. It is interesting to learn that the circumstance that evidence of matriarchal conditions is to be found among most peoples is proof that it does not exist in Greece. Although I cannot but think that a better case might be made in defence of sceptical views, so striking an exhibition of their feebleness is certainly impressive.

A criticism of the evidence which we shall presently consider in regard to early Italic populations, similar in value to his effusion concerning early Greek social history, has been published by Mr. Rose (" Mother-right in Ancient Italy," *Folk-lore*, xxxi, pp. 93 sqq.).

Mr. Rose concludes with a characteristic reference to " the amiable " and " pre-scientific " Bachofen. Bachofen has been subjected to far too many such patronising sneers. It is time that some measure of justice, or at least of decent respect, should be shown to the memory of the man who, single-handed, with no hint from predecessors or contemporaries, in the face of a solid wall of prejudice more massive even than that which confronted Darwin, and working from the limited field of classical scholarship alone, first perceived one of the most momentous and fundamental facts

and the traveller often comes upon scenes that answer in every detail to the descriptions of the 'Iliad' and 'Odyssey.' In the Island of Kythnos, at the present day, it is the invariable custom for a husband to take up his abode after marriage with the family of his wife.[1]

That adaptation of the laws of a matriarchally organised society to patriarchal ideas and aims is no less clearly exhibited by the legislation concerning inheritance. The Athenian law in this respect was very similar to the Kretan law preserved at Gortyna. As regards the latter we can have very little doubt that it derived from the usages of a purely matriarchal society. An enormous amount of attention is devoted in the code of Gortyna to the case of heiresses legally holding landed property. Such an heiress is compelled, according to the seventh-century Kretan code, to marry her nearest male kinsman, excepting the forbidden degrees; she must marry her father's brother, if there is one—if not, one of his sons; in any case a member of the family.[2] It is fairly obvious that this is a provision to secure that the property shall remain with the male members of the family, although, if that had been the original intention of the Kretan usage as to the transmission of property, the purpose would have been much more simply achieved by excluding females altogether from the succession and making it transmissible in the male line only. The Gortynian law is, therefore, clearly designed to adapt an older usage of succession to landed property in the female line to the requirements of succession in the male line, in much the same way as in Egypt the same purpose was achieved by the practice of incest. The

of social history, and enounced it with a gigantic erudition which has never in a single instance been found at fault. In spite of some errors of judgment inevitable in the work of a pioneer, Bachofen stands in the highest place among the founders of modern social science. In the special sphere of Egyptology, the foremost scientific authorities have to-day recognised and adopted the view of the fundamental features of Egyptian society which he expounded, and they acknowledge that it was the 'pre-scientific' Bachofen, himself no Egyptologist, who first placed the sociological aspect of Egyptology upon a scientific basis (see L. Mitteis, *Reichsrecht und Volksrecht in den östlichen Provinzen des römischen Kaiserreichs*, p. 57; E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, Part i, vol. ii, p. 51). The discovery of Kretan civilisation, our enormously expanded views of Mykenean and primitive Greece have added daily corroboration to the inductions of his genius. That anyone should to-day speak as does Mr. Rose of Bachofen, who has done incomparably more to advance scientific knowledge than Mr. Rose is ever likely to do to obstruct it, is as indecent as if some belated curate should refer to 'the amiable' Darwin.

[1] H. Hautecoeur, *Le Folklore de l'île de Kythnos*, p. 17.

[2] F. Büchler and E. Zitelmann, "Das Recht von Gortyn," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, N.F., xl; *Erganzungsheft*, p. 30 (vii, 15 sqq.). For Dr. Zitelmann's Commentary, see pp. 149 sqq.

Athenian law was exactly the same, save that the interests of the male kinsmen were even more strictly protected. A woman could, and commonly did, inherit landed property, but in that case she had not the slightest control over that property or any option as to her marriage. The property lay fallow until she married, and she was obliged by law to marry her nearest male kinsman, or whomsoever the testator from whom the property was derived might have appointed as her husband. Even if the woman were already married at the time that she inherited the land, the male heir had a right to take her away from her husband, whose marriage became null and void, and to marry her.[1] The woman was thus tied to the land; in order to obtain the latter it was necessary to marry her, but, on the other hand, she was debarred from marrying anyone except the male heir according to patriarchal law. Here again, then, as in the ordinary law of marriage, the Athenian law was a forcible and somewhat circuitous device to adapt traditional matriarchal usage to the aims and objects of patriarchal usage, and the law would be quite unintelligible had the latter aims and objects been in view from the first. "The fact that even in classical times, when the succession was through males, the claim of a woman who had no brother to the family land remained paramount, points distinctly," Professor Ridgeway remarks, "to a time when all property descended through women." And he is not, I think, going too far when he says, on the strength of that evidence, that it is "certain that at Athens there had been a time when descent was traced and property passed through females."[2]

The contrast between the social constitution of primitive and that of historical Greece does not, then, appear to be due to racial differences, but to the transition from a matriarchal to a patriarchal type of social institutions. And no contrast could well be more glaring than that presented by the position of women, and the social organisation pictured in the 'Homeric' world and that found in Greece in historical times. We shall consider in another place the position of women in historical Greece; it was, beyond all comparison, the most degraded and abject to be found in any civilised country of the Western world, and for a parallel to it we must go to China. In the Homeric poems, as in the remains of

[1] Isaeus, *De Pyrrhi hereditate*, lxiv. lxxii. sqq.; *De Aristarchi hereditate*, v.; *De Cironis hereditate*, xxxi.; Demosthenes, *Contra Lacritum*, xlviii; *Contra Stephanum*, xi. 22; *Contra Eubulidem*, xx.; Arrdocides, *De mysteriis*, cxx.; A. W. Heffter, *Die athenäische Gerichtsverfassung*, pp. 384 sqq.; A. H. G. P. van der Es, *De jure familiarum apud Athenienses*, p. 19 sq.; C. C. Bunsen, *De jure hereditario Atheniensium*, pp. 45 sqq.; E. Caillemer, *Études sur les antiquités juridiques d'Athènes. Le droit de succession à Athènes*, pp. 36 sqq.

[2] W. G. Ridgeway, *The Origin of Tragedy*, pp. 191 sq.

Mykenean and Aegean civilisation, we come upon the exact opposite. The discrepancy has been a source of endless perplexity to critics and scholars. "There is nothing more remarkable in the social history of Greece," says one writer, "than the difference in the character and position of women, as set forth in the 'Iliad' and 'Odyssey,' and as we see them in the pages of the tragedians and comedians of the so-called classical period."[1] So conspicuous is the preponderance of women in the 'Odyssey' that no less a scholar than Richard Bentley, who cannot be suspected of modernism, declared that it had been specially composed for women.[2] That feminine predominance suggested to Samuel Butler the whimsical theory that the epos must have been written by a woman. "Throughout the 'Odyssey' it is the women who are directing, counselling, and protecting the men."[3] Wherever Odysseus goes, in "the Navel of the Sea," in the isle of Aiaie, in the country of the Laistrygonians, in that of the Phaiakians, in his own Ithaka itself, he comes upon a queen or 'queen-goddess,' ruling the land alone or with a quite subordinate consort.[4] The royal houses are founded by women, and the royal office is transmitted by the practice of dynastic incest.[5] In relating his interview with the shades of the netherworld, when "sent forth by august Persephone, the women came, the wives of chiefs and their daughters," Odysseus recites 'Catalogues of women,' giving the female genealogies of the Minyan and Aiolian houses.[6] Queen Arete, "honoured as no other woman in the world is honoured," is "looked upon by her people as a goddess,"[7] and takes invariable precedence over her consort-brother in receiving and entertaining her guest, and making provision for his repatriation.[8] "Pass him by without notice," says Nausikaa to Odysseus, speaking of her

[1] W. C. Perry, *The Women of Homer*, p. 220. Cf. H. Munro Chadwick, *The Heroic Age*, p. 359.

[2] R. C. Jebb, *Bentley* (*English Men of Letters*), p. 146.

[3] S. Butler, *The Authoress of the 'Odyssey,'* p. 107.

[4] Homer, *Odyssey*, v. 148 sqq.; x. 135 sqq., 112 sqq.; vii. 54 sqq.

[5] *Ibid.*, vii. 54 sq.; x. 5 sqq. It is noteworthy that the lines in which Alkinoos and Arete are unambiguously and beyond all possibility of evasive interpretation stated to be brother and sister, are immediately followed by an explanatory genealogy which represents them as uncle and niece. Hesiod expressly states that they were brother and sister (Scholiast ad *Odyssey*, vii. 54). No more concrete illustration could be offered of the adaptation of the matriarchal original—which is shown to have been in the same meter—to patriarchal ideas (cf. J. J. Bachofen, *Das Mutterrecht*, p. 312; A. Fick, *Die homerische Odyssee in der ursprungiche Sprachform*, pp. 58 sq.; A. Kirchhoff, *Die homerische Odyssee*, pp. 79, 329; R. M. Burrows, *The Discoveries in Crete*, pp. 217 sq.).

[6] Homer, *Odyssey*, xi. 225 sqq.

[7] *Ibid.*, vii. 64 sq. 71.

[8] *Ibid.*, vii. 141 sqq., 231; viii. 433 sqq.; xi. 335 sqq.

father, "and about my mother's knees clasp thou thy hands, that thou mayest see with joy the day of thy return."[1] After he has given an account of himself, it is the queen who speaks to the assembled people: "Phaiakians! This man is my guest, though all share the honour; wherefore be in no haste to dismiss him, nor stint in giving him what he so much requires; for many are the treasures that, by the bounty of the gods, lie in our stores."[2] As a sort of afterthought, Echenos steps in with the words: "Friends, the speech of our wise queen is verily not wide of the mark, nor far from our deeming; so hearken thereto. But on Alkinoos here both word and work depend."[3] But that forced and clumsy attempt to reconcile the unfamiliar social relations pictured in the old saga with later usages and ideas is but one of the innumerable incongruities resulting from the re-editing in a later age of the 'chansons de geste' transmitted by an older society. "That contradiction," remarks Mr. Thomson, speaking of the whole subject of the inconsistencies that teem in the classical version of the poems, "disappears when we recognise that they were composed for a race with patriarchal institutions out of material derived from an older matrilinear society. The 'Odyssey,' in its treatment of women, recalls a society in which they held a great place. But to find such a society we must pass out of recorded Greek history, throughout which they held in Ionia and Athens, the preservers of Homer, a very different position, and awakened somewhat different sentiments."[4] That position and that sentiment differ

[1] Homer, *Odyssey*, vi. 310.

[2] *Ibid.*, xi. 336 sqq.

[3] *Ibid.*, xi. 342 sqq.

[4] J. A. K. Thomson, *Studies in the 'Odyssey,'* p. 168. The inconsistencies arising from the adaptation of the poems of a matriarchal to a patriarchal society are but one aspect of the anachronisms which pervade the Homeric epics. The conclusion to which we are inevitably led by our fuller knowledge of prehistoric Greece is that, quite apart from the Pisistrataean and other late re-editings, the 'Iliad' and the 'Odyssey' in their present general form were composed at a comparatively late date, not earlier than the eighth century B.C., and more probably in the seventh, by the combination and re-modelling of much older literary material. We thus come back to the 'unity of Homer,' but in a sense and with implications very different from those which formerly inspired the defence of that thesis. The Homeric poems can no longer be regarded as 'primitive,' and as affording a direct contemporary picture of the world they depict. In many respects they represent it about as accurately as Shakespeare's 'Hamlet' represents Danish society in the fourth century. Among Homeric heroes, iron is not only in general use for all kinds of cutting instruments and also for agricultural purposes, but its use is so familiar that it has passed into proverbial expressions (*Odyssey*, xvi. 294, xix. 13); Mykenean Greece belongs to the Bronze Age, and iron is completely absent, except in the form of very rare and precious finger-rings (W. Ridgeway, *The Early Age of Greece*, pp. 294 sq.; P. Cauer, *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*, pp. 312 sqq.). Homeric heroes are

indeed, as much from those of historic Greece as do the figures of Klytemnestra, Alkestis, Kassandra, Medea, Polyxena, Hermione,

cremated; Mykenean Greece invariably buried its dead (W. Ridgeway *op. cit.*, pp. 328 sq.; P. Cauer, *op. cit.*, pp. 329 sqq.). The force of those considerations may be more fully appreciated when the ingenuity displayed in attempts to meet them is considered. Professor Dörpfeld seriously suggests that Homeric heroes were not really cremated, but merely roasted or 'scorched' (W. Dörpfeld, "Verbrennung und Bestattung der Toten im alten Griechenland," *Mélanges Nicole; Recueil de mémoires offert à Jules Nicole*, pp. 95 sqq.). A theory which is compelled to have recourse to underdone heroes is surely overdone. In Mykenean art warriors are either stark naked or wear a loin-cloth only; in Homer they wear shirts. Mykenean women wear the prodigious costumes with which we are now familiar; Homeric women wear the classical 'chiton' and 'peplos' (W. Ridgeway, *op. cit.*, pp. 297 sqq.; F. Poulsen, *Der Orient in die frühgriechischen Kunst*, p. 177; P. Cauer, *op. cit.*, p. 387). Homer is under the impression that the Phoenicians were the foremost industrial producers and artists of the world he describes, as they were of the world he lived in; of the great centres of Mykenean industry and art at Knossos, at Argos, he does not appear to have heard. He describes Mykenean palaces in considerable detail; of the more striking features of their decoration, the innumerable wall-paintings, he makes no mention. Such examples could be greatly multiplied (see W. Ridgeway, *op. cit.*, pp. 293 sqq.; R. M. Burrows, *The Discoveries in Crete*, pp. 208 sqq.; R. Dussaud, *Les civilisations préhelléniques*, pp. 459 sq.; G. Perrot and C. Chipiez, *Histoire de l'art dans l'antiquité*, vol. vii, p. 115). Attempts to harmonise those discrepancies, such as that of Helbig (W. Helbig, *Das homerische Epos aus den Denkmälern erläutert*), must be pronounced to have failed (cf. R. Dussaud, *loc. cit.*). Homer endeavours to 'reconstruct' a culture different from that of his time; he archaises (cf. A. Platt, "Homer's Similes," *The Journal of Philology*, xxiv (1896), pp. 28 sqq.). He carefully avoids, save in one ambiguous instance, to mention writing, although writing had been in use in the Aegean from time immemorial (cf. M. Bréal, *Pour mieux connaître Homère*, p. 35).

Homer used, and doubtless faithfully transcribed, the heroic literary remains of the Mykenean, Karian and Kretan age. His sources appear to have lent themselves better to his epic purpose as regards the maritime sagas of the 'Odyssey' than in the genealogical 'chansons' of the 'Iliad.' He could not do away entirely with their matriarchal character. To the poet of a patriarchal society, as to all subsequent readers and critics, the great matriarchal figures of women are those of 'noble women.' But there is this difference between the patriarchal and the matriarchal conception of a 'noble woman': the former implies chastity and fidelity, the latter does not. Hence the myth of Penelope, whom tradition represents as dissolute (Pausanias, viii. 12; Duris of Samos, in *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, vol. ii, p. 479; Scholiast to Theocritus, i. 3), had to be adapted. The 'wooing of Penelope,' which would naturally form the beginning of the narrative, is transformed into the story of the 'suitors,' which on any imaginable hypothesis is a tissue of meaningless and unintelligible inconsistencies (cf. U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, *Homerische Untersuchungen*, pp. 29 sqq.). The serving-women, who according to primitive usage are offered to visitors for their entertainment, are actually hanged by Odysseus for their unchastity. That, since they are recognised by the hero after some twenty years, those dissolute damsels must have been at least forty or fifty years old, is a mere detail.

Antigone, adopted, but in a different spirit from that of the epos, by the convention of the tragic poets, were unlike the shadowy Greek wife, artificially stunted in mind, and sequestered in the obscurity of the 'gynaikonitis,' who was not even permitted to witness the representation of her ancestresses on the stage. "How early," exclaims Ottfried Müller, "was the period when the ancient constitution of the Grecian family degenerated into the slavery of the wife!"[1]

The Teutons.

Passing to the barbaric nations of Europe, everyone is familiar with the account given by Tacitus of the influence wielded by women among the Teutons. "The strongest hold upon those tribes," he says, "is got by obtaining as hostages girls of noble families. Indeed, they believe that there is in all women some spark of prophecy, and they do not despise their advice or neglect their words. We saw for ourselves in the reign of the divine Vespasian a woman named Veleda, who was long credited by many people with supernatural powers. In earlier days, too, they paid great respect to Albruna and many other prophetesses."[2] One tribe is mentioned, dwelling on the sea-coast of what is now Holland, which was ruled by a queen.[3] In the oldest Nordic and Germanic documents persons are often referred to by the names of their mothers without mention of their fathers. Thus, for example, in the 'Lay of the Nibelung' three Burgundian kings are repeatedly mentioned as the sons of 'vrou Uoten'; their father is not named.[4] The Lombard nation traced its descent from a woman, Gambara, and her two sons; their father is not mentioned.[5] Tacitus notes the fact that "the sons of a sister have the same position as regards their uncle as with their father. Some even consider the former as the stronger tie, and, in taking hostages, it is more insisted on, for a stronger hold is thereby gained on their affections, and a wider hold on the family."[6] Down to a very late date the uterine relationship was regarded in German law as more important than the paternal. Thus in the constitution of Frederic I, as in all previous Germanic legislation, it is laid down that "if a freeman marries a slave woman,

[1] C. O. Müller, *The History and Antiquities of the Doric Race*, vol. ii, p. 5.

[2] Tacitus, *De origine et situ Germanorum*, viii.

[3] *Ibid.*, xlv.

[4] *Der Nibelunge Nôt*, 126, 291, 717, 865, 1517, 2100, 2188, 2295 (ed. K. Bartsch, vol. i, pp. 20, 45, 116, 141, 251, 350, 363, 380).

[5] *Origo gentis Langobardorum*, in Pertz, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Langobardarum*, p. 2. For several other examples, see L. Dargun, *Mutterrecht und Raubehe und ihre Reste im germanischen Recht und Leben*, p. 58.

[6] Tacitus, *op. cit.*, xx.

or a freewoman marries a slave, the offspring in either case must follow the condition of the mother, and not that of the father."[1]

The social organisation of the Teutonic peoples at the time when Tacitus gathered his information was, however, patriarchal, inasmuch as a man transmitted his property to his own children. That primary and fundamental trait of the patriarchal organisation of society was, nevertheless, even at a much later date, combined in the strangest manner with juridic usages, which are the very reverse of patriarchal and belong to a purely matriarchal social organisation. Thus, according to the laws of the Thuringians, if a man died without leaving any children, his property passed to his sister; if there were no sister, to his mother; neither father nor brother is even mentioned as a possible heir.[2] Similarly, according to the laws of the Burgundians, a man's property, in the absence of children, went to his sister, and failing a sister, to his brother.[3] Of the famous Salic laws there are ten somewhat different redactions of various periods; in the four oldest a man's heirs, after his sons, are his mother, his brother, his sister, and his mother's sisters. In none is the father mentioned; in one only is the father's sister named, and she yields precedence to the mother's sister. The later redactions show very definitely the growing influence of Roman usages and of patriarchal principles, and indeed a gloss expressly informs us that "the laws which were observed in pagan times are no longer valid, for according to them many persons were deprived of their rights." The amended laws provide that the father shall also become an heir, and likewise the father's sisters, but the mother's sisters still retain precedence over the latter. "It is not until towards the end of the sixth century," remarks Amira—a conservative jurist who is here a hostile witness—"that the legal equality of the father's and of the mother's relations became fully established."[4]

We have, in fact, ample evidence that amongst Teutonic peoples property and titles were, at any rate as regards royal houses, transmitted through the women. For example, we read in Beowulf

[1] J. Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer*, p. 325. Cf. L. Dargun, *op. cit.*, pp. 24 sqq.

[2] E. Th. Gaupp, *Das alte Gesetz der Thuringer*, p. 341; L. Dargun, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

[3] *Lex Gundobada*, in Pertz, *op. cit.*, *Leges*, Sect. i, vol. ii, Part i, p. 52. Cf. L. Dargun, *op. cit.*, p. 62; O. Opet, *Die erbrechtliche Stellung der Weiber in der Zeit der Volksrechte*, p. 54.

[4] K. von Amira, *Erbenfolge und Verwandschafts-Gliederung nach den alt-niederdeutschen Rechten*, p. 41; L. Dargun, *op. cit.*, pp. 62 sqq.; F. Walter, *Corpus juris germanici*, vol. i, p. 179; G. Waitz, *Das alte Recht der Salischen Franken*, p. 108. One jurist naïvely remarks: "Why the sister of the mother should have the preference over the sister of the father I am at a loss to explain" (E. R. L. Laboulaye, *Recherches sur la condition civile et politique des femmes*, p. 110).

that when Hygelac was killed in a disastrous battle against the Frisians, his widow, Hygd, called Beowulf, who had escaped from the slaughter, and "offered him the treasury and the government, the rings and the throne."[1] "The whole passage," remarks Mr. Chadwick, "seems to indicate that the throne with all its rights was regarded very much like any ordinary family property."[2] Saxon aspirants to the throne do not consider that they have fully established their claim until they have married the queen. Thus Hermigisil, King of the Varini, when on his deathbed, admonishes his son Radger to be sure and marry his stepmother in accordance with their ancestral custom.[3] Edbald, King of Kent, does likewise;[4] and so does Ethelbald, King of the West Saxons, who marries the widow of his father Ethelwulf.[5] The West Saxon queen Seaxburg, however, preferred to retain the kingdom for herself.[6] Like the Saxon kings, Canute the Dane, after having overthrown Ethelred, sends for the queen, an old woman who was then living in Normandy, and does not regard his usurpation as complete until he has married her.[7] Hamlet's uncle, Feng, obtains the Danish crown in the same manner; and Hamlet himself was killed by Wiglet in order to obtain possession of Hamlet's wife and of the kingdom.[8] Similarly among the Scandinavians the kingdom passed to the daughters and to their husbands as late as the eighth century; and it is usual, in Nordic records, for the kingdom to be inherited through a man's mother, or by marrying the queen or a royal princess. In fact, in royal houses, matrilocal marriage "plays a decidedly important part in Northern tradition."[9]

We have no express information as to whether among commoners marriage was with the German barbarians patrilocal or matrilocal, though from the statements of Tacitus as to their extreme reluctance to part with their daughters as hostages, and as to their preferring being taken prisoners themselves to the clan losing any of the women upon whom its increase depended, it would seem safe to conclude that they would not willingly allow their daughters to become transferred to another clan.[10] We know that, at any rate, the

[1] *Beowulf*, vv. 2369 sqq.

[2] H. M. Chadwick, *The Heroic Age*, p. 372.

[3] Procopius, *De bello Gothico*, iv. 20; vol. ii, p. 562 (ed. Dindorf).

[4] Bede, *Historia Ecclesiatica*, ii. 5. 102; cf. i. 27. 63.

[5] Prudentius Trecensis, *Annales*, *anno* 858, in Pertz, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, *Scriptores*, vol. i, p. 451.

[6] H. M. Chadwick, *op. cit.*, p. 372.

[7] E. A. Freeman, *History of the Norman Conquest of England*, vol. i, pp. 410 sqq.

[8] Saxo Grammaticus, *Historia Danorum*, iii, iv (O. Elton, *The First Nine Books of the Danish History of Saxo Grammaticus*, pp. 106 sq., 130).

[9] H. M. Chadwick, *The Origin of the English Nation*, pp. 333, 331 sqq.

[10] Cf. K. Lamprecht, *Deutsche Geschichte*, vol. i, pp. 97 sq.

Gothic tribes were familiar with the usage of matrilocal marriage. For Procopius, in describing the friendly relations existing between the Ostrogoths and the Visigoths at the time of their occupation of Southern Gaul, informs us that intermarriages were common between the two nations, and he adds that "many went over to the homes of their wives."[1]

The Celts.

Concerning the various Celtic-speaking peoples, we unfortunately possess no systematic account such as Tacitus has left us concerning the Germans, and our information in regard to many of them is very fragmentary. But, as we shall have occasion to note more than once, there appears to have been great uniformity in the usages and ideas of all peoples of Celtic speech, whether they dwelt in Ireland or North Britain or on the banks of the Po or of the Tagus; so that there is in general a strong presumption that any information we have concerning any one branch of those nations applies substantially to other peoples speaking the Celtic tongue.

In Gaul, before it became Romanised, women occupied a position which is only compatible with pronouncedly matriarchal institutions. Several accounts testify to that great influence.[2] They took part in tribal councils, and when Hannibal passed through Gaul it was agreed between him and the native authorities that any dispute arising from damages that might be caused by his army should be referred to a commission consisting exclusively of Gallic women.[3] Concerning their marriage customs, the following is well-nigh the only account available. When the Phokeans first settled at Massalia a Greek merchant was invited by a native chief to attend the wedding of his daughter. That wedding-feast struck the Greek as somewhat peculiar: the bridegroom had not yet been selected. A banquet was given at which a large number of the marriageable young men of the place were invited. After the feast, the bride entered bearing in her hand a golden cup full of wine; after surveying the assembly, she signified her choice by presenting the cup to the man whom she had selected as her husband.[4] We shall come upon similar usages in various parts of the world, and it is manifest that they represent a matriarchal and not a patriarchal social state, and that in all probability matrilocal marriage would be the natural sequel to such a procedure. The practice of matrilocal marriage is, indeed,

[1] Procopius, *De bello Gothico*, ii. 13, p. 345.

[2] See, for instance, the accounts of Chiomara (Polybius, xxii. 21), of Camma (Plutarch, *De virtut. mulier.*, 20), of Eponyma (Tacitus, *Historiae*, iv. 67).

[3] Plutarch, *op. cit.*, vi. Cf. Polyaenus, *Strategemata*, vii. 50.

[4] Justin, xliii. 2; Athenaeus, xiii. 36; Plutarch, *Vit. Solon.*, ii.

to be found even at the present day in some secluded mountain districts of Savoy. The usage is known as "goat-marriage," in allusion to the practice of bringing the he-goat to the female, while cows and ewes are taken to the male.[1]

If we possess little information concerning the marriage customs of the Celts in Gaul, we have, on the other hand, thanks to the literary activities of the Irish during the early centuries of the Christian era, a considerable literature of myths and traditions which affords us valuable material in forming some notion of their mode of life; and it may be presumed that the customs of the ancient Irish did not differ fundamentally from those of other Celtic peoples. In Irish traditional myths the women and goddesses play the chief part, and those narratives show clearly that, as with the Greeks of the heroic age, marriage was with the Irish Celts essentially matrilocal. The heroines "abide in their own place, and they allure or compel the mortal lover to resort to them. Connla and Bran and Oisin must all leave this earth and sail across ocean or lake before they can rejoin their lady-love; even Cuchulainn, mightiest of all the heroes, is constrained, struggle as he may, to go and dwell with the fairy queen Fand, who had woed him." Throughout, the mistress or wife retains the superiority; "she chooses whom she will, and is no man's slave; herself she offers freely, but she abandons not her liberty."[2] "Irish and Welsh divine and heroic groups are named after the mother, not the father"; and, more especially in the older strata of Celtic tradition it is common for heroes to be metronymous, the father's name being omitted. Ireland and Scotland were named after eponymae, Erin and Scota, and the earliest settlers in Ireland are represented as having been women, not men.[3] The queens and princesses of Irish traditional history are pictured as domineering viragoes of whom their husbands generally stood in wholesome dread. The royal spouses of the famous Queen Medb, for instance, are insignificant nonentities upon whom she never wearies of pouring her scorn and contempt, and whom she flatly tells that they would be but miserable paupers but for the honour of their alliance with her.[4] Among the Picts, we are expressly and repeatedly told, property was transmitted exclusively in the female line, a man's estate passing not to his son, but to his sister's children. "It is in the right of mothers they succeed to sovereignty and all other successions."[5] We may thence infer, as indeed we

[1] H. Baudesson, *Indo-China and its Primitive Peoples*, pp. 57 sq.

[2] A. Nutt, *Studies on the Legend of the Holy Grail*, p. 232.

[3] J. A. MacCulloch, *The Religion of the Ancient Celts*, pp. 222 sq.

[4] *Táin Bó Cúalnge*, translated by H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, pp. 32 sqq. and *passim*.

[5] W. F. Skete, *Chronicles of the Picts, Chronicles of the Scots, and other*

know from the accounts of early Scottish history, that women did not on marriage leave the home of which they were the owners. Traces of the usage survive in the Scottish highlands even at the present day. "It is a practice among the better sort, in these days," says Mr. J. Logan, "for the bride to remain with her parents for some weeks, and when she goes to her husband, the furniture which she has provided, and which is called 'starald,' is removed with much ceremony, every article being moved in succession according to fixed rules." [1] The accounts of the 'Book of Leinster' and other Irish documents, which mention the matriarchal organisation of the Picts represent it as having been imposed upon them by the Irish Gaels after a victory over the former. That, of course, is exceedingly unlikely; but such a tradition clearly implies that the Irish themselves had the same social customs, for it is scarcely to be supposed that they would 'impose' upon other peoples usages which were foreign to themselves. And in fact throughout the literature of the Irish and British Celts, which has furnished much of its material to the romantic literature of mediaeval Europe, the heroes are represented, as in the archaic Greek sagas, as leaving their homes and seeking in some foreign tribe an heiress whom they marry, and with whom they share the dominion over her estates.[2] The ancient laws of Ireland and of Wales lay down that when a daughter is married to a stranger, her son shall inherit the family estate.[3] Throughout Celtic literature also the principal personage after the chieftain, or 'king,' is invariably, not the king's son, but his nephew, his sister's son. Many of those stories represent the impatience of the heir apparent to enter upon the heritage of his uncle; and while that relation is constantly referred to, there is no allusion to any anxiety on the part of the ambitious heroes concerning their paternal inheritance.[4] There can in fact be no doubt that purely matriarchal succession was the immemorial rule with all Celtic-speaking peoples. Livy tells us of a certain Gaulish king, Ambicatus, living about 400 B.C., who appointed to the command of his armies the sons of his sister.[5] No doubt these were in fact the heirs to the throne.

Early Memorials of Scottish History, pp. 319 sq.; H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, *Le cycle mythologique Irlandais et la mythologie celtique*, p. 265; Id., *La famille celtique*, pp. 88 sq.

[1] J. Logan, *The Scottish Gael; or Celtic Manners*, vol. ii, pp. 362 sq.

[2] See below, vol. iii, pp. 376, 407.

[3] *The Ancient Laws of Ireland*, pp. 202, 206; *The Ancient Laws of Wales*, pp. 46, 790; H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, *La famille celtique*, pp. 68 sqq.

[4] G. Schoepperle, *Tristan and Isolt, a Study of the Sources of Romance*, vol. ii, p. 281; cf. below, vol. iii, p. 437.

[5] Livy, v. 34.

Ancient graves of the Bronze Age in Great Britain show that women were buried with at least as much pomp as the men, and the wealth of their sepulchral ornaments often surpasses in splendour the armour of the warriors.[1] Tacitus tells us that among the Britons, "the laws make no distinctions between the sexes."[2] Doubtless, as with reference to the Germans, Tacitus thought it too extravagant a supposition that those laws did make a distinction in favour of the female sex. He reports with considerable surprise the very natural behaviour of the countrymen of Queen Boadicea, or Boudicca, and of kings holding their thrones by the right of their wives, when some British prisoners were brought before the Emperor Claudius. As they were expected to make their obeisance, those barbarians caught sight of the Empress Agrippina who was sitting at some distance from the Emperor. They went straight to her, doing homage to the Empress as to the Emperor. "A novel thing, truly," exclaims Tacitus indignantly, "and most opposed to the spirit of our ancestors—that a woman should sit before the Roman ensigns!"[3]

Rome.

Rome stands for the very type and stronghold of the patriarchal organisation of society, and it is in a very large measure from her that our own patriarchal social organisation and sentiments have been derived. It is also from that form of society, together with the Biblical accounts of the 'patriarchal age,' that the ideas and theories of social evolution which prevailed generally before the rise of modern anthropological science were chiefly drawn by the foremost students of the subject. Roman writers themselves, with their keen interest in all political and legal questions, devoted considerable attention to the structure and development of their institutions and, of course, interpreted them in terms of the principles which were axiomatic in their day, that is, in terms of patriarchal society. But, curiously enough, they regarded that constitution of society as in a large measure peculiar to themselves; they considered that they were the only people with whom the absolute patriarchal rule of the father as head of the family was, properly speaking, fully developed. "There is scarcely any other race of men," said their foremost jurists, "who have the same power over their sons which we have."[4] Dion Chrysostom contrasts the servile status of the children in the Roman family

[1] J. Abercromby, *A Study of the Bronze Age Pottery of Great Britain and Ireland and its Associated Grave-Goods*, vol. i, p. 70.

[2] Tacitus, *Vita Agricolae*, xv.

[3] Id., *Annales*, xii. 37.

[4] Gaius, *Institutionum commentarii*, i. 55.

with their position amongst other peoples.[1] The analysis and interpretations of Roman jurists and antiquarians have served as the basis of the investigations and theories of modern jurists and historians brought up in the classical school. That tradition, and the patriarchal theory derived from it, which has been worked out with great learning, notably by Sir Henry Maine, assumes as its essential doctrine, that the patriarchal family as we know it is not only the unit of existing human society, but that it is the primitive and original form of the human social group, and that all other groups, such as the clan, or gens, the tribe, and finally the City and State, have been formed by the aggregation of patriarchal families, and " organised as a collection of patriarchally governed families."[2] Apart from all the biological and comparative ethnological grounds which render such a conception untenable, it leads within the limited domain of Roman and Greek archaeology itself, to such a tangle of difficulties, inconsistencies and contradictions with known facts, that even the supporters of the theory feel bound to admit that the formation of those supposed compound units remains wholly obscure and insusceptible of any clear explanation ; and Sir Henry Maine himself, with a candour founded on much deeper knowledge and more judicial judgment than the confidence of many later doctrinaires, admits that the origin of the patriarchal family itself is a complete mystery, and that he is unable to furnish any explanation of it.[3] Such are those difficulties, when applied to the interpretation of ancient Roman society, that one of the most distinguished of classical social students, M. Fustel de Coulanges, working purely from the classical point of view, felt compelled to break away entirely from current traditional theories, and to regard the primary original unit not as a family, but as a ' gens,' or clan, as a group larger than the family, and which could not be based upon the same principles.[4] I have already given some of the reasons for thinking that such a group, from which the family has subsequently arisen, could not have rested upon patriarchal principles, that is, on the domination of the male, which would make the group a herd from which no family could ever be derived, and that it must of necessity have been, on the contrary, a matriarchal group resting not on the domination of the male, but on the unifying bond constituted by the maternal instincts, a group depending not upon domination, but upon sentiment and

[1] Dion Chrysostom, " De servitute et libertate posterior," *Orationes* xv, p. 240 (ed. Casaubon and Morelli).

[2] H. Maine, *The Early History of Institutions*, p. 323 ; *Ancient Law*, pp. 122 sq., 135 sq.

[3] Id., *Village Communities in the East and West*, pp. 15 sq. Cf. G. Grote, *A History of Greece* (1872), vol. ii, p. 430.

[4] N. D. Fustel de Coulanges, *La Cité antique*, p. 116.

kinship. And in fact, when regarded in the light of our present knowledge, the evidence that patriarchal Roman society was preceded within the verge of historical times by a matriarchal constitution, is no less conclusive than in regard to other peoples.

The primitive Romans were, we know, divided into tribes; those tribes again consisted of 'curiae,' which Dionysius of Halicarnassus tells us corresponded to the Greek 'phratries,'[1] or, roughly speaking, to what we may call clans. Concerning the organisation of those clans, or 'curiae,' which constituted the fundamental form of grouping of the primitive Roman population, Livy gives us some interesting information, which is confirmed by Plutarch. We are told that the joyful peace which followed after the war between the Romans and the Sabines endeared the Sabine women to their husbands and to Romulus, who "therefore, when he divided the people into thirty curiae gave to each the name of one of those Sabine women. Doubtless the number of those women was somewhat greater than that of the curiae, but tradition does not relate whether their names were given to the curiae according to their age and the rank of their husbands, or whether they were chosen by lot."[2] We need, of course, take little notice of the clumsy and manifestly aetiological explanation given to account for the origin of the women's names borne by the curiae, except as showing that the metronymous curiae dated from times beyond the memory of Roman tradition. The fact which stands out is that the Roman clans, or curiae, were named after women, that is, after the mothers and not the fathers of the clans. And thus the primitive organisation of the Romans consisted of 'Motherhoods' similar to those which we have come across among so many primitive peoples. The Latin people as a whole, also derived their name, not from their tribal ancestor, but from their tribal ancestress; for the former, or first king of the Latins, was, according to tradition, Saturnus, and his wife was Latia, and it was after the mother of the race, and not after the father, that the Latin people were named.[3]

The inference which those facts suggest, that the social constitution of the early Romans was matriarchal, and that the women not only gave their names to the clans, but were the owners of the land, is confirmed by other evidence. The land

[1] Dionysius Halicarnassensis, *Antiq. Rom.*, ii. 7.

[2] Livy, i. 13. 6–7. Plutarch, in reporting the same tradition (*Romulus* xx), says that he doubts its accuracy "because many of the curiae are named after places." This confirms the importance of the information, for, as we know not only the primitive tribe, but also its abode, is named after the traditional ancestress. And in fact the number of Latin towns, including Rome itself, which, like the Greek towns, bear feminine names, is not without significance.

[3] Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*, xiii. 22.

upon which Rome itself was built was, according to tradition, inherited by the Roman people from women. It is reported that Acca Larentia, who is curiously described as "a most noble prostitute"—"nobilissima meretrix"—and had her home on the Velabrum, married a wealthy Etruscan, "whose home she ruled," and that when she died she left the land to the Roman people.[1] The same thing is also stated of the Vestal Gaia Tarratia.[2]

And in fact, as always happens when the women and not the men are the owners of landed property, the succession to the throne did not take place with the Roman kings in the male line; although they had sons, these did not inherit their father's crown. Sometimes it passed to strangers whose title, however, was confirmed by their marrying a woman of the royal house, a usage which is common in primitive royalty among matriarchal people. In other words, the rights of succession lay in the female line, and if a male of the royal family had a claim to the throne it was not through his father, but through his mother, and he did not succeed his father, but his uncle. That this was the rule of succession in primitive Rome we are expressly told by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who makes Tatia say, speaking of Tarquin to his nephew: "Not only his property, but also his kingdom belongs to you by hereditary right, since you are the eldest of his nephews."[3] And we find in fact that the crown was in early Rome transmitted along the female line, and that with the later kings, about whom our information may be regarded as more historical than that concerning the earlier ones, a keen rivalry and hostility existed between uncles and nephews. Tarquin the Proud actually caused one of his nephews to be murdered in the hope of securing the succession for his own son. The other nephew, however, Lucius Junius Brutus, escaped by feigning, like Hamlet, mental derangement. It was upon him, in accordance with matriarchal law, that after the assault on his niece Lucretia, the duty of blood-revenge devolved, and not on her husband or on her father; and he drove the tyrant from the throne and succeeded to his power, though the office changed name, as being the rightful heir.[4] Thus the relations

[1] Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, i. 10; Plutarch, *Quaestiones Romanae*, xxxv; Id., *Vita Romuli*, v; Aulus Gellius, vi. 7; Augustin, *De civitate Dei*, vi. 7. Cf. V. Scialoia, "Il testamento di Acca Larentia," *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, Ser. 5, vol. xiv (1905), pp. 141 sqq.; Th. Mommsen, *Römische Forschungen*, vol. ii, pp. 1 sqq.

[2] Aulus Gellius, lvii; Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, xxiv. 2.

[3] Dionysius Halic., *Ant. Rom.*, iv. 29.

[4] Livy, i. 56; Dionysius Halicarn., iv. 67–69, 77; Valerius Maximus, vii. 3. 2. Aurelius Victor, *De viris illustribus urbis Romae*, x; Joannes Zonaras, *Annales*, vii. 11. The two rulers who replaced the 'rex' were known at first as 'praetors' (Livy, iii. 55. 12); their powers were identical with those of the kings (Id., ii. 1. 7 sq.); and the 'revolution' was not, in the

between maternal uncle and sister's son followed in primitive Rome the matriarchal and not the patriarchal rule. As in all matriarchal societies, the distinction between paternal and maternal uncle was clearly drawn. The former was called 'patruus,' the latter 'avunculus,' a diminutive of 'avus,' that is, 'ancestor,' or 'the person from whom one inherits.' In our word 'uncle,' which is a corruption of 'avunculus,' is therefore preserved a relic of the primal order of succession in matriarchal society.

Of the Italian populations, by far the most important, the Etruscans, who in all probability were the actual founders of Rome,[1] are known to have been definitely matriarchal. "The

sense in which we are prone to think of such a change, a sudden passage from 'monarchical' to 'republican' institutions. The subject of Roman kingship has been treated in his usual admirable manner by Sir James Frazer (*The Golden Bough*, vol. ii, pp. 268 sqq., *The Magical Origin of Kings*, pp. 231 sqq.). It is interesting to note that the true character of the royal succession in primitive Rome, which is now made clear by comparative anthropology, was perceived and very ably expounded nearly ninety years ago by Professor Francesco Orioli, of Florence, in a little book, most wretchedly printed, and now almost unprocurable (F. Orioli, *Dei sette re di Roma, e del comminciamento del consolato; Nuove ricerche storiche*. Poligrafia Fiesolana, 1839). Some are disposed to suspect anthropologists of interpreting the facts of traditional history to suit their theories. Signor Orioli, who, of course, knew nothing of comparative anthropology or of the matriarchal theory, and who imagined that the peculiar facts he noted were the result of some strange arrangement deliberately 'instituted,' arrived at precisely the same conclusion as Sir James Frazer. "The females," he says, "instead of the male heirs, inherited the crown, and brought it as a dowry to their husbands, or transmitted it to their offspring by those unions" (*op. cit.*, p. 11).

[1] Cf. W. Schulze, "Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen," *Abhandlungen der königlich Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, philologisch-historische Klasse*, N.F., v, p. 580. The names 'Roma,' 'Romulus,' or in the older Oschian form, 'Rumna,' 'Rumla,' are manifestly variations of the name of the Etruscan clans Rumate, Rumulna. A very large proportion of Roman names, such as Capenna, Ratumenna, Rames, Lucii, Tiberii, etc., are Etruscan. The Romans, whose political origins had their source in their breaking away from the Etruscan empire, which extended over the greater part of Italy, from the Po to the Bay of Naples, showed great anxiety to obliterate the traces of their relations to Etruria; but these are too numerous and manifest in the whole structure of their culture not to be recognised (cf. W. Ihne, *Römische Geschichte*, vol. i, pp. 71 sqq.; M. Zoeller, *Latium und Röm*, pp. 166 sqq.; C. C. M. Casati, *Fortis Etruria; origines étrusques du droit romain*).

There exists no substantial ground for the traditional theory of the Asiatic origin of the Etruscans. In their traditions they represented themselves as having migrated from Lydia (Strabo, v. 2. 2; Tacitus, *Annales*, iv. 55; Tertullian, *De spectaculis*, 5; Plutarch, *Romulus*, ii; Velleius Paterculus, i. 1. 4; Valerius Maximus, ii. 4. 4; Justin, xx. i. 7); but all Italic peoples, including the Romans themselves, had similar traditions. The supremacy of Greek culture and of Homeric tradition caused most European peoples to claim to be connected with the heroes of the Trojan war, in exactly the same way as was done in the Middle Ages, when the inhabitants of Britain likewise claimed to be Lydian immigrants. Dionysius of Halicarnassus,

singular custom of the Lykians, of tracing their descent by the maternal line," remarks Dennis, "obtained also among the Etruscans."[1] "There is no instance of an Etruscan agnomen,"[2] that is, of a name derived from the father. On funeral monuments the sole name by which the deceased is designated is usually his metronymic; in bilingual inscriptions the father's name is inserted in the Latin version only, while sometimes the mother's name, which is always given in the Etruscan inscription, is omitted in the Latin.[3] That nomenclature, Lord Crawford quaintly remarks, "illustrates that respect for mothers, and, it may be inferred, for the female sex in general, which forms so favourable a characteristic of the Etruscans."[4] Most writers, however, far from appreciating that "favourable characteristic," have been at a good deal of pains to make excuses for the attitude of the Etruscans towards the female sex in general; for the same customs obtained amongst them as are generally found in a matriarchal order of society. Girls were unrestrained before marriage, and were said

one of the best informed of ancient antiquaries, entirely rejected the tradition, and regarded the Etruscans as autochthonous (Dionysius Halicarn., xxviii. 30). The arguments, from supposed linguistic and cultural similarities, in support of the tradition of Asiatic origin, have lost all significance since it has been realised that eastern and western Mediterranean culture both owe their origin to a common ethnic source (cf. P. Kretshmer, *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechische Sprache*, p. 409).

[1] G. Dennis, *The Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria*, vol. i, p. xlv.

[2] I. Taylor, *Etruscan Researches*, p. 257.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 256 sq.; Alex., Earl of Crawford, *Etruscan Inscriptions Analysed*, pp. 62 sqq.; K. Ottfried Müller, *Die Etrusker*, vol. i, pp. 376 sqq. A. N. Des Vergers, *L'Étrurie et les Étrusques*, vol. i, pp. 143 sq.; F. S. Maffei, *Museum Veronese*, p. 367; L. A. Lanzi, *Saggio di lingua etrusca*, vol. i, p. 132 n.; vol. ii, p. 85; J. J. Bachofen, *Die Sage von Tanaquil*, pp. 282 sqq. Thus, for example—

KUINTE.SINU.ARNTAL
O.SENTIUS L.F.ARRA NATUS

(A. Fabretti, *Corpus inscriptionum Italicarum antiquioris aevi*, No. 980) denotes "Quintus Sentius, son of L., born of Arra." The suffix 'al' is rendered in Latin by 'natus.' "The peculiar force of the word consists in that it denotes derivation from the female parent, that it is used always with reference to the mother, not the father" (Crawford, *op. cit.*, p. 64). The termination, found in 'Viminal,' 'Quirinal,' etc., became in Latin an adjectival termination. It is clearly connected with 'alere,' 'to bring up,' 'to nurse.' Even in Christian times the tradition of mother-kin persisted in Etruria, as witness the following inscription from a Christian cemetery near Chiusi: "Juliae sanctissimae ex genere Mustoliae sanctae Asinire Felicionimae que vixit animo xxxvii" (J. J. Bachofen, *op. cit.*, p. 323, after Canedoni, *Raggualio storico-archeologico sugli antichi cimiteri cristiani di Chiusi*, p. 40). It has been noted that Horace, in addressing Mecenas, who was an Etruscan, mentions his mother before his father (Horace, *Epistol*, i. 6).

[4] Alex., Earl of Crawford, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

to earn their dowry by prostitution.[1] Their freedom of disposing of themselves was scarcely more restricted after marriage. "It is a custom instituted by law among the Etruscans," says Theopompos, "that wives should be in common."[2] In their frequent feasts or banquets, the luxury of which was celebrated,[3] the married women lay with the men on rich couches; not, however, with their husbands, but with any man they chose, and had freedom of intercourse with him.[4] Paternity was, we are told, unknown.[5] "It is very significant from an ethnological point of view," remarks Canon Taylor, "that no word for 'father' has yet been detected in the inscriptions. The words denoting 'husband' and 'wife' are also somewhat doubtful."[6] "Of marriages," says Dennis, "few representations which have not a mythical reference have been found on the sarcophagi or sepulchral urns of Etruria."[7] In some tombs containing husband and wife, the former is not mentioned in the Etruscan text, while his name appears alone in the Latin version.[8] "It has generally been remarked that the tombs of women are more highly ornamented and richly furnished than those of the opposite sex."[9]

It would be extremely difficult to imagine how in primitive times two populations, which were so intimately intermingled as were the Etruscans and the local Italic tribes which, together with them, formed the population of Rome, could each have maintained a separate and totally different form of social constitution and nomenclature of kinship, the one matriarchal and the other patriarchal. In the bilingual sepulchral inscriptions of Etruria special devices have to be adopted to render the matriarchal Etruscan nomenclature of kinship in accordance with later Latin usage. A paternal 'cognomen' has to be fabricated. But the Latin 'cognomen,' which denoted the 'gens,' that is, the 'generation,' with which a Roman was connected, properly means a name derived from maternal relations, 'cognates.' The correct term for a patronymic, derived from the paternal, or 'agnatic,' relatives, would be 'agnomen'; but the term was never used, and was only introduced by grammarians in the fourth century.[10]

[1] Plautus, *Cistellaria*, ii. 3. 20.

[2] Theopompos, cited by Athenaeus, xii. 14.

[3] Aristotle, in Athenaeus, i. 23; Dionysius Halicarn., ix. 16; Diodorus Siculus, v. 40.

[4] Theopompos, in Athenaeus, *loc. cit.*; Dionysius Halicarn., *loc. cit.* Cf. F. Poulsen, *Etruscan Tomb Paintings*, p. 33.

[5] Theopompos, *loc. cit.*

[6] I. Taylor, *Etruscan Researches*, p. 245.

[7] G. Dennis, *The Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria*, vol. ii, p. 178.

[8] A. Fabretti, *Corpus inscriptionum Italicarum antiquioris aevi*, tab. xxiii, No. 252.

[9] G. Dennis, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 162.

[10] F. Soripatrus Charisius, *Ars grammatica*, in *Grammatici Latini*, ed.

The very same language which is used by Theopompos in speaking of the Etruscans, and which is the usual manner of referring to a matrilinear organisation, was employed in speaking of the Roman plebeians themselves; they were said not to know their fathers.[1] But that originally the nobility were in exactly the same case we know from the evidence furnished by Vergil, who was thoroughly familiar with primitive Latin tradition. The most eminent of the Latin nobles, Drances, the friend and counsellor of King Latinus, "was proud of the nobility derived from his mother; as to his father he was uncertain."[2] That uncertainty of the Latin nobility as to their paternal descent was shared by the kings of Rome themselves. Not only Romulus, but also Ancus Martius and Servius Tullius, knew their mothers, but not their fathers.[3]

The patriarchal principle, the legal provision by which the man transmits his property to his son, was evidently an innovation of the 'patricians,' that is, of the partisans of the patriarchal order, the wealthy, the owners of property. They disintegrated the primitive mother-clan by forming patriarchal families, which they 'led out of' the clan—'familiam ducere.' The patricians set up the paternal rule of descent, and regarded the father, and not the mother, as the basis of kinship—"patres ciere possunt."[4] "They are either called 'patres,'" says Mommsen, "inasmuch as they alone are, or can be, fathers, or else

H. Keil, vol. i, p. 152; Diomedes, *Ars grammatica*, *ibid.*, p. 320. Cf. Th. Mommsen, *Römische Forschungen*, vol. i, pp. 44 sqq.

[1] Livy, x, 8. Cf. Justinian, *Institutiones*, iii. v. 4.

[2] "... genus huic materna superbum
nobilitas dabat, incertum de patre ferebat"
(*Aeneid*, xi. 340–341).

[3] Cicero, *Resp.* ii. 18. 33; Dionysius Halicarn., ii. 76; Livy, i. 32. 34; Seneca, *Epistol.*, cviii. Seneca says: "Anci pater nullus. Numae nepos dicitur." Servius Tullius had no human father. He was said to have been conceived during a religious ceremony by a virgin—obviously a Vestal priestess—while tending the sacred fire (Plutarch, *De fortuna Romanorum*, x; Dionysius Halicarn., iv. 1 sq.; Ovid, *Fasti*, vi. 627 sqq.; Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, ii. 241, xxxvi. 204; Livy, i. 39; Servius on *Aeneid*, ii. 683; Arnobius, *Adversus gentes*, v. 18). It is to be noted that Ancus and Servius were two of the most popular kings of the Romans—"nimium gaudens popularibus auris" (Vergil, *Aeneid*, vi. 816 sq.).

[4] Livy, x. 8; Dionysius Halicarn., ii. 8. The etymology of 'patrician' from 'patres scire' is linguistically absurd, but sociologically significant. The ancients were quite at a loss to explain the origin of the patricians. They offer feeble surmises: "Patres certe ab honore" (Livy, i. 8); "*πατέρας, εἴτε δία τὸ πρεσβεύειν ἡλικία τῶν ἄλλων, ἔιθ ὅτι παῖδες αὐτοῖς ἦσαν, εἴτε δια τὴν ἐπιφάνει αὑτου γένους*" (Dionysius Halicarn., *loc. cit.*); "a pietate patres," suggests Aurelius Victor (*De virib., ill.* iii. 11.) We know that the rigour of marital exclusiveness did not always obtain among the patricians themselves (see below, pp. 694 sq.).

in adjectival form 'patricii,' inasmuch as they alone have a father."[1] We find in other parts of the world the classes with whom wealth accumulates adopting precisely the same measures to transmit it in the male, and not in the female, line. Thus among the Tlinkits of Alaska, while the poorer or lower classes are matrilinear in their reckoning of descent, the wealthier are patriarchal; they have become patricians.[2] Similarly, in Dahomey the chiefs and land-owning aristocracy reckon descent in the paternal line, whereas the common people continue to reckon it in the maternal line.[3]

The contest between the plebeians and patricians which occupies so considerable a place in early Roman history is not merely part of the eternal conflict between Disraeli's 'two nations,' the poor and the rich, but also a conflict between the two forms of organisation of human society, the primitive matriarchal order and the later patriarchal order, brought about by the development of property. The transition from the one to the other appears, then, to have taken place in Rome within almost historical times. The elder Cato refers in pretty clear terms to that legal establishment of male supremacy. "Our fathers," he says in his defence of the Lex Oppia, "have willed (uoluerunt) that women should be in the power of their fathers, of their brothers, of their husbands. Remember all the laws by which our fathers have bound down the liberty of women, by which they have bent them to the power of men. As soon as they are our equals, they become our superiors." Cato knew what he was talking about, for he was the author of a book on 'Roman Origins'; and he was defeated in the debate on the law by arguments drawn from his own book—"Tuas aduersus te 'Origines' reuoluam";[4] "I will refute you from your own book," he was told by Lucius Valerius.

Much as the loss of Cato's book is to be deplored, we know enough to be assured that it referred to a state of society which hardly accorded with the patriarchal or patrician ideas of a later age. Plutarch represents Roman senators as scandalised at the notion of a woman raising her voice in their august assembly,[5] but in the primitive age of 'Romulus and Tatius' women, according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, were commonly in the habit of delivering lengthy orations in the Senate.[6] Tacitus notes as a

[1] Th. Mommsen, *Abriss des römischen Staatsrechts*, vol. ii, p.13.

[2] W. H. Dall, *Alaska and its Resources*, p. 414.

[3] A. B. Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast of West Africa*, pp. 177 sq.

[4] Livy, xxxiv. 2, 3, 5.

[5] Plutarch, *Numae et Lycurgi Comp.* iii. 9.

[6] Dionysius Halicarnassensis, ii. 45.

striking and characteristic peculiarity of the Germans that they insisted upon female hostages,[1] but Porsenna did exactly the same thing in regard to the archaic Romans.[2] Much in Roman cult survived from an earlier time which became incomprehensible; in the temple of Ceres, for instance, the names of male relatives were never pronounced,[3] and in the rites of Mater Matuta it was the custom for Roman women to pray first for their sisters' children, that is, for the children of the maternal clan.[4] The whole of Roman 'origins' is replete with the influence exercised by women. The Romans, observes one historian, "had a most remarkable predilection for ascribing to women the most important events in their history."[5] Far from this being a 'predilection,' there are, on the contrary, pretty definite indications that the traditions of a matriarchal society were edited in the light of patriarchal ideas; nevertheless, they reflect a state of society in which the position of women was wholly different from that which they occupied in historical times. Of the story of Coriolanus, Mommsen remarks "through the whole story there runs a romantic, and tender tone, but, above all, a veneration of women, such perhaps as is not to be found anywhere in the same degree in the whole of ancient tradition."[6] Vergil represents the Italic tribes as being led, in their resistance against the invader, by an unwedded queen, Camilla, high-priestess of Diana, who, though she has a brother living, reigns over the Volsci in her own right.[7] He pictures the Latin Queen, Amata, as claiming as her due the privilege of choosing a husband for her daughter, that is, an heir to the throne, and as inciting not only Turnus, but the Latin women, to resist the nominee of her husband. She appeals, in addressing the women, to their 'maternal right.'[8] Horace recalls the time

[1] Tacitus, *Germania*, xviii.

[2] Livy, ii. 13.

[3] Servius in *Aen.*, iv. 58. Ceres was an old Divinity of the Sikuli, the cult of whom was particularly popular with the plebs (see J. Marquardt and T. Mommsen, *Handbuch der römischen Alterthümer*, vol. iii, p. 346). Compare the like observance of the Karians (Herodotus, i. 146).

[4] Plutarch, *Quest. Roman*, xiv. Cf. below, p. 605.

[5] R. von Ihering, *Geist des römischen Rechts auf der verschiedener Stufen seiner Entwicklungs*, vol. iii, p. 210.

[6] Th. Mommsen, *Römische Forschungen*, vol. ii, pp. 113 sq.

[7] Vergil, *Aeneid*, vii. pp. 803 sqq.; xi. pp. 535 sqq.

[8] *Ibid.*, vii. 400–403 :—

> "Io matres, audite, ubi qaeque Latinae :
> si qua piis animis manet infelicis Amatae
> gratia, *si iuris materni cura remordet*,
> soluite crinalis uittas, capite orgia mecum."

when Roman youths were wont to hew and carry wood " under the orders of a severe mother." [1]

It is owing to its original matriarchal character, and to the relatively sudden and artificial manner in which the change to a patriarchal constitution was effected in Roman society, that, in spite of its strenuous and emphatic patriarchal principles, in spite of the 'patria potestas' on which it became founded, women, nevertheless, retained in that society a dignity and privileges which are in strong contrast with those principles, and with the status of women in other civilised communities, as, for instance, in Greece. Their social and legal position in Rome, as we shall see later, was marked by a strange combination of patriarchal institutions and matriarchal sentiment which is to be found nowhere else. It is that peculiar combination which has in a large measure determined the position of women in the European social order which directly derives from that of Rome.

In the stronghold of the patriarchal tradition from which our own current ideas have been mainly drawn, we find, then, that as among other peoples, both savage and civilised, the order of society in which that tradition is embodied has been preceded by social stages in which the position of women was distinctly higher and more independent. With those races out of whose culture European civilisation has arisen, the change from a matriarchal to a patriarchal type of society would seem, from what we have just seen, to have taken place almost within the fringe of historical times, and at a relatively advanced stage of cultural development. That change, on the other hand, may, as we saw, also take place at quite rude stages of culture, and even in the lowest phases. This is notably seen in Australian aboriginal society, and also among the Melanesian savages. In those two regions of the uncivilised world the position of women is one of more brutal subjection to the unscrupulous domination of the males than in any other part of the world. Dr. Westermarck, in arguing that the liberty of choice of women in marriage is " decidedly greater among the lowest savages than among other more advanced

[1] Horace, *Carmen*, iii. vi. 33–41 :—

" Non his iuuentus orta parentibus
infecit aequor sanguine Punico,
. . . . . .
sed rusticorum mascula militum
proles, Sabellis docta ligonibus
uersare glebas et *seuerae*
matris ad arbitrium recisos
portare fustes."

savages," justly notes that the Australian natives must be regarded as constituting an exception, and as being abnormal in this respect.[1] In every other region of the savage world the transition from matriarchal to patriarchal society, where it has taken place, appears, in fact, to have occurred at a more advanced cultural stage, when the development of individualism consequent upon that of private property had imparted a greater importance to the transmission of the latter. And, accordingly, however complete the subordination of women in a juridical sense, their real position is never so barbarously degraded and oppressed as in those savage races where that subjection has become imposed in a low state of culture. Thus, although from a juridical and religious point of view the women of Polynesia are as completely excluded from all activity as in Melanesia or Australia, yet, in reality, their influence, independence, and general status are incomparably superior.

It may, I think, be rightly conjectured that the association in Australia of a very low cultural development with the establishment of male despotism and complete female subjection at an early stage is not wholly fortuitous. In a very able report to the Government on the prospects of imparting a civilised organisation to the Australian aborigines, Sir George Grey, then Captain Grey, said that, so far as regards their mental capacities, they were, he considered, quite as able to acquire education or social culture as any race in the world. It was not, he thought, their intellectual faculties that would stand in the way of their gaining the rudiments of civilised order, but their social principles. "From the peculiar code of laws of these people," he wrote, "it would appear not only impossible that any society subject to them could ever emerge from the savage state, but even that no race, however highly endowed, however civilised in all other respects, could remain long in a state of civilisation if they were submitted to the operation of such barbarous customs."[2] The aspect of those 'barbarous customs,' which appears more particularly to preclude the possibility of further progress, is the almost entire abolition of women's influence, the elimination of their instincts and interests as social factors, and the unchecked rule of purely male instincts. A patriarchal organisation of society can certainly not be regarded as in itself an obstacle to social and cultural advancement. The greatest cultural achievements of humanity have, on the contrary, been accomplished in patriarchally organised societies. When such a type of social organisation becomes established in a society

[1] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. ii, p. 310.

[2] G. Grey, in *Copies of, or Extracts from, Dispatches of the Governors of the Australian Colonies, with Reports of the Protector of the Aborigines. House of Commons; Accounts and Papers*, 1844, vol. xxxiv, p. 100.

which has already reached a high cultural level, the men taking over the peaceful occupations on which the women were formerly employed, the most favourable conditions of cultural development would seem to be secured, and a great progressive impetus is the result. But if that change takes place, as among the Australian and Melanesian savages, before any degree of material and social culture has been attained under a matriarchal organisation, the conditions of further progress would seem to be abolished. For, as the facts which we shall consider in the following chapter will show more clearly, it is as an outcome of the functions and activities of the women that the first steps in cultural development naturally arise, while the instincts and interests of the male being directed towards the competitive struggle for food and the predacious activities of the hunter and the warrior, do not spontaneously tend towards the improvement of material culture and of the peaceful relations of the social group. "It is to woman," remarks Reclus, "that mankind owes all that has made us men." She was the founder of the home, and thence the originator of the arts. "Notwithstanding the doctrine which holds sway at present, I maintain that woman was the creator of the primordial elements of civilisation. No doubt woman at the outset was but a human female, but the female nourished, reared and protected the more feeble than herself, while her mate, a terrible savage, knew only how to pursue and kill. Necessity forced him to slay, and the duty was not distasteful. He was by nature a ferocious beast, she by function a mother."[1]

[1] E. Reclus, *Primitive Folk*, pp. 57 sq.

CHAPTER IX

PRIMITIVE DIVISION OF LABOUR BETWEEN THE SEXES

THE difficulty which many still experience in fully recognising the matriarchal character of primitive human societies arises, I believe, in a great measure from a fundamental misconception which has not been sufficiently considered. It is assumed that in a matriarchal type of society the women exercise a domination over the men similar or equivalent to the domination exercised by the men over the women in a patriarchal social order, and that the two types of society thus differ merely in the sex which exercises dominant power in each.[1] But such a conception is very far from accurate. The characteristics of societies of a matriarchal type are by no means a simple inversion of the parts respectively played by the sexes in a patriarchal society. In the most primitive human societies there is nothing equivalent to the domination which, in advanced societies, is exercised by individuals, by classes, by one sex over the other. The notion of such a domination is entirely foreign to primitive humanity; the conception of authority is not understood. The ultimate basis of the respective status of the sexes in advanced patriarchal societies is the fact that women, not being economically productive, are economically dependent, whereas the men exercise economic power both as producers and as owners of private property. A social order involving such a domination, whether exercised by the men or by the women, can exist only in advanced economic conditions where private property has acquired a paramount importance; to impute that organisation to primitive society, where private property scarcely exists, is an anachronism. The development of durable private property, of wealth, the desire of the constitutionally predatory male to possess it and to transmit it to his descendants, are, in

[1] That conception has been expressly expounded as the thesis of a book which contains much that is suggestive, but is marred by inadequate scholarship (Mathilde and Mathias Vaërting, *Neubegründung der Psychologie von Mann und Weib*, Karlsruhe, 1921; translated by Eden and Cedar Paul under the title, *The Dominant Sex*, London, 1923).

fact, the most common causes of the change from matriarchal to patriarchal institutions; the other most frequent motive being the desire for a monopoly of certain magical powers primitively regarded as a special attribute of women. Where private property has begun to acquire importance and its transmission comes to be a matter of moment, the change from a matriarchal to a patriarchal order generally tends to take place very rapidly. Neither the notion of economic domination through the ownership of private property, nor the notion of privileged right or authority, is a primitive idea or has any place in truly primitive forms of society. The term 'mother-right,' which is often employed in speaking of the matriarchal features of primitive society, contains therefore a misleading implication, for it assumes the very principles upon which patriarchal societies are founded, namely, the notion of privileged and established claims, and suggests that the foundations of the matriarchal order of society are the same.[1] Those conceptions are, on the contrary, the reverse of primitive, and are therefore inapplicable to primitive matriarchal society. The primitive ascendancy of women is not founded on artificial economic control arising from proprietary rights, but on the functional constitution of the social group. The primitive human group is matriarchal in the same way and for the same reasons that the animal group is matriarchal; it is not so by virtue of established domination, but of functional relations. The maternal biological group subserves the maternal instincts and is governed by those instincts, but that functional fact does not impose a domination over the male any more than the animal male imposes a domination over the animal female. In the primitive human group, the motherhood, the functional equilibrium implied, as in the animal group, a preponderance of the female as compared with her position of economic dependence in the patriarchal group; but it was not a domination imposed upon the male, or one which, before the development of personal property, conflicted with any of his interests or his instincts.

Where the matriarchal order of society persists after the development of private property and accumulable wealth, and that wealth continues to remain in the hands of the women and to be trans-

[1] Professor Révillout, who failed to perceive that the constitution of Egyptian society was merely a direct persistance of primitive social conditions, and supposed that it was due to 'the power of beauty,' nevertheless remarks quite justly that the notion of 'right' implied in the term 'mother-right,' is not and cannot be a primitive notion. It postulates conditions which are not primitive and do not exist in primitive society. "Summum jus, summa injuria." Primitive society knows neither the 'jus' nor the 'injuria' (E. Révillout, in introductory letter to G. Paturet, *La condition juridique de la femme dans l'Égypte ancienne*, p. viii).

mitted in the female line, the result is indeed an economic advantage and domination on the part of the women similar to that exercised by the men in patriarchal societies. That economic lever may be deliberately used and abused by the women, and a condition of actual feminine domination and an oppressed condition of the men may accordingly result. Examples of such a state of things have been noted. Those conditions are not those of primitive matriarchy; they are the result of the persistence of primitive matriarchal social tradition which in most cases tends to disappear or to become profoundly modified when such a stage of economic development is reached; they do not, properly speaking, represent a primitive matriarchal social order, but the effects of the survival of that order amid conditions which are no longer primitive. The state of things brought about by the economic domination of women who remain the controllers of property is one of gynaecocracy, not of primitive matriarchy.

The matriarchal constitution of the primitive group resolves itself, nevertheless, like all functional adjustments, into economic relations; functional sexual differences leading to social differences must necessarily translate themselves into economic relations. Nothing, however, could differ more profoundly from the economic relations of advanced pastoral, agricultural, or industrial societies than primitive economic relations in their bearing upon the social relations between the sexes. The fundamental fact of advanced patriarchal societies is the ownership of property and the control of economic power by men, and the consequent economic destitution and dependence of women. In all earlier social phases economic power does not depend upon property, for there exists in such phases no form of durable wealth, nothing of value which is susceptible of being kept and accumulated. The sole form of wealth and of economic power consists, at those primitive social stages, in power to produce. The economic advantage which such power bestows is wholly in favour of the women; for women in primitive society, far from being economically unproductive, and therefore dependent, are, on the contrary, in the highest degree producers of wealth, and are, indeed, the chief producers. The patriarchal theory—that is, the theory that primitive society was from the first patriarchally constituted, and that the social relation between the sexes was essentially similar to that to which we are accustomed—is indeed, apart from any other evidence than that of primitive economic facts, a fantastic unreality. The visionary picture of a primitive patriarchal ruler of dependent women who have no economic value or power except their sex has no basis except in late myth and superficial speculation.

Before the development of private ownership and where productive capacity is the sole source of economic power, the situation is

the exact reverse; the advantage is entirely on the side of the women. The productiveness of the hunter can never go beyond hand-to-mouth subsistence; scarcely ever, in fact, can it afford a continuous and reliable means of subsistence. The preservation of meat, all wealth from the soil, all industrial production which is susceptible of accumulation, appertains to the sphere of the sedentary woman. Hence it is that when once private property develops all such property is in her hands, and even before that development, economic control is collectively in the hands of the women and not of the men.

Women's Labour in Primitive Society.

Although the primitive division of labour between the sexes generally throws the most continuous and onerous burden upon the woman, it is precisely that fact which excludes the possibility of male supremacy as it exists in patriarchal society. It is a gross fallacy to suppose that the hard-working primitive woman is in a position of inferiority as compared with the idle woman in patriarchal society. The truth is exactly the reverse; so long as woman remained economically productive it was impossible for complete patriarchal supremacy to become established. The primitive woman is independent because, not in spite of her labour.

No labour of any kind is, in primitive society, other than voluntary, and no toil is ever undertaken by the women in obedience to an arbitrary order or under a threat or menace. Numerous accounts have described the slavery and oppression of North American squaws; they rested upon a complete misunderstanding of the situation. Iroquois warriors, we have seen, regarded the position of privilege and ascendancy which those squaws in reality occupied as rightly due to them on account of the many indispensable tasks which they performed.[1] The American Indian women, says Father Théodat, "usually work more than the men, but they are not forced or constrained to do it."[2] "The work is not only voluntarily, but cheerfully performed."[3] "It is perfectly voluntary labour. All labour with Indians is voluntary."[4] "They are so perfectly free," says another writer, "that unless their children, who generally assist their mother, may be called servants, they have none."[5] "There are many persons,"

[1] See above, p. 316.

[2] F. G. Sagard Théodat, *Le grand voyage du pays des Hurons*, p. 130.

[3] J. G. E. Heckewelder, *History, Manners and Customs of the Indian Nations*, p. 142.

[4] H. R. Schoolcraft, *Indian Tribes*, vol. ii, p. 64.

[5] W. Smith, *The History of the Province of New York*, pp. 49 sq.

wrote Heckewelder, "who believe from the labour that they see Indian women perform that they are in a manner treated as slaves. Their labours, indeed, are hard compared with the tasks that are imposed on females in civilised society; yet they are no more than their fair share, under every consideration and due allowance of the hardships attendant on savage life. Therefore they are not only voluntary, but cheerfully submitted to, and as the women are not obliged to live with their husbands any longer than suits their pleasure or conscience, it cannot be supposed that they would submit to being loaded with unjust or unequal burdens." [1] "The woman," says the Rev. Owen Dorsey, "did the work which she thought was hers to do. She always did her work of her own accord. The husband had his share of labour, for the man was not accustomed to lead an idle life." [2] "In the affairs of the family," writes Loskiel, "the husband leaves the whole to his wife, and never interferes in things committed to her. She cooks victuals regularly twice a day. If she neglects to do it in proper time, or even altogether, the husband never says a word, but rather goes to some friend. . . . If his wife longs for meat, and gives a hint of it, he goes out early in the morning without victuals, and seldom returns without some game, should he even be obliged to stay out till late in the evening. When he returns with a deer he throws it down before the door of the hut, and walks in, saying nothing. . . . She may then do with it what she pleases. He says nothing if she even gives the greatest part of it to her friends, which is a very common custom. . . . Most married people understand that whatever the husband gets by hunting belongs to the wife. As soon as he has brought the skin and meat home he considers them as his wife's property." [3] "The Indians," says another writer, "seldom make their wives feel their authority by words or deeds." [4] The division of labour was determined by conditions and requirements, not by the will or domination of either sex; and it was by no means unequal. "The division of labour between man and wife in Indian life," says Schoolcraft, "is not so unequal while they live in the pure hunter stage as we may suppose. The large part of a hunter's time which is spent in seeking game leaves the wife in the wigwam with a great deal of time on her hands." [5]

[1] J. Heckewelder, *History, Manners and Customs of the Indian Nations*, p. 154.

[2] J. O. Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," *Third Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 267.

[3] G. H. Loskiel, *History of the Mission of the United Brethren among the Indians of North America*, London, 1794, p. 59.

[4] T. Forsyth, "Memoirs of the Sauk and Foxes," in E. H. Blair, *The Indian Tribes of the Upper Mississippi Valley and the Region of the Great Lakes*, vol. ii, p. 218.

[5] H. R. Schoolcraft, *Indian Tribes*, vol. ii, p. 63.

The men's work is generally far more strenuous and dangerous than the work of the women. The latter do not " think it any hardship imposed upon them, for they themselves say that, while their field labour employs them at most six weeks in the year, that of the men continues the whole year round." [1] " Before the introduction of firearms the man had to depend on his bow and arrows for killing buffaloes, deer, etc., and hunting was no easy task. The Indian never hunted game for sport." [2] " Their manner of rambling through the woods to kill deer is a very laborious exercise, as they frequently walk twenty-five or thirty miles through rough and smooth grounds, and fasting, before they return to camp loaded." [3] " They undergo as great hardships in winter as the women, for very often one man has to hunt and provide for fourteen or fifteen persons." [4] " An Indian makes nothing of dragging a deer of 100 or 150 pounds weight through a considerable tract of forest—at least, he affects not to feel its weight, even when it is evident that he is quite exhausted." [5] The " fatigues of hunting wear out body and constitution far more than manual labour." [6] We remark disparagingly on the savage hunter loafing round the fire when in camp while the women are toiling and preparing his meal; but even in our own society we consider men to be dispensed from any productive labour when doing military service. The strain of man's share in the primitive division of labour is testified by the strenuous, almost barbarous, tests of hardihood which he considers necessary to undergo in order to fit himself for the task.

By comparison the women's work is often light. The work of the Indian women " is not hard or difficult. The tilling of the soil at home is frequently done by female parties much in the manner of husking, quilting and other ' frolics.' The labour is thus quickly and easily performed. When it is over, or sometimes in intervals, they sit down and enjoy themselves by feasting on some good victuals." [7] The men are always willing to give a helping hand to the women when they are required [8]; and their own work is often

[1] J. G. E. Heckewelder, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

[2] J. O. Dorsey, *loc. cit.* " It is characteristic of the Indian never to destroy more than he can consume " (W. H. Keating, *Narrative of an Expedition to the Source of St. Peter's River*, vol. i, p. 395).

[3] J. Adair, *History of the American Indians*, p. 402.

[4] D. Cameron, in L. R. Masson, *Les Bourgeois de la Compagnie du Nord-Ouest*, vol. ii, p. 257.

[5] G. H. Loskiel, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

[6] J. G. E. Heckewelder, *op. cit.*, p. 157. Cf. J. Hunter, *Memoirs of a Captivity among the Indians*, p. 199: " I have known Indians, when much enfeebled by hunger, to carry loads of buffalo meat, deer and elk for miles to the camps of their party, which very few white people in perfect health would have willingly undertaken."

[7] J. Heckewelder, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

[8] J. F. Lafitau, *Moeurs des sauvages amériquains*, vol. ii, pp. 109, 78;

entirely regulated by that of the women, hunting expeditions being timed so as to fit in with the agricultural occupations of the women-folk.[1]

It is commonly adduced by travellers as evidence of the servile position of savage women that in travelling all the burdens are carried by them, while the men carry their weapons only. But such an arrangement is absolutely essential to the safety of both. "In all their movements," remarks Dr. Keating, of the Chippewas, "they are prepared for any event, whether of the chase or warfare."[2] A woman would object to travelling with men who were not ready to defend her at an instant's notice, and the supposed 'beast of burden' is often the ruler of the household. "I have never known an Indian woman," says Heckewelder, "complain of the hardship of carrying their burden, which serves for their comfort and support as well as that of the husband."[3] Speaking of the tribes of the Gran Chaco, Dr. Pelleschi observes: "Although to Christians the woman may seem too much overburdened when carrying heavy weights by the side of a man who bears his arms only, yet they are not worse treated than the universal majority of women amongst ourselves. Moreover, an Indian never makes a journey without the intention of securing food, and is never free from the possibility of attack. How could he procure the first, or encounter the second while bearing a heavy burden?"[4] In Africa, remarks Miss Werner, the native man "has been much reprobated for carrying nothing but his weapons while she is heavily loaded. But this leaves out of account the ever-present possibility of attack by raiders or wild animals—of course, now rapidly becoming a matter of tradition. Still, no longer ago than 1894 I saw men patrolling the gardens with spear and shield while their wives gathered millet, in very real danger of being carried off by the Machinga."[5]

What is true of North American Indian society is equally true, with very few exceptions, of all primitive societies. Even where, as in Australia or Melanesia, women are ill-treated and roughly handled, such treatment is not used to compel them to do tasks which they do not voluntarily undertake; the idea of such

F. X. de Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, p. 237; L. Carr, *The Mounds of the Missouri Valley*, pp. 12 sqq.

[1] J. O. Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," *Third Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 283 sq.

[2] W. H. Keating, *Narrative of an Expedition to the Source of St. Peter's River*, vol. ii, p. 242.

[3] J. Heckewelder, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

[4] G. Pelleschi, *Eight Months on the Gran Chaco of the Argentine Republic*, p. 64.

[5] A. Werner, *The Natives of British Central Africa*, pp. 135 sq.

compulsory labour imposed by force is entirely foreign to all primitive societies. "A superficial consideration of the position of woman in Eskimo society," says Rasmussen, "might induce one mistakenly to believe that she leads a cowed and unhappy existence. But certainly no one would be more astonished than she herself if anyone consoled the Eskimo woman and pitied her. She herself has no consciousness whatever of being man's drudge."[1] In Africa, where the misconceived 'slavery theory' is often applied, "a woman," Sir T. Shepstone states, "need not work except of her own free will. The actual labour performed by the women bears no comparison to what is performed by the women of the lower classes in England. The labour of the Kaffir woman is to cultivate her garden in which the mealies are grown. This takes three or four weeks in spring. Two months afterwards she has to hoe the ground, which takes three or four weeks more. She is not driven to work, and if so disposed may take it easily enough. As a rule women only work during these eight weeks in the year."[2] In the Cameroons, remarks another observer, "the position of women in general, including slave-girls, is, in spite of the fact that they are purchased and that upon them devolves the whole of the not very onerous field and house work, by no means so oppressed as one is liable to imagine. There is, under those conditions which appear strange to us, much more real human happiness than in Europe."[3] Referring to Zulu women, a missionary writes: "Whoever has observed the happy appearance of the women at their work and toil, their gaiety and chatter, their laughter and song, their ceaseless jesting and banter, chiefly at the expense of the men, let him compare with them the bearing of our own working-women."[4] In West Africa "the Kru women do much work on the farm, each wife having her distinct field of rice, cassava, ground nuts to attend to; and she is very ambitious that it should be large and carefully weeded, so as to make a large return for the labour bestowed."[5] Men, when they can, will always lend a hand. Where servile labour is available, the women do not need to work, but they nevertheless reserve for themselves the cultivation of their garden and the upkeep and ornamentation of the home.[6]

Among mammals there is no economic division of labour; except as regards the young of carnivora, which are assisted by

[1] K. Rasmussen, *The People of the Polar North*, p. 62.

[2] E. Blackwood Wright, "Native Races of South Africa," *Journal of the African Society*, ii, p. 268.

[3] M. Buchner, *Kamerun, Skizzen und Betrachtungen*, p. 32.

[4] M. Kranz, *Natur- und Kulturleben der Zulu*, p. 65.

[5] J. L. Wilson, *Western Africa*, p. 126.

[6] D. Livingstone, *Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa*, p. 186.

their mother in the procuring of food, each individual attends to his own food-supply. The same state of things obtains, according to the most reliable information, among the higher primates. In a band of gorillas each animal, male or female, forages for itself.[1] Primitive humanity was, no doubt, like the anthropoids, mainly frugivorous, and in those conditions very little division of labour could take place. That frugivorous period, during which complete economic equality obtained, must have extended over a considerable time, for it is during that period that the incipient human race must have developed to a sufficient degree to devise weapons and thus become capable of undertaking systematic attacks on animals of some size.[2] There are, as will presently be seen, indications that the differentiation of the male as a hunter, of which there is no inkling in any animal species, was but incompletely established in many primitive societies. Women hunted equally with men; fishing, which plays an important part in the economy of numerous primitive tribes, appears to be, in the lowest stages of culture, more commonly done by the women than by the men. It was, however, the development of hunting which finally established the primitive economic division of labour between the sexes.

That division of labour has not been determined wholly or chiefly by the respective powers or aptitudes of the sexes or by any physical inferiority in woman, but by the functional necessity which bound her to the care of the offspring and prevented her from undertaking pursuits entailing prolonged absence. That handicap is much greater in humanity than in any animal species, in proportion to the prolongation of infancy in the former. An Iroquois myth represents early man and woman as hunting together in the forest, both taking an equal part in the work of obtaining a food-supply. But when children were born there were so many things for the wife to do that she stayed at home, and the man went alone. "When he went alone," adds the narrative, "he never had good luck."[3]

[1] A. E. Jenks, "Bulu Knowledge of the Gorilla and Chimpanzee," *The American Anthropologist*, xiii, p. 57; P. Deschamps, "Les différences sociologiques entre les sauvages et les anthropoïdes," *L'Anthropologie*, xxx, p. 12.

[2] Professor Carveth Read suggests that the development of carnivorous habits and of hunting took place in the anthropoid stage of development, and was the primary factor of human differentiation (Carveth Read, "On the Differentiation of Man from the Anthropoids," *Man*, xiv, pp. 181 sqq.). The adoption of a carnivorous diet would not, so far as I can see, account for the prolongation of infancy and its numerous consequences, whereas the prolongation of infancy, by greatly developing intelligence, accounts for the adoption of predatory habits.

[3] E. A. Smith, "Myths of the Iroquois," *Second Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 103.

Physical Differences between the Sexes in Primitive Races.

Among primitive men and women there is not by any means the disparity in physical power, resourcefulness, enterprise, courage, capacity for endurance, which are observed in civilised societies, and are often regarded as organic sexual differences. Those differences in physical and mental capacity between the sexes are often assumed to be the chief cause determining the division of labour between them, but to a very large extent they are rather the effect of that specialisation and of the divergence in the avocations of men and women which has taken place in the course of social development.

The physical disadvantage of the female in size and strength is far from being a fundamental biological character; it is, on the contrary, the general rule throughout the greater part of the animal kingdom that the females are larger and more powerful than the males. With most invertebrates, when there is any difference in size between the sexes, it is the female which is the larger. Among Cirrhipeds the male is sometimes a small parasite on the body of the female.[1] Among spiders the male is always much smaller than the female, often in an extreme degree.[2] With all kinds of insects the males are commonly smaller than the females.[3] Of several species, such as the common mosquito, we see the females only, the males being so small and their existence so transient that they do not usually come under observation. Dr. Günther says that "in all teleosteous fishes the female is larger than the male";[4] and Darwin states that he did not know "a single instance in which the male is larger than the female." With some Cyprinodont fishes the males are not even half the size of the female, and are liable to be devoured by them.[5] All female snakes are larger than the males,[6] but among lizard-like reptiles the male is usually larger than the female. Among birds the male is generally larger than the female, but there are numerous exceptions. In many species, such as cuckoos, there is no difference in size between the sexes; female hawks are usually larger than the males.[7] Among mammals the male is almost invariably larger.[8]

[1] G. Smith, "Crustacea," *Cambridge Natural History*, vol. iv, p. 99.

[2] C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, vol. i, p. 338.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. i, pp. 345 sq.

[4] A. C. L. G. Günther, *Introduction to the Study of Fishes*, p. 656.

[5] C. Darwin, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 7. Those statements are, it appears, too absolute; there are several exceptions to the rule that the male is smaller than the female amongst fishes (see Th. Gill, "Parental Care among Freshwater Fishes," *Smithsonian Reports for 1905*, pp. 408 sq.).

[6] C. Darwin, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 29.

[7] Lester F. Ward, "Our Better Halves," *The Forum*, vi (1888) pp. 266 sq.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 270

The female okapi is almost unique among land mammals in being larger than the male.[1] It would appear that there is some correlation between the physiological development of the maternal function—prolonged pregnancy, prolonged maternal care, etc.—and the reduced size of the females among the higher vertebrates. But although the mammalian female is generally smaller than the male, there is no indication that any physical inferiority, lesser activity, combativeness, or resourcefulness go with that difference in size. Females, among mammals, are, on the contrary, generally more active and more intelligent than the males; and it is well known to hunters that the females of carnivorous animals are far more formidable antagonists than the males. "A lioness," says Mr. Rainsford, "is, I think I am safe in saying, a hundred per cent. more dangerous than a lion."[2] It is even said that the male carnivores scarcely ever attack man.[3]

Women are, as a very general rule, smaller than the men of the same race. But there is great racial variation in this respect, and of several races it is reported that the women are equal in size to the men, or even larger, and they are quite frequently better developed and more muscular. Thus among the Bushmen, according to Fritsch, the women are on an average about four centimetres taller than the men.[4] Among the Adombies of the Congo "the women are often stronger than the men and more finely developed."[5] Among the Ashira "the men are not nearly so finely built as the women."[6] The Bashilanga women are "strikingly more muscular than the men," who are weak by comparison.[7] In Dahomey "the women are generally tall, muscular and broad, and the men smooth, full-breasted, round-limbed and effeminate-looking."[8] The women of Ashanti "are of a stronger make than the men."[9] The Wateita women are described as being much more muscularly developed than the men.[10] "In muscular strength and endurance the women of the Somals are far superior to their lords."[11] "A Kikuyu man," says Mr. Routledge, "is quite unequal to carrying a load that his women think nothing of. The writer has often tried to lift a woman's load of firewood from the ground, and found

[1] A. T. Barns, *The Wonderland of the Eastern Congo*, p. 152.
[2] W. S. Rainsford, *The Land of the Lion*, p. 101.
[3] L. F. Ward, *op. cit.*, p. 270.
[4] G. Fritsch, *Die Eingeborenen Süd-Afrikas*, p. 398.
[5] H. H. Johnston, quoted by H. Havelock Ellis, *Man and Woman*, p. 4.
[6] P. du Chaillu, *Exploration and Adventure in Equatorial Africa*, p. 415.
[7] P. von Wissmann, *Unter deutscher Flagge quer durch Afrika*, p. 91.
[8] A. B. Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples of the Gold Coast*, p. 184, partly adopting the words of Burton.
[9] J. A. Skertchly, *Dahomey as it is*, p. 487.
[10] J. Thomson, *Through Masai Land*, p. 48.
[11] R. F. Burton, *First Footsteps in East Africa*, p. 188.

himself unable to do so, though he stands six feet and is fairly powerful." [1] The Manyema women of the Congo "can carry loads as heavy as those of the men, and do it quite as well." [2] The Kru women "are robust and strong, and capable of carrying immensely heavy burdens on their heads. Every evening they may be seen trudging home with large water-pots or a bundle of wood of a hundred pounds weight on their heads, and perhaps a child slung on their backs. They can in this way walk for miles without raising their hand to steady or adjust their heavy burden." [3] Bosman, speaking of the women of the Coast of Guinea, says that "with a burthen of one hundred pounds on their head they run a sort of continual trot, which is so swift that we Hollanders cannot keep up with them without difficulty, though not loaded with an ounce of weight." [4] The women among the Iyashi of Nigeria are pronounced to be physically superior to the men, and among the Lala tribes "the men are for the most part of a low, stunted physique; the women are of a superior build." [5]

Admiral Wrangell, after describing the division of labour between men and women among the natives of Northern California, the former devoting themselves entirely to hunting while all the heavy work fell to the lot of the women, remarks somewhat naïvely: "This unusual division of labour must probably be ascribed to the remarkable circumstance that the women are, in general, of far greater bodily strength than the men, who, although tall and well proportioned, nevertheless appear to be weaker than the women." [6] The women of the Shastika tribe of California are described as being "larger and stronger-featured and every way more respectable than the men." [7] Champlain remarks on the "powerful women of extraordinary strength" among the Canadian Indians; [8] and an Indian chief declared that a woman "can carry or haul as much as two men can do." [9] Among the

[1] W. S. and K. R. Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People, the Akikuyu*, p. 104.

[2] T. H. Parke, *My Experiences in Equatorial Africa*, p. 344.

[3] J. Wilson, *Western Africa*, p. 126.

[4] W. Bosman, "A New Description of the Coast of Guinea," in Pinkerton, *Voyages and Travels*, vol. xvi, p. 479.

[5] O. Temple, *Notes on the Tribes, Provinces, Emirates, and States of the Northern Provinces of Nigeria*, pp. 161, 256.

[6] F. P. Wrangell, *Statistische und ethnographische Nachrichten über die russischen Besitzungen an der Nordwestküste von Amerika* (K. E. von Baer and Gr. von Helmersen, *Beiträge zur Kenntniss des russischen Reiches und der angränzenden Länder Asiens*, vol. i), pp. 75 sq.

[7] S. Powers, *Tribes of California*, p. 244.

[8] S. Champlain, *Oeuvres*, vol. iv, p. 80.

[9] S. Hearne, *A Journey from Prince of Wales's Fort to the Northern Ocean*, p. 55.

Cherokees, Lieutenant Timberlake knew an old woman, whose youngest son was about fifty, who used to carry on her back daily for a couple of miles a load of wood weighing two hundredweights.[1] Vespucci states that the women of Honduras carried weights which the men found difficulty in lifting; they thought nothing of running two or three leagues.[2] Patagonian women are nearly as big and muscular as the men; their lowest stature is five feet eight inches.[3] Among the Fuegians, "in general the female sex is much sturdier and stronger than the male sex."[4] Arab and Druse women are said to be as tall and as strongly developed as the men; and so are the women of Afghanistan.[5] Tibetan women are described as being taller and stronger than the men.[6] Bogle remarks on the enormous strength of Tibetan girls. "A girl of eighteen," he says, "travelled one day fifteen or eighteen miles with a burden of seventy or seventy-five pounds weight. We could hardly do it without any weight at all."[7] In Butan the women carry the men on their backs when travelling.[8] Colonel Dalton says: "It has always struck me that the Michi women are comparatively taller and finer creatures than the men."[9] The Khasi women of Assam "can carry loads which Hindus are unable to lift;"[10] and the Bodo and Dhimal women are said to be as big and strong as their men.[11] Dom or Chandai women "are conspicuous for their powerful physique."[12] Among the Gond tribes of Central India "the women are finer animals by far than the men."[13] In Formosa, among the Chinwan, the women carry burdens which the men are unable to handle.[14] A crew of Dayak women can beat a crew of Malay men.[15] The women of Melanesia are much hardier labourers

[1] H. Timberlake, *Memoirs*, p. 54.

[2] A. Vespucci, *Quattuor Navigationes*, in M. F. de Navarrete, *Colecion de Viages*, vol. ii, p. 284.

[3] T. J. Hutchinson, "The Tehuelche Indians of Patagonia," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society*, N.S., vii, p. 320.

[4] C. Spegazzini, "Costumbres de los habitantes de la Tierra de Fuego," *Anales de la Sociedad Cientifica Argentina*, xiv, p. 171.

[5] H. Schaaffhausen, *Anthropologischen Studien*, p. 665. Cf. T. L. Pennel, *Among the Wild Tribes of the Afghan Frontier*, p. 191.

[6] F. Grenard, *Tibet and the Tibetans*, p. 261.

[7] C. P. Markham, *Narrative of the Mission of George Bogle to Tibet*, p. 17.

[8] J. B. Tavernier, *Les Six Voyages de J. B. T.* vol. ii, p. 467.

[9] E. T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal*, p. 20.

[10] E. A. Gait, in *Census of India*, 1891, *Assam*, p. 257.

[11] H. Schaaffhausen, *loc. cit.*

[12] H. H. Risley, *The Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, vol. i, p. 244.

[13] J. Forsyth, *The Highlands of Central India*, p. 124.

[14] W. Joest, "Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Eingeborenen der Inseln Formosa und Ceram," *Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie*, 1882, p. 59.

[15] C. Brooke, *Ten Years in Sarawak*, vol. i, p. 101.

than the men. "It is marvellous to see the loads they carry. It is quite a common thing to meet a woman with a child on her back and a heavy load of yams tied together on her head; above this a bundle of sticks for her fire, and over her shoulder a large bamboo filled with water." [1] Papuan women are pronounced to be more strongly built than the men.[2] In Central Australia "it is by no means rare for a woman single-handed to beat a man severely." [3] Diodorus says that Gaulish women were as tall as the men.[4]

Speaking generally, the physical differences between the sexes are far less pronounced in primitive races and in the lower phases of culture than among civilised peoples. In prehistoric skeletons the determination of sex is often difficult and doubtful; the bones are as massive in the female as in the male, the muscular attachments are nearly as pronounced, and the differences in the shape and dimensions of the pelvis are much less marked than among modern Europeans. It has been noted that even in the less highly civilised parts of Europe, such as Russia, there is less difference in physical proportions between the sexes than in France or England.[5] The masculine type of the women among uncultured races is apparent in any collection of ethnological photographs. It is very pronounced among many African races. Among the Bushmen it is often difficult to distinguish the sexes, even though the individuals are almost naked. The breasts constitute no distinction, for they are so developed in the males that these are sometimes able to suckle.[6] The sexual characters of the pelvis are difficult to distinguish even in the skeleton.[7] Among Bantu races it is often scarcely possible to distinguish the women from the men, either by their facial conformation or by their figures. "It is often hard to distinguish the sex of an individual," says Mr. Phillips of the Lower Congo races.[8] Among the Wanyamwesi "it is sometimes difficult to tell a grown woman, seen from behind, from a man." [9] "Sometimes," says so experienced an observer

[1] H. A. Robertson, *Erromanga, the Martyr Isle*, p. 370.

[2] O. Schellong, "Beiträge zur Anthropologie der Papua," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xxiii, p. 173.

[3] A. W. Howitt, "Further Notes on the Australian Class System," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xviii, p. 61. Cf. Id., *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 197; E. Thorne, *The Queen of the Colonies*, p. 134.

[4] Diodorus Siculus, v. 32.

[5] H. Schaaffhausen, *Anthropologischen Studien*, p. 665.

[6] F. João dos Santos, in G. M. McCall Theal, *Records of South-East Africa*, vol. vii, p. 215.

[7] G. Fritsch, *Die Eingeborenen Süd-Afrikas*, p. 407.

[8] R. C. Phillips, "The Lower Congo, a Sociological Study," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xvii, p. 217.

[9] P. Reichard, "Die Wanjamuesi," *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin*, xxiv, p. 252.

as Sir Harry Johnston, "it has occurred even to myself to ask about some youth, 'Is that a man or a woman?'"[1] Mr. Ellis remarks that there is not the same difference between the men and the women in Tahiti as in Europe.[2] Of the natives of King George's Sound, Captain Cook remarked that "the women are nearly of the same size, colour and form as the men, from which it is not easy to distinguish them."[3] The sexes are not easily to be distinguished by Europeans among the Eskimo, Chukchi, Kamtchadals and allied races. Among the Botocudos men are said to be feminine-looking and women masculine;[4] and of the Campas of Peru it is also remarked that it is difficult to distinguish the women from the men.[5] Of the Patagonians, Mr. Hutchinson says, "it is difficult to recognise the sexes."[6] Among the Sakai of the Malay Peninsula the sexes are very much alike in appearance.[7] The Kuki and the Marring tribes of Assam have a tradition that different ways of wearing the hair were introduced among them in order to obviate the difficulty of distinguishing the sexes.[8] The Chinese have a similar tradition.[9] To a large extent the secondary physical sexual characters of men and women would appear to be a product of social conditions and of artificial cultivation.

Women as Hunters and Fishers.

That the pursuit of hunting, one of the primary factors in the primitive division of labour, has been taken up by men and not by women is not due to any incapacity on the part of the latter. In British Columbia the women used to hunt, and were "nearly as good hunters as the men."[10] Eskimo women have been known to refuse to marry, to set up their own home, and hunt for themselves.[11] The women of New Spain, Herrera tells us, used to go

[1] H. H. Johnston, *British Central Africa*, p. 398.

[2] W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, vol. i, p. 81.

[3] J. Cook, *A Voyage to the Pacific Ocean*, vol. ii, p. 303.

[4] R. C. Avé-Lallemant, *Reise durch Nord-Brasilien*, vol. i. p. 286.

[5] E. Grandidier, *Voyage dans l'Amérique du Sud, Pérou et Bolivie*, p. 139.

[6] T. J. Hutchinson, "The Tehuelche Indians of Patagonia," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society*, N.S., vii, p. 320.

[7] G. B. Cerruti, *Nel paese dei veleni. Fra i Sakai*, p. 120.

[8] T. C. Hodson, *The Naga Tribes of Manipur*, pp. 27 sq.

[9] P. Du Halde, *The General History of China*, vol. i, p. 271: "The sexes were not distinguished by different habits. Fu-Hi reformed this disorder; he commanded the women to distinguish themselves by their habits." Cf. *Deuteronomy*, xxii. 5.

[10] S. S. Allison, "Account of the Similkamen Indians of British Columbia," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxi, p. 307.

[11] W. H. Dall, "Social Life among our Aborigines," *The American Naturalist*, xii, pp. 5 sq.

hunting regularly with the men. "The women followed their husbands, leaving their children, hung in baskets made of boughs of trees till they returned from hunting, their bellies being first filled with suck." [1] Of the women of Nicaragua we are told that " they could run and swim and shoot with bows and arrows as well as the men." [2] Fuegian women are said to have formerly done most of the hunting.[3] Among the Tungus, young unmarried women and widows dispense with the primitive division of labour; they hunt for themselves, and they are pronounced to be " good shots and hunters of land-game." [4] Tibetan women are adepts at using the sling, " and the accuracy with which they fling stones and hit the mark at very great distances is really marvellous." [5] In West Africa the women formerly used to " carry bows and arrows and to go out hunting without the aid of the men." [6] Among the Hill Dayaks of Borneo a spear forms part of the equipment of every woman; they go out hunting with dogs.[7] In Tasmania the women hunted the opossum, and they provided all the food except that derived from the kangaroo.[8] Procopius mentions certain barbarians of ' Thule,' among whom men and women hunted together.[9]

Fishing, which with many primitive populations is the chief means of subsistence, is commonly done by both men and women; often it is exclusively a woman's occupation, as, for instance, among the Bambala,[10] the Tasmanians,[11] the Fuegians. The Fuegian women not only collect shell-fish from the rocks, but go out to sea in canoes, which are their exclusive property, and conduct operations on a large scale. Their apparatus is most primitive: they fashion lines out of the roots of certain plants, weight them with a stone, and tie the bait to the end; they use no hook. The results which they obtain with this rudimentary tackle are astounding. The fish apparently follows the bait when the line is pulled on feeling a bite; it is then simply caught in the water with the hands. " Often," say MM. Hyades and Deniker, " we have seen them take large quantities of fine fish when our own sailors

[1] A. de Herrera, *General History of the West Indies*, vol. iii, p. 188.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 3.
[3] A. Cojazzi, *Los Indios del Archipelago Fueguino*, p. 24.
[4] W. Bogoras, *The Chukchee*, p. 601.
[5] A. H. Savage Landor, *In the Forbidden Land*, vol. ii, p. 3.
[6] " Adventures of Andrew Battel," in Pinkerton, *Voyages and Travels*, vol. xvi, p. 334.
[7] C. Lumholtz, *Through Unknown Borneo*, vol. i, pp. 182 sq.
[8] J. Bonwick, *Daily Life and Origin of the Tasmanians*, p. 55.
[9] Procopius, *De bello Gothico*, ii. 15, p. 207.
[10] E. Torday and T. A. Joyce, " Notes on the Ethnography of the Ba-Mbala," *Journal of the Anthropoliogcal Institute*, xxxv, p. 405.
[11] J. Bonwick, *loc. cit.*

at the same time and place barely succeeded in securing a few, using European lines and fish-hooks." The women go out in all weathers, and even at night, though they are entirely naked, and at certain seasons they not only provide the whole food-supply of the tribe, but in addition supply English missionaries with quantities of fish in exchange for biscuits and theology.[1] The women alone are able to swim.[2]

It is abundantly clear that the division of labour between the sexes has not arisen from any inability of primitive woman to provide for herself. An account given by Hearne of a Canadian Indian woman who, having been taken prisoner by a hostile tribe, had escaped and had for seven months lived entirely alone, illustrates the manner in which primitive woman is able to supply all her needs. She had constructed ingenious traps and had supported herself by snaring animals and birds. She had built a comfortable hut, had manufactured knives and needles, made herself clothes, which were not only warm and comfortable, but "showed great taste and not a little variety and ornament." She had a neat store of provisions, was in perfect health and condition, and had a prosperous appearance.[3] Among the Arawaks, women whose husbands have died and whose children have got married are found at the present day living together in self-supporting little communities where there are no men; they clear their own field, build their home, and provide for all their own needs.[4]

The primitive division of labour as regards the procuring of food and the exclusion of women from hunting has become firmly established rather by the spirit of professional exclusiveness and monopoly which is a marked feature of all occupations in primitive society than by natural differences in aptitude. That professional spirit is well illustrated by the circumstances which led to the famous feud between the Iroquois and Algonkin nations in North America. Formerly the two races were allies. Among the Iroquois agriculture had assumed so much importance that it had in great part been taken up by the men, who, therefore, gave up to

[1] P. Hyades and J. Deniker, in *Mission scientifique du Cap Horn*, vol. vii, pp. 368 sqq. Cf. G. Bove, *Patagonia, Terra del Fuoco, Mari Australi*, p. 131; *The Narrative of the Honourable John Byron*, p. 96.

[2] A. Cojazzi, *Los Indios del Archipelago Fueguino*, p. 96; C. Spegazzini "Costumbres de los habitantes de la Tierra de Fuego," *Anales de la Sociedad Cientifica Argentina*, xiv, p. 171. Vespucci states that Arawak women are better swimmers than the men (A. Vespucci, *Quattuor Navigationes*, in M. F. de Navarrete, *Colecion de Viajes*, vol. iii, p. 204).

[3] S. Hearne, *Journey from the Prince of Wales's Fort to the Northern Ocean*, p. 62.

[4] W. Curtis Farabee, *The Central Arawaks* (*University of Pennsylvania Anthropological Publications*, vol. ix), p. 167.

a large extent the pursuit of hunting. The Algonkins had little agriculture and remained pure hunters. The two races came to an understanding and formed an economic alliance for their mutual advantage, the Iroquois supplying the Algonkins with agricultural products and preparing the hides which the hunters obtained, while the Algonkins furnished the Iroquois with meat. The Algonkins, however, with the deep professional pride of the hunter, affected to despise the Iroquois, taunting them with doing women's work. Mixed parties of the two nations would often proceed together on hunting expeditions, the Algonkins doing the actual hunting and the Iroquois dealing with the carcasses. On one such occasion, it is related, the Algonkin hunters were completely unsuccessful, and after vain efforts returned to camp empty-handed. The Iroquois members of the party offered to try their luck, but the proposition was scouted by the Algonkins, who scorned the absurd notion that, where they themselves had failed, men who were addicted to women's pursuits could succeed; and they, moreover, strictly forbade the Iroquois to make any such presumptuous attempt. Nevertheless, the Iroquois stole secretly away during the night and proceeded to seek out the buffaloes, and presently they returned to camp loaded with game. So mortally was the pride of the Algonkin hunters wounded by the humiliation that on the following night they murdered all but one or two of the Iroquois. That deed led to the feud between the two nations and to the formation of the famous League of the Iroquois, the mightiest native military power of North America.[1]

"It has been alleged," remarks a writer in speaking of the Congo natives, "that the black imposes upon his mate all the base tasks, while he reserves for himself those which are regarded as noble, such as hunting, fishing and war. That conception may to a certain extent be true as a statement of the sentiments which exist at the present day, but it is wholly erroneous if put forward as a general explanation. . . . Certain tasks falling habitually to the lot of the men, these have little by little come to regard them as manly, as the only forms of labour which they could undertake without derogation—in short as 'noble' occupations—whereas those tasks which have devolved upon the women, whom several savages regard as inferior beings, have come to be looked upon as inferior tasks."[2]

[1] F. X. de Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, vol. v, pp. 295 sqq. Cf. N. Perrot, *Mémoire sur les moeurs, coutumes et religion des sauvages de l'Amérique septentrionale*, pp. 9 sqq.; B. de la Potherie, *Histoire de l'Amérique septentrionale*, vol. i, pp. 292 sqq.

[2] *Annales du Musée du Congo Belge, Ethnologie et Anthropologie* Série iii, vol. ii, p. 23.

Women as Warriors.

The differentiation of the man as warrior and fighter is certainly not due to any constitutional indisposition or incapacity in primitive woman, but to economic necessities. Australian women are "perfectly capable of taking care of themselves at all times, and so far from being an encumbrance on the warriors, they will fight if need be as bravely as the men, and with even greater ferocity." [1] One writer relates how, on hearing an alarm raised, "the women threw off their rugs, and each, armed with a short club, flew to the assistance of their husbands and brothers." [2] "It not infrequently happens," says another writer, "that while the battle is raging between warriors, the gins become too excited to be mere spectators; seizing their yam-sticks, they fall on each other with cries, shrieks, howls and gesticulations truly barbarous." [3] In Borneo it was quite common for women to fight by the side of the men, and even to lead them into battle. Brooke, who is disposed to speak disparagingly of certain chieftainesses with whom he had considerable trouble, recognises that the success of the military operations which they conducted was due entirely to their personal ability and courage.[4] Among the Hill Dayaks, when the men are away on a war expedition the women remain in the village, but if it is attacked they defend it.[5] In the island of Buru, in the southern Moluccas, "the women did duty with the men and were as able to withstand any enemy whatever, being of a very large breed, but furnished with few good qualities." [6] In the Caroline Islands "the women take a share in the war, not only to defend their country against the enemy, but also to attack, and in the squadron, they form, though in small numbers, a part of the military forces." [7] In the Ladrones Islands they fought under female leaders.[8] In New Guinea the women accompany the men in warlike expeditions. In Kumusi, in the north of Papua, they act as spear-bearers, and on Kiwai they follow their husbands with a kind of wooden sword. Even at the present day they sometimes take a more active part in warfare. In the year 1900 a punitive expedition was sent against a sanguinary tribe of the interior. "The whole collected force of the district met the constabulary

[1] A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, p. 147.

[2] J. Morgan, *The Life and Adventures of William Buckley*, p. 43.

[3] E. Thorne, *The Queen of the Colonies*, p. 134.

[4] C. Brooke, *Ten Years in Sarawak*, vol. i, p. 131. Cf. C. A. L. M. Schwaner, *Borneo*, vol. i, p. 161.

[5] C. Lumholtz, *Through Unknown Borneo*, vol. i, pp. 182 sq.

[6] J. Talton, "Voyage of Captain G. Castleton to Priaman in 1612," in Astley's *New Collection of Voyages and Travels*, vol. i, p. 472.

[7] O. von Kotzebue, *A New Voyage round the World*, vol. i, pp. 321 sq.

[8] Id., *A Voyage of Discovery into the South Sea*, vol. iii, p. 171.

and commenced pouring in showers of arrows from the scrub and from each house in the village. Heavy volleys silenced the fire from the bush, but the arrows still came from the houses. To the surprise and dismay of the officer in command it was found that the garrisons of the houses contained as many women as men, and they were using the bow as capably as their husbands. One woman came to the door of a house and deliberately drew an arrow on the police sergeant." [1] In Hawaii and in New Zealand " women were accustomed to attend their husbands and relations in battle." [2] Speaking of the Hervey Islanders, Mr. Gill reports as a notable circumstance that " rarely did women fight; their part was to stand behind their husbands to carry baskets of stones and weapons with which to supply the warriors. Heavy tikom cloths were thrown by the wives over the spears to turn their points aside." [3]

Among the North American Indians the women frequently accompanied the men in war.[4] Among the Iroquois " many of the Indian women were as famous in war as powerful in council." The special honorific title of ' Beloved ' was bestowed on women who had distinguished themselves by warlike deeds.[5] Many acts of heroism are recorded of Indian squaws. Captain Carver mentions a woman who, having been captured by the enemy, presently returned to her camp bearing the scalps of all her captors.[6] In the lower Mississippi valley the early Jesuit missionaries came upon a woman who " had so distinguished herself by the blows that she had inflicted upon their enemies, having in person led several war parties, that she was looked upon as an Amazon and the mistress of the whole village. Greater honour was paid to her than to the chief." [7] During their expedition on the Klamath in 1854 the United States troops frequently saw women fighting or found them dead on the battlefield. " One day the savages came suddenly upon them, advancing rapidly over the brow of a hill, and filling the air with a perfect shower of arrows. But not a male barbarian was in sight. Before them, in serried line of battle, their women were moving to the charge, while the warriors slunk behind them discharging their arrows between the women." [8] In the province of Cartagena the Spaniards found that

[1] W. N. Beaver, *Unexplored New Guinea*, p. 123.

[2] J. Jarves, *History of the Hawaiian Islands*, p. 64; J. S. Polack, *Manners and Customs of the New Zealanders*, p. 64.

[3] W. W. Gill, *The South Pacific and New Guinea*, p. 15.

[4] M. G. J. de Crèvecoeur, *Voyage dans la Haute Pensylvanie et dans l'État de New York*, vol. i, p. 10; G. B. Grinnell, *The Cheyennes*, vol. i, p. 157.

[5] *The Memoirs of Lieut. H. Timberlake*, pp. 70 sq.

[6] J. Carver, *Travels through the Interior Parts of North America*, pp. 332 sqq.

[7] J. Gilmary Shea, *Early Voyages Up and Down the Mississippi*, p. 144.

[8] S. Powers, *Tribes of California*, p. 248.

" the women fight as well as the men." One female prisoner taken had accounted for eight Spaniards. In Chimitas " the women go to war, and show both skill and courage." [1] The wives of chiefs followed their husbands in battle, and chieftainesses led their men in person.[2] Columbus and his companions were attacked by female archers.[3]

Primitive women are not only as courageous as the men, but they are, it must be admitted, even more cruel and ferocious. The American Indians handed their prisoners to the women to be tortured, and the squaws excelled in the ingenuity of their cruelty.[4] The old women among the Lenapes " in vindictiveness, ferocity and cruelty far exceed the men." [5] Among the Hottentots women used to torture slaves, beating them with boughs of the thorny acacia, and rubbing salt and saltpetre in their wounds. When engaged in this feminine pastime " one could easily read in their faces the infernal joy it gave them to witness the tortures of their victims." [6] In Western Australia Sir George Grey remarked that " the ferocity of the women exceeds that of the men." [7] In Fiji the women excelled the men in fiendish cruelty; one of their favourite amusements was to torture prisoners of war by slowly scraping off their skin with a sharp shell.[8] During a battle they would rush upon a fallen foe, tear his body open with their teeth, and drink his blood; [9] and they led their children over the battlefield, teaching them to kick and tread upon the bodies of enemies.[10] In New Britain the women " were generally the most prominent in abusing the dead and in inciting their own people to the perpetration of any insult or cruelty which was possible." [11] The women are apparently the chief instigators of head-hunting in Borneo; [12] and the natives of New Guinea say that it was the women who first urged them to cannibalism.[13]

[1] F. L. de Gomara, *Historia general de las Indias*, p. 200.

[2] G. F. d'Oviedo, " Historia generale e naturale dell' India," in Ramusio, *Navigationi et Viaggi*, vol. iii, fol. 45.

[3] Pietro Martire, *ibid.*, fol. 28.

[4] F. X. de Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, vol. v, pp. 357 sqq.; J. O. Dorsey, " Omaha Sociology," *Third Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, pp. 312 sq.

[5] J. T. Sharf and T. Westcott, *History of Philadelphia*, vol. i, p. 49.

[6] T. Hahn, " Die Nama-Hottentoten," *Globus*, xii, p. 304.

[7] G. Grey *Journals of Two Expeditions of Discovery in North-West and Western Australia*, vol. ii, 314.

[8] Père Mathieu, in *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi*, xxviii (1856), p. 389.

[9] L. Fison and A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, p. 214 n.

[10] T. Williams, *Fiji and the Fijians*, vol. i, p. 177.

[11] G. Brown, *Melanesians and Polynesians*, p. 153.

[12] C. Hose and W. McDougall, *The Pagan Tribes of Borneo*, vol. i, pp. 186 sq.

[13] J. Chalmers, *Pioneering in New Guinea*, pp. 62 sq.

Among the inland tribes the women, when left alone with prisoners whose lives the men have decided to spare, often kill them and eat them.[1] Among the ancient Irish, likewise, the women appear to have been the main instigators to cannibalism. In a poem of the cycle of Fionn, the wife of Goll MacMorna urges her husband to eat the bodies of his slain enemies.[2]

Among the Guanches of the Canaries women fought in the ranks.[3] Among the Berber tribes of Morocco the women gallop about, riding straddle-legged, and can, when occasion demands, use a rifle as well as the men.[4] Tibbu women are always armed.[5] Women quite commonly join with the men in warfare among Berber, Bedawi, and Arab tribes;[6] and the Arabs themselves encountered desperate resistance from women soldiers in North Africa.[7] Arab history is full of the warlike deeds of women; they not only stood close behind the men in every battle, and after the fray finished off the wounded, but heroic amazons commonly took an active part in the fighting, and have often turned the tide of battle and saved the lives of their brothers, husbands, or chiefs.[8] In the eighteenth century Ghaliya, the wife of a Wahabi chief, opposed Muhammad Ali in many a bloody field.[9] Among the Fanti, female troops fought regularly in the field,[10] and the Fulahs have fought under the leadership of amazons.[11] Among the Watuta of East Africa the women joined the men in battle.[12] The Sultan of Zanzibar had an army corps of six thousand female soldiers.[13]

There is no reason to suppose that such female warriors are purely ornamental. Such is certainly not the case as regards the famous corps of Amazons of Dahomey. It is stated that without

[1] H. Detzner, *Vier Jahre unter Kannibalen*, p. 277.

[2] *The Book of the Lays of Fionn*, ed. E. McNeill, (*Irish Text Society*), p. 122.

[3] G. Chil y Naranjo, *Estudios historicos de las Islas Canarias*, vol. i, p. 410.

[4] M. de Segonzac, *Voyages au Maroc*, p. 136.

[5] G. Nachtigal, "Die Tibbu," *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin*, v. p. 295.

[6] F. J. Mayeux, *Les Bédouins*, vol. ii, p. 150.

[7] *Une Jeanne d'Arc Africaine, épisode de l'invasion des Arabes en Afrique.*

[8] See R. Geyer, "Die arabische Frauen in der Schlacht," *Mitteilungen der anthropologische Gesellschaft*, Wien, xxxix, pp. 149 sqq.

[9] R. F. Burton, *Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to Al-Madinah and Meccah*, vol. ii, p. 94.

[10] B. Cruikshank, *Eighteen Years on the Gold Coast*, vol. i, p. 245.

[11] A. Bastian, *Die Rechtsverhältnisse bei verschiedenen Völker der Erde*, p. 181.

[12] R. F. Burton, *The Lake Regions of East Africa*, vol. ii, p. 77.

[13] Duarte Barbosa, *Viaggi*, in G. B. Ramusio, *Navigationi et Viaggi*, vol. i, fol. 288.

their assistance the Dahomey monarchy would have long since fallen from the rank it occupied among African kingdoms. It was to the courage and devotion of the Amazons that King Gueso owed his safety in the disastrous expedition against Abeokuta. The women alone stood their ground, in spite of appalling losses, while the rest of the army scattered in utter rout. On another occasion King Gueso's successor and the rest of the army took to flight, while the Amazons were hacked to pieces rather than yield an inch of ground. Their strenuous training has often been described by eye-witnesses. In their manoeuvres they take fortified positions by assault, charging through obstacles formed of cactus, thorny bushes and spikes; and as they march past after those playful sham-fights, their bodies are streaming with blood and the skin hangs in shreds from their torn limbs. They crown and girdle themselves with thorns as trophies, smiling proudly.[1] "Their appearance," says Mr. J. Duncan, late of the 1st Life Guards, "is more martial than the generality of the men, and if conducting a campaign, I should prefer the female to the male soldiers of this country. From what I have seen of Africa, I believe that the King of Dahomey possesses an army superior to any west of the Great Desert."[2]

The Tartar and Mongol women of Central Asia have long been noted as active and warlike viragoes. Their horsemanship surpasses that of the men of most countries, and "their bows and arrows," says an old author, "are their rings and jewels. They accompany their husbands in the wars, and many times charge with them into the very midst of the enemy's battalion."[3] Matthew Paris, in describing the Mongol hordes of Jinghis Khan, refers to the fierceness of "their wives, who are brought up to fight like the men."[4] The habits of the women among Turkic nomads are the same at the present day. Speaking of the Hazarah, a Tartar tribe of Afghanistan, General Ferrier remarks: "The women are proud of being able, when necessity requires, to mount a horse and use a firelock or sword with an intrepidity equal to that of their warlike brothers and husbands."[5] "In all the hordes which I passed," says Mr. Creagh, "the ladies were armed almost

[1] A. B. Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, pp. 183 sq.; K. Laffitte, *Le Dahomé*, pp. 86 sqq.

[2] J. Duncan, *Travels in Western Africa in 1845 and 1846*, vol. i, p. 240.

[3] J. Palafox y Mendoza, *The History of the Tartars*, p. 582. Cf. J. Deguignes, *Histoire des Huns*, etc., vol. iii, p. 5; H. Vámbéry, *Das Türkenvolk*, p. 341.

[4] Matthew Paris, *Chronica Magna* (*Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland*), vol. iv, p. 77.

[5] J. P. Ferrier, *Caravan Journeys and Wanderings in Persia, Afghanistan, Turkistan and Beloochistan*, p. 194. Cf. E. Huntington, "The Mountains of Turkestan," *The Geographical Journal*, xxv, pp. 154 sqq.

as copiously as the men, and a long gun often hung over the fair shoulder of a damsel who seemed to wield her spear with all the ease and dexterity of a well-drilled lancer." [1] Mr. Wilson relates how his party were prevented from entering Shipki by "a band of handsome and very powerful young Tartar women, clad in red or black tunics, loose trousers, and immense cloth boots." "Woman to man, I believe these guardian angels could have given our people a sound thrashing. These angels in big boots were very good-humoured, and seemed to enjoy their little game immensely, but not the less on that account were very pertinacious, and even ferocious, when any attempt was made to get past them. If catching a Tartar be a difficult operation, I should like to know what catching a Tartar woman must be." [2] The manner in which household ties have restricted the activities of primitive woman is illustrated by the habits of the Uzbek tribe, in the neighbourhood of Bokhara. They are wild brigands who dwell in the mountains and live chiefly by attacking and plundering caravans. Their women sometimes accompany them in their marauding expeditions, but usually have to remain at home while the men are away. If, however, an unfortunate caravan happens to pass near at such a time, the women alone set upon it, put the convoy to flight, and rob the travellers quite as effectively as the men could have done.[3]

The Kings of Siam used to keep an Amazonian guard; and so did the Nizam of Hyderabad.[4] The kings of Kandy likewise kept a bodyguard of female archers.[5] The Persian kings also are said to have had a bodyguard of Amazons.[6] Those corps of female warriors, like those with which the Satrap Atropates met Alexander,[7] and which Thalestris presented to him,[8] had doubtless their origin in tried efficiency. Among the Maratha, the great military caste of Southern India, women played a conspicuous part, and many Maratha princesses have led troops in person. The famous Rāni of Ghansi, during the Indian Mutiny, was called by the rebels their best man.[9] Of the ancient Scythians Diodorus reports that

[1] J. Creagh, *Armenians, Koords, and Turks*, vol. ii, p. 168.

[2] A. Wilson, *The Abode of Snow*, pp. 169 sq.

[3] A. Burnes, *Travels in Bokhara*, vol. ii, p. 219.

[4] H. Schaaffhausen, *Anthropologischen Studien*, p. 661; H. Mouhot, "Voyage dans le royaumes de Siam, Cambodge, de Laos, etc.," *Le Tour du Monde*, 1863, p. 238.

[5] Duarte Barbosa, *Viaggi*, in G. B. Ramusio, *Navigationi et Viaggi*, vol. i, fol. 315.

[6] Athenaeus, xii. 8.

[7] Arrian, vii. 13.

[8] Justin, xii. 3; Diodorus Siculus, xvii. 77; Plutarch, *Vit. Alexand.*, 46; Strabo, xi. 505; Arrian, iv. 15.

[9] R. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, vol. iv, p. 207.

" the women fight like the men and are nowise inferior to them in bravery." [1] In the light of the facts of comparative ethnology, and of what we know of Tartar and other Asiatic women, it is certainly unjustifiable to dismiss the traditions of the encounters of the Greeks with Asiatic Amazons as intrinsically incredible.[2]

Among all the barbaric nations of Europe the women were wont to accompany the men in war and to take part in warfare. The Walkyries of Nordic and Teutonic myth are, as Müllenhoff remarks, regarded as ideals of womanhood, it being considered a woman's part to share all dangers with her husband or brothers.[3] " It often happened," says a Norwegian historian, " that the women dressed in warrior's garb and followed their husbands and brothers in battle. They showed alertness and bravery equal to that of the best warriors. Sometimes the women would even become leaders of armies, like the ' Red Maiden,' a Norwegian amazon, who led an army in Ireland in the tenth century." [4]

[1] Diodorus Siculus, ii. 44.

[2] The Amazons were Scythian women. There is agreement among ancient writers as to the original location of the Amazons on the shores of the Caspian (Diodorus Siculus, ii. 45, iii. 52 ; Justin, ii. 4 ; Strabo, xi. 503 sq. ; Sallust, *Fragm.*, iii, 46 ; Aeschylus, *Prometh.*, 415, 723 ; Herodotus, iv, 110 sqq.), and among those accounts is that of the cautious and generally reliable Strabo, who treats the matter as historical. In the same region Chinese annals placed the ' Western Kingdom of Women ' (W. W. Rockhill, *The Land of the Lamas*, p. 339). The Tcherkiss, who know even less of Greek literature than did the Chinese, affirm that there existed in the same region a race of female warriors. They call them ' emetchi,' which means ' descended through women ' (H. J. von Klaproth, *Reise nach den Caucasus*, vol. i, p. 655 ; M. Kovalewski, " Marriage among the Early Slavs," *Folk-lore*, i, p. 470). The etymology of the name ' Amazon,' from μαξός (Philostratus, *Heroicon*, xix. 19 ; Eustathius, *ad Homer.*, p. 402), which is so un-Greek as to be susceptible of being interpreted in half a dozen different ways (' lacking a breast,' ' breast-fed,' ' not fed at the breast,' ' with strong breasts,' etc.), is manifestly fanciful. It would be strange that a race of fabulous beings, having no existence except in Greek imagination, should have been called by a name which appears to have no Greek etymology. The conjecture that the word is but a Greek rendering of ' emetchi ' would explain the anomaly. The name Amazon was naturally applied to the numerous women among the Aegean populations of Asia Minor who took part in war. This, we know, was the custom with Mysian women (see above, p. 390), and in historical times, where there can be no question of any myth, the Karian queen Artemisia led a contingent in the army of Xerxes. Diodorus says (iii. 52–3) that there were also Amazons in Libya who were older than those of Pontus. There is nothing surprising in this, considering the abundance of Amazons in Africa in our own day. The ' ubiquity ' of the Amazons has been adduced as evidence of their mythical character, but that Amazonian women abounded does not prove that they did not exist. (See the sensible remarks of Professor Ridgeway on the subject, *The Early Age of Greece*, pp. 651 sq. n.).

[3] C. von Müllenhoff, *Deutsche Alterthumskunde*, vol. iv, p. 205.

[4] Knut Gjerset, *History of the Norwegian Peoples*, vol. i, p. 76.

Celtic women regularly followed their male relatives in war, and such military service was not abolished in Ireland until the year 590.[1] Irish literature abounds with references to warlike women and corps of amazons. Queens were expected to lead their armies in battle, and the famous Queen Medb, although she is pictured as somewhat of a coward, puts on full armour and accompanies her army.[2] The hero, Cuchulainn, has a hard fight with the famous amazon, Princess Aife, who shatters his chariot and breaks his sword at the hilt.[3] Irish tradition preserves the memory of warlike chieftainesses, such as Geraldine Desmond, who "was a fierce and restless character, always leading her clansmen to make frays in all the adjoining district. She killed all who opposed her, and took possession of their property."[4]

The Romans remembered that in the first terrible encounter with the overflowing tide of barbarian invasion at Aquae Sextiae "the fight had been no less fierce with the women than with the men themselves." The Cimric and Teuton women fought like perfect furies. "They charged with swords and axes, and fell upon their opponents uttering a hideous outcry." When the barbarian onslaught broke against Roman discipline, the women erected barricades and entrenched themselves, fighting fiercely with their axes and lances amid the mountains of dead. When summoned to surrender, they killed their children, slaughtered one another and hanged themselves to trees.[5] Among the slain Marcomanni and Quadi the Romans found the bodies of women in full armour.[6] Several of the Gothic warriors taken prisoners turned out to be women.[7] The same thing was observed by the Byzantines when they were attacked by the Varangians.[8] Queen Boudicca boasted that British women were quite as good soldiers as the men.[9]

Of the endurance and courage of primitive woman there is an even more general test. Childbirth appears to be, as a rule, easier with her than with civilised women, partly owing to the smaller size of savage babies at birth; but the remarkable endurance shown by primitive women on those occasions is by no means

[1] D. Hyde, *A Literary History of Ireland*, p. 234; J. A. MacCulloch, *The Religion of the Ancient Celts*, p. 72

[2] *Táin Bó Cúalnge*, tr. H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, pp. 46, 242 sqq.

[3] E. Hull, *The Cuchullin Saga in Irish Literature*, pp. 77 sq.

[4] Lageniensis, *Irish Local Legends*, p. 25.

[5] Plutarch, *Vita Marii*, xix; Florus, *Epitomae*, i. 38.

[6] Dio Cassius, lxxi. 3.

[7] Vopiscus, *Aurelianus*, xxxiv.

[8] Cedrenus, *Synopsis*, vol. ii, p. 406.

[9] Xiphilinus, Epitome of Dio Cassius, *Histor. Roman.*, lxii. 6.

wholly due to this cause. "It is said," remarks Long, "that the Indian women bring forth children with very little pain, but I believe it is merely an opinion. It is true they are strong and hardy, and will support fatigue to the moment of delivery, but that does not prove that they are exempt from the common feeling of the sex on such trying occasions. A young woman of the Rat tribe has been known to be in labour a day and a night without a groan."[1] Long's opinion is confirmed by Dr. Keating, who says that labour, with Dakotan women, may last from two to four days;[2] and Charlevoix says that "sometimes labour is very prolonged and they suffer a great deal."[3] "A woman," he says elsewhere, "will be a whole day in labour without uttering a cry. If she showed the least sign of pain she would be disgraced and considered unworthy of being a mother, and her child would grow up a coward."[4] The Spaniards wondered at the fortitude of the women of Cumana, who never uttered a complaint during labour.[5] In the conceptions of the ancient Mexicans "women dying in childbirth are regarded as the female counterparts of warriors falling in battle or immolated on the sacrificial stone. Hence they were called 'mocinaquetzqui,' 'the warriors appearing in the form of a woman.'" Pieces of skin or flesh from a woman who had died in childbirth were worn by Aztec warriors as a charm to impart courage.[6] If, among South American tribes, the mother uttered a groan, the child was usually killed.[7] Dr. Winterbottom likewise remarks of the women of Sierra Leone that the inference drawn from the way savage women bring forth their children without a sound being heard is in some respects misleading. With all African women it is a traditional rule and a point of honour that no sign of pain shall be shown during labour.[8] The same thing has been noted in most parts of the world; thus the endurance of Maori women who bore labour-pains without uttering a cry has been commented upon.[9]

[1] J. Long, *Voyages and Travels of an Indian Interpreter*, p. 59.

[2] W. H. Keating, *Narrative of an Expedition to the Sources of St. Peter's River*, vol. i, p. 434.

[3] F. X. de Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, vol. v, p. 425.

[4] *Ibid.*, vol. vi, p. 9. Cf. La Potherie, *Histoire de l'Amérique Septentrionale*, vol. iii, p. 21.

[5] F. C. de Gomara, *Historia general de las Indias*, p. 206. Cf. A. de Herrera, *General History of the West Indies*, vol. iii, p. 304; P. de Cieza de Leon, *La Cronica del Peru*, p. 372.

[6] E. Seler, *Codex Fejérváry-Mayer*, p. 207.

[7] J. F. Lafitau, *Moeurs des sauvages amériquains*, vol. i, p. 592.

[8] T. Winterbottom, *An Account of the Native Africans of the Neighbourhood of Sierra Leone*, vol. ii, p. 209.

[9] M. J. Dumont d'Urville, *Voyages de la corvette L'Astrolabe*, vol. iv, p. 442.

Primitive Industry: Leatherwork, Embroidery, Weaving, Basketry.

It is, I think, clear from such facts as we have just considered that the differentiation of men as hunters and warriors is not due to any lesser physical capacity or to more limited powers of endurance, or deficient spirit or courage on the part of the women. But while the women are frequently known to share in the active pursuits of the men, the constructive occupations which have given rise to the development of material culture belong, in the rudest societies, almost exclusively to the sphere of women's work, and the men take no share in them. All industries were at first home industries, and developed therefore in the hands of the women, who were the home-makers and stayed at home; and those industries, with the exception of the manufacture of men's weapons, are at the present day, in primitive societies, exclusively feminine occupations.

To be clad in the skins of beasts may seem the crudest form of attire, but the preparation of those skin garments and of hides for the many uses to which they have been put has given rise to a long and wonderful industrial evolution. The Australians merely use unprepared dried skins of opossum, roughly sewn together with tendons, and rendered more flexible by cutting a series of slashes in the hide.[1] From that crude procedure an elaborate technique has developed, which embodies a multitude of trade secrets. It varies infinitely according to the use for which the leather is intended: pliable skins smoothed out to a uniform thickness and retaining the layer to which the hair is attached; hard hides for tents, shields, canoes, boots; thin, soft wash-leather for clothing—all require special technical processes which primitive woman has elaborated. The results achieved in leather-work by savage women elicit the admiration of experts. The North American Indian women "surpass the world in the beauty of their skin-dressing."[2] The women of Central Asia likewise "are wonderfully skilful at dressing hides. With the aid of milk and a wooden toothed implement they work the skin until it becomes as soft and

[1] A. W. Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, pp. 140 sq.

[2] O. T. Mason, "Aboriginal Skin-Dressing," *Report of the United States National Museum*, 1888–89, p. 568. Cf. R. W. Shufeldt, "The Navajo Tanner," *Proceedings of the United States National Museum*, xi, pp. 59 sqq.; A. L. Kroeber, "The Arapahos," *Bulletin American Museum of Natural History*, xviii, pp. 26 sq.; G. B. Grinnell, "The Lodges of the Blackfeet," *The American Anthropologist*, N.S., iii, pp. 651 sqq.; J. D. Hunter, *Memoirs of a Captivity among the Indians*, p. 200: "Their manner of dressing skins into leather, either with or without preserving the hair for many purposes, far exceeds those in general practice in the United States."

as fine as if it were tanned under the most scientific methods." [1] The strength and quality of the boots produced by Tartar women are admired.[2]

In order to carry out those industrial processes primitive woman has devised various implements. The 'scrapers,' which form so large a proportion of prehistoric tools, were used and made by women. In the days when Boucher de Perthes's discoveries of the palaeolithic tools of European humanity were being discussed, much controversy took place as to the possible use of those 'scrapers.' The fact which went farthest towards silencing scepticism was that the Eskimo women at the present day use instruments identical with those which their European sisters have left in such abundance in the drift gravels of the Ice Age. The scrapers and knives of the Eskimo women are often elaborately and even artistically mounted on handles of bone.[3] In South Africa the country is strewn with scrapers identical with those of palaeolithic Europe; and Mr E. S. Hartland learnt from the testimony of persons intimately acquainted with the Bushmen that those implements were manufactured by the women.[4] The question arises whether the art of flint-knapping was not a feminine invention, whether the scraping-knife preceded the axe and the lance-head, and whether man's first weapons were not, as were his first tools, devised by women. The flint arrow-heads of the Seri Indians, which are identical in type with those of palaeolithic Europe, are said to be manufactured by the women.[5]

From the prepared skins of fine fur animals and of birds all manner of garments are fashioned by industrious stitching. Eskimo women even utilise the intestines of fishes to manufacture shirts.[6] By combining various furs, and by the insertion of numerous pieces, elaborate designs and patterns are produced, and Eskimo robes thus fashioned, are often gorgeous. Aleutian women

[1] D. Carruthers, *Unknown Mongolia*, p. 221. Cf. P. S. Pallas, *Voyages en différentes provinces de l'Empire de Russie*, vol. i, pp. 513 sqq.

[2] N. Prejevalsky, *Mongolia*, vol. ii, p. 121.

[3] Cf. Lord Avebury, *Prehistoric Times*, pp. 504 sq.

[4] E. S. Hartland, "Notes on Some South African Tribes," *Man*, vii, p. 50.

[5] W. J. McGee, "The Seri Indians," *Seventeenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 274. Canoes are, as well as weapons, generally made by men, but the rule is not invariable. Of the American Indians, Hunter says: "Their canoes are made promiscuously by either men or women, and sometimes conjointly by both, according to the exigencies for which they are wanted" (J. D. Hunter, *Memoirs of a Captivity among the Indians*, p. 292; cf. M. Lescarbot, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, vol. iii, p. 757; J. Jetté, "L'organisation sociale des Ten'as," *Quinzième Session du Congrès des Américanistes, Quebec*, 1906, p. 406).

[6] F. X. de Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, vol. v, pp. 264 sq.

will sometimes spend a whole year over the production of a robe.[1] Needles are manufactured from the bones of birds and fishes, and thread out of the tendons of animals. The tendon-threads used by Eskimo women will pass through the eye of the finest needle of European manufacture.[2] The robes manufactured by North American squaws were richly ornamented with fringes and embroideries of various hairs and tendon-threads dyed in brilliant colours with the juice of berries.[3] Those dyes and embroidery patterns elicited the wonder of Father Théodat, who declared that "les couleurs qu'elles font sont si vives que les nôtres ne semblent point en approcher."[4] North American women attached the greatest importance to the work, and considered it, "when properly performed, quite as creditable as was bravery and success in war among the men." Their artistic labours were carried out as an almost religious function, and were subject to all manner of ritual rules. The sewing and ornamenting of robes with embroidery even formed the chief purpose of a kind of 'secret society' from which men were excluded.[5] An interesting light is thrown by these embroideries, not only on industrial technique, but on history. The same processes, the same materials, and the same fashions which are employed by the American Indian women are in vogue among the Aleutian women.[6] Passing over to the Asiatic continent—they are found again among the Chukchi,[7] among the women of Kamchatka,[8] among the Gilyak and the tribes of the Amur region,[9] among the Tungus,[10] and among the Samoyeds.[11] The same methods and artistic products are met with among the

[1] H. H. Bancroft, *The Native Races of the Pacific States*, vol. i, p. 89.

[2] O. T. Mason, *Woman's Share in Primitive Culture*, pp. 55 sq.

[3] G. Catlin, *Manners and Customs of the North American Indians*, pp. 132, 192; H. Ling Roth, "Mocassins and their Quill Work," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxxviii, p. 53.

[4] G. Sagard Théodat, *Le Grand Voyage du Pays des Hurons*, pp. 132, 192.

[5] G. B. Grinnell, *The Cheyenne Indians*, vol. i, pp. 159 sqq.

[6] W. Coxe, *An Account of the Russian Discoveries between Asia and America*, p. 104.

[7] W. Bogoras, *The Chukchee*, p. 226.

[8] H. Krashininnikof, *History of Kamtchatka*, p. 189; G. Georgi, *Description de toutes les Nations de l'Empire de Russie*, vol. iii, p. 83; W. Jochelson, "Scientific Results of the Ethnological Section of the Riabouchinsky Expedition of the Imperial Geographical Society to the Aleutian Islands and Kamtchatka," *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Congress of Americanists*, pp. 342 sq.

[9] L. von Schrenk, *Reisen und Forschungen im Amur-Lande*, vol. iii, pp. 309–401; B. Laufer, *The Decorative Art of the Amur Tribes* (*Jesup North Pacific Expedition* vol. iv,), pp. 22 sqq.; H. Schurtz, "Zur Ornamentik der Ainos," *Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, ix, pp. 237 sqq.

[10] J. Georgi, *Description de toutes les nations de l'Empire de Russie*, vol. iii, p. 55.

[11] *Ibid.*, vol. iii, p. 13.

Kalmuks,[1] and they have passed into Europe with the Lapps.[2] The Tartar and Kirghis women of Central Asia are also famed for the beauty of their embroidery; the material, at the present day, instead of being leather and tendon, is satin and silk, but the manner in which they still use their needle, passing it, like an awl, from above downwards, shows that formerly their work was done in leather, like that of the more primitive Asiatic tribes.[3] Tartar embroidery, and also that of the Gilyak, is, on the other hand, manifestly related to the similar industry of all Eastern women, from China to Persia and Syria. It would thus appear that the deft needlework wrought with gorgeous dye materials for which the women of Tyre were famous, and which still occupies the leisure of the harems of the East, can be directly connected by cultural links with the work of the Redskin squaw on the banks of the St. Lawrence and Mississippi and with the neolithic culture of the Eskimo and Aleutian women.[4]

In several tropical countries the inner bark of trees, beaten into a soft, pliable material and stamped with ornamental patterns, is used for clothing and mats. The manufacture of bark-cloth in Polynesia is a highly developed process, and, from the collection of the material and the preparation of the dyes, is entirely the work of women. Even princesses devote most of their time to it, although the work is extremely laborious.[5] In Hawaii, "as the daughters of chiefs took a pride in the manufacture of superior cloth, the queen would have felt it derogatory to her rank if any other female in the island could have finished a piece of cloth better than herself."[6]

Fibres of inner bark are also used, without any twisting or spinning, by the Ainu women of Yezo for the manufacture of cloth, which they weave without any special loom, the weft being fastened to a post at one end and to a board at the other. Leaning over the latter, they change the warp and pass through the filling, pressing it down with a sharp-edged board.[7] That arrange-

[1] P. S. Pallas, *Voyages en différentes provinces de l'Empire de Russie*, vol. i, pp. 513 sq.

[2] J. Georgi, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 7.

[3] N. Prejevalsky, *Mongolia*, vol. ii, p. 121; E. and P. Sykes, *Through Deserts and Oases in Central Asia*, p. 121. The transition from embroidery in tendon-thread to embroidery in silk has taken place since the Russian occupation in Kamtchatka. The Kamtchadal women now do both (Dall, *Alaska and its Resources*, p. 518).

[4] Cf. Ling Roth, "American Quillwork: a Possible Clue to its Origin," *Man*, xxiii, pp. 113 sqq.

[5] W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, vol. iv, pp. 109, 179, 184; P. Lesson, *Voyage autour du Monde*, vol. i, pp. 376 sqq. (Tahiti).

[6] W. Ellis, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 185.

[7] A. S. Bickmore, "Some Notes on the Ainos," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society*, N.S., vii, p. 17.

ment has developed into a simple loom, in which all the principles of the contrivance are embodied.[1] The same process is employed by the Stlatlumh Indians and other Salish tribes of British Columbia.[2] In the Caroline Islands, cloth is woven from the fibres of the hibiscus, and " the whole industry is in the hands of women, from the preparation of the material to the weaving of it on the loom." [3] The unspun filaments of palm-leaves and of grass, or ' raphia,' are also woven into cloth on primitive looms in the Congo and West Africa.[4] Weaving, although it has been later taken up, in some countries, by the men, who, in Central America, even did the spinning,[5] is everywhere originally a woman's industry. It has often attained a high degree of development in quite low stages of culture; thus the Abipone women, who have no agriculture, spin and weave cloths which are much sought after and admired by Europeans.[6] The Patagonian women, who have not even any earthenware, weave fine mantles of woollen yarn, beautifully dyed with many colours.[7]

Among the tribes of Manipur cloth, in ten different patterns, is produced in certain villages only. " This industry," says Mr. T. C. Hodson, " is carried on by the women alone, and the six villages, as far as possible, prevent their girls from marrying into a village where the industry is not practised. In this way a ' Clothworkers' Guild ' is in process of formation, and as a proof of the hold that

[1] I. L. Bird, *Unbeaten Tracks in Japan*, vol. ii, p. 92. Cf. H. Ling Roth, " Studies in Primitive Looms," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlvi, pp. 292 sqq.

[2] C. Hill Tout, " Report on the Ethnology of the Stlatlumh of British Columbia," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxxv, pp. 135 sq.

[3] J. Kubary, " Die Bewohner der Mortlock Inseln," *Mittheilungen der Geographischen Gesellschaft in Hamburg*, 1878–79, p. 267.

[4] H. H. Johnston, *George Grenfell and the Congo*, vol. ii, p. 589; H. Ling Roth, " Studies in Primitive Looms," *Journal of the Royal Anthopological Institute*, xlvii, pp. 113 sqq.; B. Ankermann, " L'ethnographie actuelle de l'Afrique méridionale," *Anthropos*, i, p. 586.

[5] A. de Herrera, *General History of the West Indies*, vol. iii, p. 297; A. F. Bandelier, *Papers of the Archaeological Institute of America*, Series iii, p. 141; F. C. Nicholas, " The Aborigines of the Province of Santa Marta, Colombia," *American Anthropologist*, N.S., iii, p. 613. The reason of this abnormality is clearly traceable and is interesting. Agriculture assumed so much importance with those tribes that it took up most of the time of the women, while at the same time the men were relieved from the necessity of hunting. Since there are no draught animals or cattle in America, the men did not, as elsewhere, at once take over, in the capacity of ploughmen, the agricultural work of the women. The latter being fully employed, the men were compelled to look after the manufacture of their own blankets and cloaks. For similar reasons men in Central Africa have taken up tailoring, and when the women require a stitch they come to their husbands to have their scanty attire mended.

[6] M. Dobrizhoffer, *An Account of the Abipones*, vol. ii, pp. 128, 130.

[7] T. Falkner, *A Description of Patagonia*, p. 128.

custom, once it has become custom, has on others outside the charmed circle, I may adduce the case of a woman of the village of Toloi who married a man of the village of Powi and wished to weave cloths in her new village, but was forbidden to do so by the people of Powi, who, so far from being desirous of acquiring this new and valuable accomplishment, declared that it was forbidden to them to weave cloths, and declared it a tabu. Every specialisation of function in this level of culture seems to derive its sanction from the idea that it is dangerous, in some vague mysterious way, to infringe the patent." [1] In Togoland the women weavers are similarly organised as a guild.[2]

The weaving of fibres on looms is a development of the more primitive art of plaiting by hand, which is one of the earliest achievements of feminine industry.[3] Even Australian,[4] Tasmanian,[5] Andamanese,[6] and Fuegian [7] women make baskets. Speaking of the Loyalty-Group woman, Mrs. Hadfield says: "If she found herself in want of a receptacle in which to carry her produce, she immediately broke off two or three leaves from a coconut-tree, and in a few minutes made herself a good stout basket."[8] The same description of the facility with which primitive women fashion a plaited receptacle applies to all. Maori women, if they have anything to carry, will pluck a couple of leaves of flax and will have a basket in which to carry their goods in less time than it takes to make a paper parcel. The weaving of bark and grass fibres by primitive women is often so marvellous that it could not be imitated by any man at the present day, even with the resources of machinery.[9] The so-called Panama hats, the best of which can be crushed and passed through a finger-ring, are a familiar example of a deftness and technical skill to which masculine fingers are untrained. Some of the basket-work of American squaws is equally wonderful; the cradles made by the

[1] T. C. Hodson, *The Naga Tribes of Manipur*, p. 47.

[2] M. Gehrts, *A Camera Actress in the Wilds of Togoland*, pp. 93 sq.

[3] M. D. C. Crawford, "Peruvian Textiles," *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History*, xii, p. 90.

[4] A. W. Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 719.

[5] J. Bonwick, *Daily Life of the Tasmanians*, p. 55.

[6] R. Owen, "On the Osteology and Dentition of the Aborigines of the Andaman Islands," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society*, N.S., ii, p. 36.

[7] P. P. King and R. Fitzroy, *Narrative of the Surveying Voyages of H.M.S. 'Adventure' and 'Beagle,'* vol. iii, Appendix, p. 144.

[8] E. Hadfield, *Among the Natives of the Loyalty Group*, p. 78.

[9] Arthur M. Champion, "The Atharaka," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlii, p. 89, xix, p. 34; O. T. Mason, "The Technic of Aboriginal American Basketry," *The American Anthropologist*, N.S., iii. pp. 109 sqq.; L. Farrand, *Basketry Designs of the Salish Indians (Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. i); C. Hose and W. McDougall, *Pagan Tribes of Borneo*, vol. i, pp. 211 sqq., vol. ii, pp. 134, 190.

Hupa women of California, for instance, are masterpieces of the art.[1] The soles of mocassins are also plaited from fibre.[2] Mat robes, many bearing elaborate designs, are produced by Polynesian women.[3] In New Zealand at least twelve different styles of mats, differing in the fashion of plaiting and known by different names, were in use. Each was the speciality of the women of a particular tribe. Initiation to the art was, among Maori women, conducted as a religious ceremony; a consecrated workshop, the 'whare pora,' was reserved for the work, and if a man entered the precincts all work was stopped and put aside.[4] The mats were often richly adorned with polychromatic designs in feathers. The Hawaiian feather cloaks are noted. "Nowhere in the world has the use of pretty feathers attained the refined magnificence seen in the Hawaiian Islands."[5]

Pottery.

The art of pottery is a feminine invention; the original potter was a woman. "Among all primitive peoples the ceramic art is found in the hands of women, and only under the influence of advanced culture does it become a man's occupation."[6] In every part of the world where an aboriginal industry of pottery manufacture exists the men have no part in it; as in British Central Africa, "it would be little, if at all, short of improper for a man to set about making pots."[7] The art is exclusively in the hands of women throughout North America,[8] Central and South

[1] O. T. Mason, *Woman's Share in Primitive Culture*, p. 46.

[2] W. Matthews, "The Mountain Chant: A Navajo Ceremony," *Fifth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 388.

[3] A. Thompson, *The Story of New Zealand*, vol. i, p. 126; S. Ella, "Polynesian Native Clothing," *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, viii, pp. 166 sq.

[4] A. Hamilton, *The Art Workmanship of the Maori Race in New Zealand*, vol. ii, pp. 276, 279; E. Best, "Omens and Superstitious Beliefs of the Maori," *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, vii, p. 129.

[5] W. T. Brigham, "Hawaiian Feather Work," *Memoirs of the Berenice Panshi Bishop Museum*, 1903, pt. i, pp. 9 sqq.

[6] H. Schurtz, *Urgeschichte der Kultur*, p. 271.

[7] A. Werner, *The Natives of British Central Africa*, p. 197.

[8] F. Parkman, *The Jesuits in North America in the Seventeenth Century*, p. xxx; H. R. Schoolcraft, *Indian Tribes*, vol. iii, p. 81; J. D. Hunter, *Memoirs of a Captivity among the Indians*, p. 296; A. Skinner, *Notes on Iroquois Archaeology*, p. 149; W. H. Holmes, "Aboriginal Pottery of the Eastern United States," *Twentieth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 163; Maximilian, Prince zu Wied, *Travels in the Interior of North America*, p. 348; G. Catlin, *Letters and Notes on the Manners, Customs and Condition of the North American Indians*, vol. i, p. 116, vol. ii, pp. 260 sqq.; G. B. Grinnell, *The Cheyenne Indians*, vol. i, pp. 235 sqq.; W. Bartram, *Travels through North and South Carolina, East and West Florida*, p. 513;

America,[1] and in those parts of the Malay Archipelago and Peninsula,[2]

A. S. le Page du Pratz, *Histoire de la Louisiane*, vol. ii, pp. 178 sq.; G. M. Butel-Dumont, *Mémoires historiques sur la Louisiane*, vol. ii, pp. 271 sq.; M. C. Stevenson, "The Zuñi Indians," *Twenty-third Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology*, p. 273; Id., "The Sia," *Eleventh Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 11; F. H. Cushing, "A Study of Pueblo Pottery," *Fourth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, pp. 511 sqq.; J. Bradbury, *Travels in the Interior of America*, p. 166; F. Russell, "The Pima Indians," *Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology*, p. 128.

[1] C. Lumholtz, *Unknown Mexico*, vol. i, pp. 250 sq.; De la Borde, "Relation de l'Origine des Caraïbes," in P. van Aa, *Recueil de divers voyages*, p. 23; E. Im Thurn, *Among the Indians of Guiana*, p. 277; R. Schomburgk, *Reisen in Britisch-Guiana*, vol. i, p. 124; F. S. Gilii, *Saggio di Storia Americana*, vol. ii, p. 315; A. von Humboldt, *Personal Narrative of Travels to the Equinoctial Regions of the New Continent*, vol. i. p. 196; W. Curtis Farabee, *Indian Tribes of Eastern Peru* (*Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology*, vol. x), pp. 86 sq.; T. Koch-Grünberg, "Frauenarbeit bei den Indianern Nord-West Brasiliens," *Mittheilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft*, Wien, 1908, pp. 177 sqq.; Id., *Zwei Jahre unter den Indianern*, vol. ii, p. 224; T. Guevara, *Historia de la civilización de Araucanía*, vol. i, p. 277; R. E. Latcham, "Ethnology of the Araucanos," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxix, p. 339; E. Boman, *Antiquités de la région Andine de la République Argentine*, vol. ii, pp. 478, 481 sq.; W. L. Herndon, *Exploration of the Valley of the Amazon*, Part i, p. 202; L. Gibbon, *ibid.*, Part ii, p. 246; A. Wallace, *Travels on the Amazon and Rio Negro*, p. 172; C. F. Hart, "Contribuiçoes para a etnologia do valle de Amazones," *Archivos du Museu Nacional do Rio de Janeiro*, vi, pp. 79 sqq.; A. d'Orbigny, *L'homme américain*, vol. ii, pp. 150, 232, 339, 369; H. H. Smith, *Brazil, the Amazon, and the Coast*, pp. 377 sqq.; G. E. Church, *Aborigines of South America*, pp. 121, 235; F. A. Varnhagen, *Historia geral do Brasil*, vol. i, p. 119; K. von den Steinen, *Unter Naturvölker Zentral-Brasiliens*, pp. 214 sqq.; E. Nordenskiöld, *Indianerleben*, pp. 122 sqq.; P. Ehrenreich, *Beiträge zur Völkerkunde Brasiliens*, p. 19; F. Krause, *In der Wildernissen Brasiliens*, pp. 281 sqq.; F. de Azara, *Voyage dans l'Amérique méridionale*, vol. ii. p. 129; J. Brogniart, *Traité des arts céramiques*, vol. i, p. 530; F. de Castelnau, *Expédition dans les parties intérieures de l'Amérique de Sud*, vol. vi, pp. 56, 307; J. B. Debret, *Voyage pittoresque et historique au Brésil*, vol. i, pp. xi, 53; J. B. von Spix and C. F. Ph. von Martius, *Travels in Brazil*, vol. ii, p. 246; N. Barbrook Grubb, *An Unknown People in an Unknown Land*, p. 72; M. Dobrizhoffer, *Historia de Abiponibus*, vol. ii, p. 131; F. R. do Prado, "Historia dos Indios Cavalleiros, ou da Nação Guaycurú," *Revista Trimensal do Historia e Geographia*, i, p. 32; "Noticia sopre os Indios Tupinambas," *ibid.*, p. 206; G. von Koenigswald, "Die Coroados in Südlichen Brasilien," *Globus*, xciv, p. 31; C. Teschauer, "Die Caingang, oder Coroados-Indianer im brasilianischen Staate Rio Grande do Sul," *Anthropos*, ix, p. 23; L. M. Torres, *Los primitivos habitantes del delta del Paraná*, p. 445.

[2] J. C. van Eerde, *De volken van Nederlandsch Indië*, vol. ii, pp. 16, 102; P. A. van der Lith en J. F. Snellman, *Encyclopaedie van Nederlandsch-Indië*, vol. iii, pp. 320 sqq.; J. F. Snellman, "Die Töpferei auf den Kei-Inseln," *Globus*, xcii, p. 308; G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua*, pp. 65, 381; H. F. C. Ten Kate, "Verslag eener reis in de Timorgroep en Polynesie," *Tijdschrift van het kon. Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig Genootschap*, 2de Ser., xi, p. 344; F. J. P. Sachse, *Het eiland Seram*

Melanesia,[1] and New Guinea,[2] where the art is practised as a native industry. In the Nicobar Islands pottery is made by the women only,[3] and in the Andaman Islands it is made exclusively by the women in the northern island, while in the south island men also make pots.[4] In the Pamir highlands of Central Asia the women manufacture all the pottery, and their crockery is admired for its artistic taste.[5] In the Nilgiri Hills, among the Khotas, the pottery "is made exclusively by the women";[6] and the same is the case among the wild tribes of Burma.[7] Throughout by far the greater part of Africa pottery is made by the women only.[8] Zulu tradition

en zijne bewoners, p. 122; M. Morkoswski, *Auf neuen Wegen durch Sumatra*, p. 167; C. G. S. Reinwardt, *Reis naar het oosterlijk gedeelte van den Indischen Archipel*, p. 144; A. Cabaton, *Java, Sumatra and the Other Islands of the Dutch East Indies*, p. 269; A. L. van Hasselt, *Volkbeschrijving van Midden-Sumatra*, p. 406; Id., "Aanteekenigen omtrent de Pottenbakkerij in de Residentie Tapanoeli," *Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, vi, p. 42; L. Wray, "The Malay Pottery of Perak," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxiii, p. 25.

[1] F. Speiser, *Two Years with the Natives in the Western Pacific*, p. 181 (New Hebrides); H. B. Guppy, *The Solomon Islands*, p. 46; M. A. Legrand, *Nouvelle Calédonie*, p. 52; A. Bernard, *L'archipel de la Nouvelle Calédonie*, p. 282; F. Sarasin, *La Nouvelle-Calédonie et les îles Loyalty*, p. 60; J. L. Brenchley, *Jottings during the Cruise of H.M.S. 'Curaçoa' in the South Sea Islands*, p. 344; Glaumont, "Usages, moeurs et coutumes des Néo-Calédoniens," *Revue d'Ethnographie*, vii, p. 100; L. de Vaux, "Les Canaques de la Nouvelle Calédonie," *Revue d'Ethnographie*, ii, p. 340; T. Williams and J. Calvert, *Fiji and the Fijians*, p. 60.

[2] J. Chalmers, *Pioneering in New Guinea*, p. 148; O. Finsch, "Töpferei in Neu Guinea," *Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie*, 1882, p. 574; Id., *Samoafahrte*, pp. 280 sq.; N. von Miklucho-Maclay, in *Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie*, 1882, p. 577; A. C. Haddon, *The Decorative Art of British New Guinea*, pp. 220 sq.; Id., *Evolution in Art*, p. 46; *Nieuw Guinea*, p. 148; G. W. Earl, *Papuans*, p. 73; H. H. Romilly, *Letters from the Western Pacific and Mashonaland*, p. 257; W. Y. Turner, "On the Ethnology of the Motu," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, vii, p. 489; H. Zöller, *Deutsch-Neuguinea*, p. 257; C. Keysser, in R. Neuhauss, *Deutsch Neu Guinea*, vol. iii, p. 45; F. Hurley, *Pearls and Savages*, pp. 64 sq.

[3] E. H. Man, "Nicobar Pottery," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxiii, pp. 21 sq.

[4] A. R. Brown, *The Andaman Islands*, p. 473.

[5] G. Bonvalot, *En Asie Centrale. Du Kohistan à la Caspienne*, p. 80.

[6] W. Ross King, "The Aboriginal Tribes of the Nilgiri Hills," *Journal of Anthropology*, 1870–71, p. 40; J. W. Breeks, *An Account of the Primitive Tribes and Monuments of the Nilagiris*, p. 42.

[7] J. H. Hutton, *The Angami Nagas*, p. 64 n.

[8] J. Pearse, "Women in Madagascar," *Antananarivo Annual and Madagascar Magazine*, No. xxiii, p. 264; W. H. Bleek and F. C. Lloyd, *Specimens of Bushman Folklore*, pp. 343 sqq.; J. Campbell, *Travels in South Africa*, p. 23; D. Livingstone, *Last Journals*, vol. i, pp. 59, 79; H. A. Junod, *The Life of a South African Tribe*, vol. ii, pp. 96 sqq.; Id., *Les Ba-Ronga*, p. 224;

ascribes the making of the first pot to the first woman.[1] Among certain Hamitic peoples of Uganda the industry has, under Asiatic influence, been taken up by the men, as also in some parts of the

F. May, " The Zulu Kafirs of Natal," *Anthropos*, ii, p. 460 ; B. Ankermann, " L'ethnographie actuelle de l'Afrique Méridionale," *Anthropos*, i, p. 921 ; G. M. McCall Theal, *The Beginnings of South African History*, p. 92 ; Id., *The Yellow and Dark-skinned People of Africa*, p. 245 ; T. Arbousset, *Relation d'un voyage d'exploration au nord-est du Cap de Bonne Espérance*, p. 271 ; F. H. Melland, " Some Ethnological Notes on the Awemba Tribe of North-East Rhodesia," *Journal of the African Society*, iii, p. 254 ; A Werner, *The Natives of British Central Africa*, pp. 197, 204 sq. ; K. Weule, *Wissenschaftliche Ergebnisse meiner ethnographische Forschungen in der Südkoste Deutsch-ostafrikas*, p. 47 ; G. Lindblom, *The Akamba*, pp. 536 sqq. ; J. Roscoe, *The Bagesu, and other Tribes of the Uganda Protectorate*, p. 115 ; C. W. Hobley, *Ethnology of A-Kamba and other East African Tribes*, p. 30 ; W. S. and K. R. Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People, the Akikuyu*, pp. 98 sq. ; F. W. H. Migeod, " A Talk with Some Gaboon Pygmies," *Man*, xxii, p. 19. ; C. W. Hobley, *Bantu Beliefs and Magic*, p. 278 ; J. Roscoe, *The Soul of Central Africa*, p. 74 ; A. C. Hollis, *The Nandi*, pp. 35 sq. ; G. Tessmann, *Die Pangwe*, vol. i, p. 239 ; V. L. Cameron, *Across Africa*, p. 216 ; J. M. Hildebrandt, " Ethnographische Notizen über Wakamba und ihre Nachbaren," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, x, pp. 369 sq. ; G. Schweinfurth, " Das Volk der Monbuttu in Central-Africa," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, v, p. 8 ; Id., *In the Heart of Africa*, vol. i, p. 212 ; G. C. Claridge, *Wild Bush Tribes of Tropical Africa*, p. 272 ; E. Torday and T. A. Joyce, " Notes on the Ethnography of the Ba-Yaka," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxvi, p. 43 ; *Annales du Musée du Congo Belge*, Série iii, vol. ii, " La Céramique " ; H. H. Johnston, *George Grenfell and the Congo*, vol. ii, p. 812 ; Id., *British Central Africa*, pp. 197, 204 sq. ; Id., *Liberia*, pp. 108 sq. ; E. Torday and T. A. Joyce, " Notes on the Ethnography of the Ba-Mbala," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxv, p. 406 ; J. Halkin, *Les Ababua*, p. 231 ; F. Gaud, *Les Mandja*, p. 231 ; R. P. Colle, *Les Baluba*, vol. i, p. 109 ; C. van Overbergh, *Les Mangbetu*, p. 262 ; Id., *Les Basongé*, p. 221 ; J. Vanden Plas, *Les Kuku*, p. 179 ; R. Schmidt, *Les Baholoholo*, p. 115 ; H. Hecquart, *Voyage à la côte occidentale de l'Afrique*, p. 338 ; S. and O. Jonson, *The History of the Yoruba*, p. 125 ; K. Laffitte, *Le Dahomé*, p. 90 ; G. T. Basden, *Among the Ibo of Nigeria*, p. 177 ; J. Parkinson, " Note on the Asaba People (Ibos) of the Niger," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxvi, p. 321 ; C. Partridge, *Cross River Natives*, p. 185 ; F. Schuster, " Die sozialen Verhältnisse des Banjage-Stammes (Kamerun)," *Anthropos*, ix, p. 955 ; T. J. Alldridge, *A Transformed Colony, Sierra Leone*, p. 218 ; A. Macmichael " Pottery Making on the Blue Nile," *Sudan Notes and Records*, v, pp. 35 sq. ; J. H. Driberg, " A Preliminary Account of the Didinga," *ibid.*, p. 217 ; Yuzbashi, " Tribes of the Upper Nile : The Bari," *Journal of the African Society*, iv, p. 231 ; C. Monteil, *Les Khassonké*, p. 116 ; E. Mangin, " Essai sur les us et coutumes du peuple Mossi en Soudan occidental," *Anthropos*, ix, p. 718 ; L. Tauxier, *Le Noir du Soudan*, pp. 36, 90, 125, 209, 733, 742, 750, 755, 766, 778 ; Id., *Le Noir du Yatenga*, p. 207 ; G. Bruel, " Les populations de la Moyenne Sanga, les Pomo et les Boumali," *Revue d'Ethnologie et de Sociologie*, i, p. 21 ; F. Foureau, *Documents scientifiques de la mission saharienne*, vol. ii, p. 980 ; H. Labouret, " Mariage et polyandrie parmi les Dagari et les Oulé," *Revue d'Ethnographie et des Traditions populaires*, i, p. 271.

[1] H. Callaway, *The Religious System of the Amazulu*, p. 46.

Congo. This, however, "is quite exceptional." Out of seventy-eight tribes investigated by the ethnologists attached to the Belgian Congo Museum, "the men had no hand whatever in the making of pottery in sixty-seven;" the others "are exceptions arising from special circumstances which in almost every instance it is easy to trace." The industry in those instances is carried on for commercial and export purposes, and has been taken up by those tribes of the lower Congo region who have come most in contact with Europeans and have discovered the lucrative possibilities of the industry.[1] Similar causes have led to the taking up of pottery manufacture by the men in Uganda. The commercial pottery thus produced "has retrogressed from a once higher standard to a low one. The old earthenware we dig up from time to time is superior in design, shape and finish to the native pottery of the present day."[2] The manufacture of pottery by the women does, however, in many instances not only supply household requirements, but is also the chief means of barter. Thus in New Guinea "the men have nothing whatever to do with the manufacture of these things; the art belongs entirely to the female portion of the community;" and the products constitute the chief means of barter of the Eastern Massim tribes, who make yearly trading expeditions to the Gulf of Papua to exchange the pottery of their women for sago and other goods. The industry is thus the chief source of their wealth.[3]

In the higher phases of culture the art has, like most other industries, been taken over by the men; but relics of the original division of labour are often found surviving in the midst of advanced cultural conditions. Thus, for example, in Teneriffe and the Grand Canary at the present day a large industry in earthenware is carried on by peasant women. These potters, who lead, like their ancestresses, a troglodytic existence in curious cliff-dwellings, may be seen any day bringing their wares to the towns, each woman carrying on her head a huge bundle of some twenty pitchers.[4]

[1] *Annales du Musée du Congo*, Série iii, vol. ii, pp. 23, 25.

[2] H. H. Johnston, *British Central Africa*, p. 459. It is still not uncommon to come upon wholly inaccurate statements on the subject in works where one has a right to expect greater precision in matters of easily verifiable fact. Thus Professor Deniker, in a work which is regarded as a standard text-book of ethnology, refers to pottery in the following terms: "Sa confection est abandonée presque exclusivement à la femme chez la plupart des peuplades de l'Amérique, tandis qu'elle est confiée indistinctement aux hommes et aux femmes en Afrique" (J. Deniker, *Les Races et les Peuples de la Terre*, Paris, 1900, p. 185). It would be difficult to compress more errors and misrepresentations into fewer words.

[3] J. Chalmers, *Pioneering in British New Guinea*, pp. 19 sq., 23. Cf. C. G. Seligman, *The Melanesians of British New Guinea*, p. 45; H. H. Romilly, *Letters from the Western Pacific and Mashonaland*, pp. 257 sq., 298.

[4] A. Carter Cook, "The Aborigines of the Canary Islands," *The American Anthropologist*, N.S., pp. 465 sq.

Among the hill-populations of Algeria " the women are the only potters." [1] So also in Tunisia the pottery is, in the country districts, made entirely by the women ; in the towns it is made on the wheel by men.[2] The Algerian pottery is very similar to that found in the neolithic deposits of southern Europe. That of Tunis, which is of a very elaborate and ornamental kind, is indistinguishable from the oldest pottery of Egypt.[3] In Nubia, at the present day, the pottery is made exclusively by the women ; but in Upper Egypt the head-potter is always a man, although women, working under him, are employed in the manufacture. In Lower Egypt, on the other hand, the pottery is made by the men.[4] There is thus, following the course of the Nile, a complete series illustrating the stages by which the ceramic art passed from the hands of the women into those of the men.

At Ordézan, near Bagnière de Bigorre in the Pyrenees, " pottery similar to that found in caves is still moulded by the women." [5] In the Hebrides the pottery is manufactured by the women.[6] There can be no reasonable doubt that the pottery of prehistoric Europe and of European barbarians was the work of the women.[7] The remains found in the lacustrine dwellings of Switzerland bear numerous imprints of thumbs and fingers ; they are undoubtedly those of women. The conclusion is confirmed by the statement of Strabo that among the Gauls, " as with other barbarians, the respective occupations of the men and the women are distributed in the reverse way from that which is customary amongst ourselves ; " [8] which may be taken to mean that the division of labour between the sexes was among the European barbarians the same as is found among most primitive peoples.

The manufacture of pottery occurs among very primitive races. Thus the women of the Pygmy tribes of the Congo " are adepts at fashioning very presentable earthenware," [9] and Bushmen women

[1] E. Barclay, *Mountain Life in Algeria*, p. 101 ; D. Randall-Maciver and A. Wilk, *Libyan Notes*, p. 40 ; A. van Gennep, *Études d'Ethnographie Algérienne*, pp. 29 sqq.

[2] D. Randall-Maciver and A. Wilk, *op. cit.*, p. 56 ; Berthelon, " Note on the Modern Pottery Fabrics of Tunisia," *Man*, iii, p. 86.

[3] D. Randall-Maciver and A. Wilk, *op. cit.*, p. 57. Cf. J. Myres, " Notes on the History of the Kabyle Pottery," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxii, pp. 248 sq.

[4] D. Randall-Maciver, " The Manufacture of Pottery in Upper Egypt," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxv, p. 22.

[5] C. F. Hart, " Notes on the Manufacture of Pottery among Savage Races," *The American Naturalist*, xiii, p. 91.

[6] E. B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, vol. i, p. 45.

[7] Cf. Hon. J. Abercromby, *A Study of Bronze Age Pottery of Great Britain and Ireland and its Associated Grave-goods*, vol. i, p. 70.

[8] Strabo, iv. 4. 3.

[9] J. M. M. Van der Burght, *Un Grand Peuple de l'Afrique équatoriale*, p. 104.

have from time immemorial manufactured pots.[1] In Mexico, as elsewhere, the art is transmitted from mother to daughter.[2] Von den Steinen noticed that in Brazil it was highly developed among certain tribes, whilst it was unknown among neighbouring tribes, although they had access to abundance of the best clay. He found that the development of the art depended on whence the wives came, the secrets of the art being transmitted in the female line.[3] In the Philippine Islands most of the pottery is imported from China,[4] but among the ruder tribes there are special centres of native manufacture. The Samoki women supply the neighbouring districts with earthenware; every Samoki woman must be proficient in the art, but she is forbidden to practise it if she marries in another district, so that the industry is a close monopoly.[5] The same thing is noted in Ceram,[6] and among the Massims of New Guinea.[7] Pottery is unknown in most parts of Melanesia; the art is confined to certain small districts in the New Hebrides, Espiritu Santo Island in the Solomon Group, certain villages of New Caledonia, and Fiji. In those districts it is a monopoly of the women of certain families and the secrets of the industry were handed down from mother to daughter.[8] There is not a native pot to be found throughout Australia or Polynesia. The Polynesians, who are in many respects advanced in culture, either migrated from districts where pottery was not known or were accompanied by women who had not acquired the art.[9]

In East Africa, among the Nandi, no man may go near the hut where women are engaged in making pottery, or watch a potter at work. If a man should take a woman's pot and place it on the fire he would be sure to die.[10] Similarly, among the Semas and the Chang of Manipur, a man may not approach while a woman is making pots, or they will crack in the firing.[11] In Brazil, among the Tupis, if any person other than the woman who moulded the

[1] E. S. Hartland, "Notes on some South African Tribes," *Man*, 1907, p. 50.

[2] C. Lumholtz, *Unknown Mexico*, vol. i, p. 250.

[3] K. von den Steinen, *Unter Naturvölkern Zentral-Brasiliens*, pp. 215 sq.

[4] A. L. Kroeber, *The Peoples of the Philippines*, p. 99.

[5] A. E. Jenks, *The Bontoc Igorot*, pp. 117 sq. Cf. J. P. Finley and W. Churchill, *The Subanu*, p. 23.

[6] F. J. P. Sachs, *Het eiland Seram en zijne bewoners*, p. 122.

[7] C. G. Seligman, *The Melanesians of British New Guinea*, p. 45.

[8] J. L. Brenchley, *Jottings during the Cruise of H.M.S. 'Curaçoa' in the South Sea Islands*, p. 344; A. Bernard, *L'archipel de la Nouvelle Calédonie*, p. 282.

[9] G. Brown, *Melanesians and Polynesians*, pp. 434 sqq.

[10] A. C. Hollis, *The Nandi*, pp. 35 sq.

[11] J. H. Hutton, *The Angami Nagas*, p. 64 n.

pot were to attempt to fire it, it would break.[1] The manufacture of pots, like most operations in primitive society, thus partakes of a ritual or religious character. D'Orbigny gives the following account of the manufacture of pots by the women of Bolivia. "The making of pottery," he says, "is not a commonplace affair with those superstitious people, and it is attended with all manner of precautions. The women, who alone are entrusted with the task, proceed in very solemn fashion to look for the clay; this, however, can only be done if there are no crops to be gathered. They fear thunder during the operation, and they resort to the most sequestered spots in order that they may not be seen by anyone. There they build a hut. While at work they observe certain ceremonies, and they must never open their mouths to speak, but converse by signs, for they are convinced that if they were to speak one word all the pots would break in the firing. They do not go near their husbands, for if they did, any people who are sick would be sure to die."[2] In like manner, among the Thonga of South Africa, the ritual tabus to be observed in the manufacture of pottery are numerous. Special qualifications are regarded as necessary to secure clay of a suitable quality, and only one particular woman of recognised character is allowed to dig up the clay, while the others receive it from her. To light the furnace for the firing of the pots, the services of a child in a state of innocence are requisitioned. The women have recourse to every aid afforded by religion in order to secure the success of their industrial operation; the bones of ancestors are consulted, and a part of the products of the women's industry is dedicated to the gods.[3] The Greek tradition that the first 'patera' was moulded on the breast of Helen is illustrated by the practice of the Zuñi women, who from of old make their pitchers in the shape of a female breast. The nipple is left open to the last, and the sealing of it is performed with the solemnity of a religious rite, and with averted eyes. Unless this ritual were observed, the women would be barren or their children would die in infancy.[4] The vessel manufactured by the woman is thus assimilated to the woman herself. The Guaranis of Brazil believe that a special magical force or virtue derived from the woman is communicated to the articles manufactured by her.[5] In the earliest Egyptian hieroglyphics the

[1] *Noticia do Brasil*, p. 286.

[2] A. d'Orbigny, *Voyages dans l'Amérique méridionale*, vol. iii, p. 194. Cf. Id., *L'homme américain*, vol. ii, p. 363.

[3] M. A. Junod, *The Life of a South African Tribe*, vol. ii, pp. 96 sq.

[4] F. H. Cushing, "A Study of Pueblo Pottery," *Fourth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, pp. 512 sq.

[5] C. Teschauer, "Die Caingang, oder Coroados-Indianer im brazilianischen Staate Rio Grande do Sul," *Anthropos*, ix, p. 23.

pot is the symbol of womanhood.[1] Vases used in religious functions among the archaic populations of the Aegean were frequently in the shape of a woman ;[2] and the pot was in Greece an emblem of fecundity.[3] Goddesses were accordingly often worshipped in the form of pots, and were called pot-bearers, 'kernophorai.'[4] In Cyprus, "the potter of to-day at Lithrodonto, when he has turned his jug and is taking it off the wheel, puts two little dabs of moist clay on the right and left side of the rounded surface, a little above the middle. If you ask him why he does so, he will probably answer, 'So my father did before me.' And, in truth, the archaeologist will pick you out from a pile of vases disinterred from tombs 2,500 years old, numberless specimens with the same finishing touch, and others of the same age, superior to anything which the modern potter can produce, on which the two dabs represent two breasts, with a female head above them."[5] "The Mother Pot is really a fundamental conception in all religions," observes Dr. Elliott Smith, "and is almost world-wide in its distribution. The pot's identity with the Great Mother is deeply rooted in ancient belief through the greater part of the world."[6] In Peru a deity called Sañacmana was worshipped throughout the country in the form of a pot.[7] Among the aboriginal races of southern India, as in Greece, goddesses are commonly represented by pots. Thus at Irungalur, in the Trichinopoly district, the pot which represents the goddess is carefully prepared at her shrine, and "during the festival is treated exactly like the goddess. It is taken round in procession on the head of a 'pujari' to the sound of tom-toms and pipes ; offerings of fruit and flowers are made to it ; a lamb is sacrificed before it, and it is worshipped with the orthodox prostrations."[8] In Canara there was a special Pot Goddess, called Kel Mari.[9] Goddesses are similarly worshipped in

[1] F. L. Griffiths, *A Collection of Hieroglyphs*, p. 3.

[2] H. Schliemann, *Troja*, p. 394.

[3] G. F. Creuzer, *Religions de l'antiquité*, tr. by J. D. Guigniant, vol. i, p. 509.

[4] Scholiast to Nicander, *Theriaca*, v. 217 ; P. N. Rolle, *Recherches sur le culte de Bacchus*, vol. i, pp. 47 sq. ; G. Wheeler, *Voyage de Dalmatie, de Grèce et du Levant*, vol. ii, p. 403.

[5] R. Hamilton Lang, "On Archaic Survivals in Cyprus," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xvi, p. 187. Exactly similar 'dabs' are found on the pottery of the oldest neolithic strata in Krete (A. Mosso, *Le origini della civiltà mediterranea*, p. 39).

[6] G. Elliott Smith, *The Evolution of the Dragon*, pp. 199, 182.

[7] M. E. Rivero and J. J. von Tschudi, *Peruvian Antiquities*, pp. 168 sq.

[8] H. Whitehead, *The Village Gods of South India*, p. 36. Cf. pp. 54 sqq., 103.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 84.

the form of pots by the Dayaks of North Borneo,[1] and in the Philippine Islands.[2]

The sacred vessels used in religious cults often retain, like other sacred objects, their archaic and primitive character. Thus the pots used by the Roman Vestals were, even in the height of Roman splendour and wealth, made in the coarsest fashion without the use of a wheel. They were spoken of as 'Numa's crockery,' and special potters, or 'fictores,' were addicted to the making of the archaic pottery.[3] In the same manner the vestals of Peru were wont to serve the god in very coarse vessels of clay, until the Inca Pachacuti, when he conquered the land, being shocked that the god should be served in such poor crockery, had it replaced by vessels of gold.[4] The pots of Peru were, of course, made by the women, and there can be little doubt that in early times the potters of the Roman Vesta were no other than the Vestal maidens themselves.[5] In Dahomey, the vestal priestesses, who are the Amazons and the king's wives, have the exclusive right to manufacture the sacred pots used in the service of the temple, as well as all other pots employed in the district.[6]

In the gradual development of ceramic technique may be perceived the countless difficulties which have been overcome throughout the long industrial history. Unless the right sort of clay is selected, no satisfactory results can be achieved. The women of Mexico judge of the quality of the clay by tasting it.[7] Mixture of the clay with pounded shells, bones, quartz, and sand is necessary if the pot is not to fall to pieces as soon as it is placed on the fire. Bushmen women, and the Samoki of Luzon, like some primitive women in ancient Europe, mixed the clay with grass.[8] Neolithic pottery in Europe and in Egypt is very imperfectly mixed and baked, and is extremely friable.[9] The women of America and of New Guinea use a number of different kinds of clay mixed in various proportions; the articles are finished by covering them with a slip

[1] I. H. N. Evans, "Notes on the Religion, Beliefs, Superstitions, Ceremonies and Tabus of the Dusuns of the Tuaran and Tempassuk Districts of British North Borneo." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii, p. 382; G. A. Wilken, *De verspreide geschriften*, vol. iii, pp. 152 sqq., vol. iv, pp. 47, 74 sqq.

[2] K. Semper, *Die Philippinen und ihre Bewohner*, p. 56.

[3] J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, vol. ii, pp. 202 sq.

[4] P. Sarmiento de Gamboa, *History of the Incas*, pp. 110 sq.

[5] The Rex Sacrorum was his own 'fictor' (J. C. von Orelli, *Inscriptionum Latinarum selectarum amplissima collectio*, No. 2281).

[6] K. Laffitte, *Le Dahomé*, p. 90; J. A. Skertchly, *Dahomey as it is*, p. 396.

[7] C. Lumholtz, *Unknown Mexico*, vol. i, p. 250.

[8] E. Sydney Hartland, "Notes on some South African Tribes," *Man*, vii, p. 50; A. E. Jenks, *The Bontoc Igorots*, p. 117.

[9] R. Verneau, *Les Races humaines*, p. 90.

of fine white clay. The wheel is a comparatively late development. The Zuñi women, with an aesthetic sense that would have rejoiced Ruskin, scorn the wheel as giving a machine-made appearance to the products; they stand over their work and trust entirely to the eye for the production of the exquisitely moulded forms of their earthenware. The potter's wheel has also no part in the manufacture of the beautiful pottery of the Congo.[1] A flat stone, the broken bottom of an old pot, or a basket constitute the first potter's wheel.

The patterns with which the clay is ornamented are commonly derived, in Africa, Papua, America, as in the prehistoric pottery of Europe, from the braidings of basket-work. "The shaping of earthen vessels in or upon baskets," says Mr. Holmes, "either of plain bark or of woven splints of fibre, must frequently have occurred. The peculiar impressions left upon the clay probably came in time to be regarded as ornamental, and were applied for purposes of embellishment alone. Decorative art has thus been enriched by many elements of beauty. These now survive in incised, stamped and painted designs. The forms, as well as the ornamentation of clay, very naturally preserve traces of the former intimacy of the two arts."[2] Such reproduction of basket-work as a pattern on clay pots is plainly seen on all the pottery manufactured by New Guinea and New Caledonian women.[3] The tracery of African pottery is an imitation of plaited basket-work. Very ancient fragments of earthenware are found throughout the continent by the side of almost fossilised bones, and "these pieces of broken pots with their rims ornamented with good imitation of basket-work attest that the lady potters of old followed the example given by their still more ancient sisters."[4] In the pottery manufactured by Berber women, as in ancient Egyptian pottery, the influence of basket-work on the ornamentation is likewise evident.[5] The neolithic pottery of Europe is in this respect identical with that of Africa and America. "It is certain that very many of the indented patterns on British pottery have been produced by the impress of twisted cords on the wet clays";[6] and old German

[1] H. H. Johnston, *George Grenfell and the Congo*, p. 812.

[2] W. H. Holmes, "Prehistoric Textile Fabrics of the United States derived from Impressions on Pottery," *Third Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 425. Cf. Id., "The Use of Textile Fabrics in Pottery Making," *The American Anthropologist*, N.S., iii, pp. 397 sqq.; F. H. Cushing, 'A Study of Pueblo Pottery as Illustration of Zuñi Culture Growth," *Fourth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, pp. 489 sqq.

[3] O. Finsch, *Samoafahrten*, p. 281; J. T. Atkinson, "Notes on Pointed Forms of Pottery among Primitive People," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxiii, p. 90.

[4] D. Livingstone, *Last Journals*, vol. i, p. 79; cf. p. 59.

[5] D. Randall-Maciver and A. Wilk, *Libyan Notes*, Pl. xii, p. 57.

[6] D. Wilson, *Archaeology of Scotland*, p. 289; Hon. J. Abercromby,

pottery retains the ornamentation of basket-work.[1] Similar imitations of plaited rush-work are found in the neolithic deposits of Bosnia,[2] and in the 'terramare' of Italy.[3] In the oldest deposits of Krete the most ancient specimens of that pottery which reached the highest pitch of artistic beauty in ceramic decoration bear the distinct design of interlaced basket-work.[4] "The 'Greek fret' need be no more than a basketry version of a 'loop-coil' meander."[5]

The origin of ceramic ornament may be clearly seen in the polychromatic designs of Maidu basket-work, which for beauty even surpass many products of Greek ceramic decoration. Fifty entirely different schemes of design have been distinguished. At the present day "the knowledge of those designs is almost exclusively confined to the older women."[6] Similarly, the extremely intricate designs of Tunisian pottery differ in every family of women-potters, and are transmitted from mother to daughter.[7] In Guiana the women not only decorated the pots they made, but also all other articles, and even the posts of the huts.[8] It would thus appear that decorative art originated with the women, the first decorators of clothes, of plaited basketry, of pottery.

Building.

We are no more accustomed to think of the building art and of architecture than of bootmaking or the manufacture of earthenware as feminine occupations. Yet, as the animal female is the

A Study of the Bronze Age Pottery of Great Britain and Ireland, vol. i, pp. 134 sq.

[1] C. Klemm, *Allgemeine Cultur-geschichte*, vol. i, p. 188; C. Rau, "Indian Pottery," *Smithsonian Reports*, 1866, p. 346.

[2] F. Fiala and M. Hoernes, *Die neolitische Station von Butmir bei Sarajevo in Bosnien*, vol. i, plate vi.

[3] A. C. Haddon, *Evolution in Art*, plate ii, 9.

[4] A. Mosso, *Le origini della civiltà mediterranea*, p. 50, fig. 39, plate i. The beautiful painted patterns of oldest painted Kretan pottery appear to me to indicate very plainly that the early pots, which in the Aegean and also in Etruria, are frequently round-bottomed, were originally covered with plaited straw in very much the same manner as modern Tuscan 'fiaschi.' The painted patterns almost exactly reproduce the arrangement of such plaiting.

[5] H. J. B., in *Man*, xiv, p. 159.

[6] R. B. Dixon, "Basketry Designs of the Maidu Indians," *The American Anthropologist*, N.S., ii, p. 276.

[7] Berthelon, "Note on the Modern Pottery Fabrics in Tunisia," *Man*, iii, p. 86.

[8] R. Schomburgk, *Reise in Britisch-Guiana*, vol. i, p. 127. At the time of Sir E. Im Thurn's visit the Guiana men also took a share in the art E. Im Thurn, *Among the Indians of Guiana*, p. 274).

builder of nest or burrow, so also primitive woman is not only the home-maker, but the actual home-builder. The title of "mistress of the house," which she retains even in patriarchal societies, is more than a mere recognition of her sphere, or even of the primitive ownership of the house by the woman; primitive woman not only owned the house, but fashioned it with her hands, and among several primitive peoples she alone, with her children, dwells in it, while the men sleep elsewhere, or are only admitted to the home as her guests. The huts of the Australian, of the Andaman islanders, of the Patagonians, of the Botocudos, the rough shelters of the Seri, the skin lodges and wigwams of the American Indian, the black camel-hair tent of the Bedouin, the 'yurta' of the nomads of Central Asia, are all the exclusive work and the special care of the women. Some of those more or less movable dwellings are extremely elaborate. The 'yurta,' for example, is sometimes a capacious house built on a framework of poles pitched in a circle and strengthened by a trellis-work of wooden battens, the whole being covered with thick felt, forming a dome-like structure; the interior is divided into several apartments. "With the exception of the wood, all its component parts are products of the industry of the Turkoman woman, who busies herself also with its construction and the putting together of the various parts."[1] Miss Sykes, oblivious of the force of occupational tradition, which would preclude the thought of her allowing Sir Percy Sykes to mend his own socks, waxes quite indignant at the sight of a Kirghis woman staggering under a load of battens while engaged in building the family 'yurta.'[2] When Mr. Bogoras was studying the language of the Chukchi, he enquired from some men the names of the various parts of the framework of the house. But they were quite unable to inform him on that point; "I don't know," they would answer, "that is women's business."[3]

Not only are all the huts, tents, and portable homes of primitive nomadic humanity fashioned by the women, but so likewise are some of the most elaborate buildings of the uncultured world. The earth-lodges of the Omahas were built entirely by the women.[4] The 'pueblos' of New Mexico and Arizona recall the picturesque sky-line of an Oriental town; clusters of many-storied houses rise in terraced tiers, the flat roof of the one serving as a terrace for that above. The upper stories are reached by ladders or by outside stairs, and the walls are bordered with ornamental crenellated

[1] A. Vámbéry, *Travels in Central Asia*, p. 316.
[2] E. and P. Sykes, *Through Deserts and Oases in Central Asia*, p. 121.
[3] W. Bogoras, *The Chuckchee*, p. 547.
[4] J. O. Dorsey, "Omaha Dwellings, Furniture and Implements," *Thirteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 269.

battlements. Courtyards and piazzas, streets and curious round public buildings serving as clubs and temples, form part of those towns which are now but a small remnant of those which once covered the south-western region of the United States, as their innumerable ruins testify. Those edifices are built exclusively by the women. Among the Zuñi at the present day the men assist with the heavier work of timbering; among the Hopis the work is still done entirely by the women.[1] Before the coming of Europeans "it was the custom for women to raise the walls of buildings and to finish the house inside and out."[2] When the first Spanish priests settled among the Pueblo Indians no man had ever set his hand to the erection of a house. Reporting concerning their settlement one of the padres describes with pride the beautiful churches and convents which the natives had built for them. "Those buildings," he says, "have been erected solely by the women, the girls, and the young boys of the mission; for among these people it is the custom that the women build the houses and the men spin and manufacture their cloaks, go to war and to the chase." When first a man was set by the good padres to building a wall, the poor embarrassed wretch was surrounded by a jeering crowd of women and children, who mocked and laughed, and thought it the most ludicrous thing they had seen that a man should be engaged in building a house.[3]

The evolution of Pueblo architecture can be traced from rude round huts of reed plastered with mud, identical with the 'hogaras' used at the present day by the Navaho Indians. In the cliff dwellings of the 'cañons' a number of such huts, now entirely built of clay, clustered together, forming a beehive-like agglomeration; on the 'mesas' they expand into tiers of terraces, retaining the square shape which they have acquired by juxtaposition, and those terraced structures, greatly expanded and improved, form, when transferred to the flat, the Pueblo city.[4] On the other hand, there can be no doubt that the architectural

[1] A. L. Kroeber, "Zuñi Kin and Clan," *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History*, xviii, p. 89.

[2] A. F. Bandelier, *The Delight Makers*, p. 14.

[3] Alonso de Benavides, *Memorial*, cited by A. F. Bandelier, "Final Report of Investigations among the Indians of the South-Western United States," *Papers of the Archaeological Institute of America*, Series III, p. 141. "Los han hecho tan solamente las mugeres, y los muchachos y muchachas de la dotrine; porque entre estas naciones se usa hazer las mugeres las paredes, y los hombres hilar y texer sus mantos, y van a la guerra, y a la caza. Y si obligamos a algun hombre a hazer pared se corre dello y las mugeres se rien."

[4] F. H. Cushing, "A Study of Pueblo Pottery as Illustrative of Zuñi Culture Growth," *Fourth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, pp. 473 sqq.

stone-work of the Maya tribes of ancient Mexico and of Yucatan was derived from the clay and brick masonry of the Pueblo tribes.[1] We may thus behold in this instance every link in the evolution from the rude shelter erected by primitive savage woman to a monumental architecture which is not far removed from that of the palaces and temples of Babylon and Nineveh.

In the building of the larger and more substantial timber houses most of the heavy work is generally undertaken by the men; but the tradition of the primitive division of labour survives in the fact that the men are invariably assisted by the women, who often take an important share in the labour. Both men and women worked conjointly in erecting the 'long houses' of the plains tribes of America.[2] Among the aboriginal tribes of the Malay Peninsula "the men only perform such work as actually requires their strength, e.g. felling, transporting, and erecting the heavy timbers, and the women complete it."[3] The large pile-dwellings of Melanesia and of Indonesia are erected by the men and women working together.[4] The thatching is done by the women.[5] The neat and well-finished houses of the Samoans, the beauty of which has been commented on by most travellers, and is such that they are often adopted by European residents, are constructed mostly of thatch and ingeniously plaited reeds on a framework of poles. The frame is put up by the men, but the thatch-work and finishing is done exclusively by the women.[6] Similarly in Madagascar the framework is erected by the men; the women then take possession and finish the house, setting up the inside walls and partitions covered with 'raphia' matting.[7] Throughout Africa, among the Bantu, the women take the main share in the erection of huts and buildings, and frequently do the whole work.[8] Among the Bechuana, for instance, "the duty of building the

[1] See, for instance, Carl Sapper, "The Old Settlements and Architectural Structures in North America," *Smithsonian Reports*, 1895, pp. 537 sqq.

[2] Maximilian zu Wied, *Travels in the Interior of North America*, vol. ii, p. 270.

[3] W. W. Skeat and C. O. Blagden, *The Pagan Races of the Malay Peninsula*, vol. i, pp. 374 sq.

[4] A. C. Haddon, "The Ethnography of the Western Tribes of Torres Straits," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xix, p. 342; A. W. Nieuwenhuis, *Quer durch Borneo*, vol. ii, p. 158.

[5] T. Watt Leggatt, "Malekula, New Hebrides," *Report of the Fourth Meeting of the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science*, p. 706.

[6] T. H. Hood, *Notes of a Cruise in H.M.S. 'Fawn' in the Western Pacific*, p. 32.

[7] Personal communication.

[8] S. Molema, *The Bantu, Past and Present*, p. 132; S. Watt, *In the Heart of Savagedom*, p. 241.

huts falls almost exclusively to the lot of the female sex. If a man has given a hand with the felling of the timber, the hewing and setting up of the main posts, he thinks he has amply fulfilled his obligations. It is the business of the women to prepare the clay out of which floor and walls are made, to erect the framework of the latter, build them up with loam, construct the roof, thatching and fastening one bundle of reeds after another; and lastly, the women construct the outer fence which encloses the ground round the hut and separates it from neighbouring buildings." [1] Instead of clay, cow-dung is sometimes used to plaster the floor and walls. The material, far from being objectionable, serves a useful function; Dr. Livingstone noticed that houses so treated were entirely free from vermin, and kept sweet and clean, whereas houses where mud plastering was used were verminous.[2] Among the Soolimas the women do the whole of the building from start to finish.[3] The traditional association of woman with the building of the home appears to be embodied in the custom of the Akamba and Theraka of East Africa, according to which it is imperative for husband and wife to join in an embrace as soon as the hut is completed; failure to observe this would be followed by dire misfortune.[4]

The buildings in primitive Egypt were constructions of reeds and plastered mud, identical with those erected by the women in every part of Africa. Even at the present day, a great deal of the building is done in Egypt by the women, and the assistants of a master builder are invariably girls, not men.[5] The architecture of ancient Egypt was directly derived from the primitive constructions of African women. "The primitive structure," says Professor Fletcher, "was composed of bundles of reeds bound together and placed at intervals vertically in the ground, the angle bundles being strengthened. The origin of the characteristic cornice is held to be due to the pressure of the clay, of which the primitive roofs were constructed, on the upright reeds which formed the framework of the walls. The jambs and lintels of the

[1] G. Fritsch, *Die Eingeborenen Süd-Afrikas*, pp. 186 sq. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 79 (Kaffirs), 229 (Mureros), 325 (Hottentots); E. Blackwood Wright, "Native Races of South Africa," *Journal of the African Society*, iii, p. 267; W. Joest, "Bei den Barolong," *Das Ausland*, lvii, p. 464; H. H. Johnston, *George Grenfell and the Congo*, vol. ii, p. 731; H. L. Duff, *Nyasaland under the Foreign Office*, p. 317; G. Lindblom, *The Akamba*, p. 137.

[2] D. Livingstone, *Missionary Travels and Researches*, p. 207.

[3] A. Gordon Laing, *Travels in the Timannee, Kootanko and Soolima Countries in Western Africa*, p. 359.

[4] C. Dundas, "History of Kitui," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii, p. 525.

[5] A. Harvey, "Some Types of Egyptian Women," *The Cosmopolitan*, xxviii, p. 276.

doors and windows were made of reeds in the humbler dwellings, and of palm trunks in those of more pretension. Here, then, is seen a fair and likely prototype of the construction of an Egyptian wall, the forms of which are more suitable to a structure of rushes overlaid with mud or puddled clay than to one consisting of large stones. A very distinct recollection of the primitive reeds tied together at intervals, and crowned with the lotus bud, is found in the later granite column and capital. In fact, throughout, although materials changed, the forms of the early reed and clay construction were adhered to; and the endeavour of the conservative Egyptian was to reproduce in stone and granite, superimposed in layers, the appearance assumed in the early reed and mud type. The surface decoration executed on the later granite buildings apparently came from the 'sgraffito' work on the earlier mud walls." [1]

In most parts of the uncultured world even more care is bestowed by the women upon the buildings in which food is stored, and which belong to their exclusive province, than upon the dwelling-house. The treasure is not only protected by constructive devices, but also by amulets and sacred objects designed to guard it against evil influences. Hence the food-stores are much more elaborately ornamented than ordinary habitations. In Polynesia and Melanesia they are covered with carvings, often representing reptiles and serpents, which have come to be regarded everywhere as the guardians of treasure. The dome-like structures of African grain-stores are extremely ornamental [2] and, as was noticed by Livingstone, the elaborate patterns with which they are adorned are exact reproductions of those found in the plaiting of basket-work.[3] In Anatolia, the peasants commonly nail on the grain-store the skulls of oxen, which occupy the same place as the stone reproductions of them seen on the metopes of Greek temples. It is more than probable that the gable roof of the wooden house was preceded and suggested by the sloping covering placed over grain to keep it dry. Sir Charles Fellows was one of the first to remark that the food store in Lykia and other parts of Asia Minor, at the present day, is the exact counterpart of the ancient tombs and temples the ruins of which are found in that ancient land of matriarchy. "The storehouses in which the grain and property is preserved are throughout this district seen and recognised by me as precisely similar in form and detail of apparent construction of ties and bolts to the tombs so commonly cut in the rocks around them. These modern barns

[1] B. and B. F. Fletcher, *A History of Architecture on the Comparative Method*, pp. 12 sq.

[2] G. Schweinfurth, *Artes Africanae*, Plate xx and accompanying text.

[3] D. Livingstone, *Last Journals*, vol. i, p. 76.

are, in general, slightly roofed; the gable or pediment supports a pole at each of its angles, the ends commonly protruding beyond the roof, which is of thin planks, laid over the other, and giving the effect of a cornice to the pediment. The similarity of the storehouse to the ancient tomb is strikingly obvious; even the beam-ends may form the ornaments protruding from the angles of the pediment. In this portion of Asia Minor all the remains of the temples show a square chamber, or cella, entered by an ornamented door of noble proportions. This form is evidently seen in the huts. Is it not highly probable that these temples may represent the huts and storehouses of the people of three thousand years ago, which at an after period were imitated in stone, and their forms cut in the rocks, making the temple a large house and the tomb a durable receptacle for the dead? Time has witnessed these changes; but the simple hut which has served as the abode of the peasants through successive generations to the present day, remains unaltered."[1] The primitive temples of Greece were built of wood.[2] The earliest temple at Delphi was a thatched hut in charge of a priestess.[3] In Lydia, Herodotus incidentally mentions, the dwelling-houses were for the most part huts built of reeds and mud like those of an African kraal.[4] There can be little doubt that, like the latter, they were built by the women. The most imposing monument in the country, the heroon of Alyattes, "the greatest of all buildings except those of Egypt and Babylonia," bore on one of its columns an inscription stating that for the most part it had been built by women.[5]

Primitive Trade.

To the women, as cultivators of the soil and keepers of the food-store, all surplus production belongs, and is theirs to dispose

[1] C. Fellows, *Travels and Researches in Asia Minor*, pp. 314 sq. Cf. G. Perrot and C. Chipiez, *Histoire de l'art dans l'antiquité*, vol. v, pp. 363 sqq. Cf. P. Sarasin, "Ueber die Entwicklung des griechischen Tempel aus der Pfahlhaus," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xxxix, pp. 57 sqq.

[2] G. Perrot and C. Chipiez, *op. cit.*, vol. vi, pp. 478 sqq., 483 sq., 500 sqq., 708 sq.; vol. vii, pp. 357 sq. When Pausanias saw the Doric temple of Hera at Ellis, one of the back pillars was still of oak (Pausanias, v. 16. 1; cf. v. 20. 3).

[3] Pausanias, x. 5.

[4] Herodotus, v. 101.

[5] *Ibid.*, i. 93. The passage is usually interpreted as meaning that the women defrayed the greater part of the expenses. Possibly Herodotus himself so understood the inscription, though the wording of the passage (*ἐξεργάσαντο . . . αἱ ἐνεργαζόμεναι παιδίσκαι*) is peculiar if that be meant. But it is exceedingly improbable that any expenses worth mentioning attached in primitive times to a construction which was mostly built of earth. There were no materials to pay for; who then should be paid? Slaves?

of ;[1] and as the sole producers of manufactured commodities they hold the means of barter and exchange, nor are they slow to avail themselves of them. In all early culture the barter and traffic is in the hands of the women ; they are the primitive traders. Throughout Africa, in the markets and fairs where vegetable produce, baskets, pottery, are brought in by the women from surrounding districts, a lively trade is driven, and it is almost exclusively carried on by the women. Among the Kikuyu and the Masai, all barter with passing caravans is done by the women, and the traffic between different tribes continues even when the men of those tribes are at war with one another.[2] In the Congo, similarly, the trading is almost exclusively in the hands of the women.[3] In the Cameroons the women are in charge of trading stations, and conduct all the business.[4] In Nigeria, " practically the whole of the trade in the Ibo country is in the hands of the women, and they are extremely capable. The markets are controlled by the influential old women, and they frame and administer the rules and regulations and settle questions as they arise. Each market is presided over by its ' queen ' (Amwu) assisted by the women's council of which she is the head. This council often fixes prices, the rate of cowrie exchange, what markets shall be visited, and with what towns commercial relations shall be established and maintained." [5] In the Tibbu country the great trade in salt which brings there caravans from all north-eastern Africa, is carried on entirely by the women ; when a caravan approaches the men disappear and betake themselves to the hills, in order not to be in the way and to leave the whole business to the women.[6] In North America the fur trade was entirely in the hands of the women, who prepared the skins.[7] In Nicaragua " a man might

[1] J. H. Weeks, " Anthropological Notes on the Bangala of the Upper Congo River," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxix, p. 118 : " If a woman sold anything from her garden the money was hers, and her husband had no claim upon it ; he might borrow it, but he would have to pay it back like a loan from an outsider." Cf. F.-J. Clozel and R. Villamur, *Les coutumes indigènes de la Côte d'Ivoire*, p. 283 ; H. Labouret, " Mariage et polyandrie parmi les Dagari et les Oulé," *Revue d'Ethnographie et des Traditions populaires*, i, p. 271 ; F. de Meuse, " De la condition de la femme," *Le Congo illustré*, iii, p. 34 ; E. Blackwood Wright, " Native Races of South Africa," *Journal of the African Society*, ii, p. 265 ; J. Roscoe, *The Bagesu and Other Tribes of the Uganda Protectorate*, p. 167.

[2] J. Thomson, *Through Masai Land*, pp. 312, 308.

[3] H. H. Johnston, " On the Races of the Congo and the Portuguese Colonies of Western Africa," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xiii, p. 474. Cf. D. and C. Livingstone, *Expedition to the Zambesi*, p. 192.

[4] M. Buchner, *Kamerun*, p. 33.

[5] G. T. Basden, *Among the Ibos of Nigeria*, pp. 90, 195. Cf. O. Temple, *Notes on the Tribes of the Northern Provinces of Nigeria*, p. 300.

[6] J. Richardson, *Travels in the Great Sahara*, vol. ii, p. 346.

[7] J. Heckewelder, *History, Manners and Customs of the Indian Nations*,

not enter the market, or even see the proceedings, at the risk of a beating."[1] Throughout Central Asia the trading is entirely in the hands of the women; what Marco Polo briefly reported holds true to this day: "the women do the buying and selling."[2] The trade of Tibet was in former times regulated by a council of women. "Trade," says an old Chinese account of the country, "cannot be carried on by anybody except under the express sanction of a set of women."[3] Among the tribes of Assam and of Manipur "women do all the trading."[4] At Tranganore, or Trengganu, in the Malay Peninsula, according to an old account, "the women do all the commerce."[5] In Burma "the whole retail business of the country is mostly carried on by women, and a large proportion also of the wholesale description."[6] In the Island of Timor "the women do all the selling and buying."[7] In the Luchu Islands "the market-place, which is the centre of life, is entirely in the hands of the women." When a Japanese merchant arrives at Luchu, the first thing he does is to engage the services of a saleswoman and to deliver all his merchandise to her; on his return the strictest account of all transactions is given to him, and all he has to do is to receive the profits handed to him.[8]

Medicine and Surgery.

The connection of women with the cultivation of the soil and the search for edible vegetables and roots made them specialists in botanical knowledge, which, among primitive peoples, is extraordinarily extensive.[9] They became acquainted with the properties

p. 158; Schoolcraft, *Indian Tribes*, vol. v, p. 176; J. Dunn, *History of the Oregon Territory*, p. 108.

[1] H. H. Bancroft, *The Native Races of the Pacific States*, vol. iii, p. 145.

[2] *The Book of Ser Marco Polo*, ed. Yule, vol. i, p. 252. Cf. E. R. Huc, *Travels in Tartary*, vol. ii, p. 260; S. Turner, *An Account of an Embassy to the Court of the Teshoo Lama, in Tibet*, vol. i, p. 83; H. Vámbéry, *Das Türkenvolk*, p. 341.

[3] *The Chinese Repository*, 1840, p. 40, citing from the Wei-Tsang Too Sheih.

[4] P. R. T. Gurdon, "Notes on the Khasis, Syntegs and allied Tribes inhabiting the Khasi and Jaintia Hills District in Assam," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, lxxiii, Part iii, p. 60.

[5] *Voyage d'Abd'Allah ben Abd al Kader*, p. 48.

[6] A. Fytch, *Burma, Past and Present*, vol. ii, p. 72.

[7] H. O. Forbes, *A Naturalist's Wanderings in the Eastern Archipelago*, p. 463.

[8] B. H. Chamberlain, "The Luchu Islands and their Inhabitants," *The Geographical Journal*, v, pp. 448 sq.

[9] According to Sir James Hector, the Maori "had a much better knowledge of the natural history of their country than any people he had ever heard of. The older Maoris had noticed and had distinct names for

of herbs, and were thus the first doctors. "The old ways of healing," remarks J. Grimm, "fell into the hands of women. To woman, not to man, was assigned the culling and concocting of powerful remedies; her little, soft hands could best prepare the salve, weave the lint, and dress the wound." [1] The word 'medicine' is derived from a root meaning 'knowledge' or 'wisdom'—the wisdom of the 'wise woman.' The name of Medea, the medical herbalist witch, comes from the same root.[2] Primitive medicine is, of course, for the most part a department of magic, and women, as we shall see, were the primitive practitioners of the art. But in addition to purely magical methods of treating diseases there exists, even among the rudest peoples, the germ of more rational medicine in the form of such herbal lore as is almost everywhere specially cultivated by women. That knowledge is, indeed, regarded as a part of the magic art. "The secret of the witch," said an Ogowe native, "is knowing the plants that produce certain effects, and knowing how to compound and use the plants in order to bring about the desired result; and this is the sum and essence of witchcraft." [3] In the Congo it is noted that the women doctors specialise in the use of drugs and herbal pharmacy.[4] In Ashanti the medicine women are "generally preferred for medical aid, as they possess a thorough knowledge of barks and herbs." [5] In East Africa "there are as many women physicians as men." [6] In Central Africa, among Soolimas, the women are the surgeons.[7] In Fiji the women were doctors.[8] "Midwifery is a distinct profession

nearly all their plants, not merely those that were in use. They had generic names by which they grouped plants according to their affinities in a way impossible to most people who were not educated botanists" (*Nature*, xii, p. 467). Of the Micmac Indians, Dr. Rand says: "They have studied botany in Nature's volume. They know the names of all the trees and shrubs and useful plants in their country. They have studied their nature, habits and uses" (S. T. Rand, *Legends of the Micmacs*, p. xi). Similar reports are given in regard to most primitive peoples.

[1] J. Grimm, *Teutonic Mythology*, pp. 1038, 1150.

[2] F. B. Jevons, "Graeco-Italian Magic," in R. B. Marett, *Anthropology and the Classics*, pp. 105 sq.

[3] R. C. Garner, "Native Institutions of the Ogowe Tribe of West Central Africa," *Journal of the African Society*, i, p. 372.

[4] *Annales du Musée du Congo*, Série iii, vol. i, fasc. 2, p. 172.

[5] T. E. Bowdich, *Mission to Ashantee*, p. 264.

[6] R. F. Burton, *The Lake Regions of East Africa*, vol. ii, p. 323. Cf. C. Dundas, "History of Kitui," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii, p. 532.

[7] A. Gordon Laing, *Travels in the Timannee, Kooranko, and Soolima Countries in Western Africa*, p. 359.

[8] D. Blyth, "Notes on the Traditions and Customs of the Natives of Fiji relative to Conception, Pregnancy and Parturition," *Glasgow Medical Journal*, xxviii, p. 178.

exercised by women in all towns, and they are said to be very skilful, performing operations which are with us considered as surgical." [1] Women are the chief medical practitioners in Savage Island,[2] in Tonga, in the Marquesas.[3] In New Guinea the women treat all wounds and injuries sustained by the men in warfare, and their skill as surgeons has elicited the admiration of travellers. They show a knowledge of anatomy, and cut down boldly through the muscles of the limbs and of the neck to extract foreign bodies.[4] Throughout the more primitive populations of Indonesia the treatment of the sick is almost exclusively in the hands of medicine-women.[5] Among the Land Dayaks of Borneo, while there are both male and female doctors, "the service of women is regarded as more valuable, and therefore commands higher remuneration than that received by men." [6] Among the Andaman Islanders "the little medicine or surgery practised by them is performed by the women." [7] Among the Eskimo, whatever knowledge of the medical art and of the virtues of herbs they possess is "entirely confined to the women." [8] Among many North American tribes "the profession is practised only by the old squaws." [9] "Their science," says Heckewelder, "is entirely founded on observation and experience, and the well tried efficiency of remedies. The wives of missionaries in every instance in which they had to apply to the female physicians for the cure of complaints peculiar to their sex, experienced good results from their abilities." [10] Among the Natchez, the women of the noble clans had an extensive knowledge of herbal remedies; Captain Bossu speaks highly of their skill, and mentions that they saved the lives of many of the French.[11] Among the Ahts of Vancouver, "old women are

[1] C. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition*, vol. iii, p. 98.

[2] Basil Thomson, *Savage Island* pp. 134 sq.

[3] E. H. Lamont, *Wild Life among the Pacific Islanders*, p. 44.

[4] H. Detzner, *Vier Jahre unter Kannibalen*, pp. 279 sq.

[5] B. Hagen, "Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Battareligion," *Tijdschrift voor Indische taal-, land- en volkenkunde*, xlv, p. 282; J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua*, pp. 314 sq., 337 sq.; N. Graafland, *De Minahassa*, vol. i, p. 131.

[6] C. Lumholtz, *Through Central Borneo*, vol. i, p. 123.

[7] F. J. Mouat, "Narrative of an Expedition to the Andaman Islands in 1857," *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, xxxii, p. 123.

[8] H. J. Rink, *Tales and Traditions of the Eskimo*, pp. 42, 53.

[9] J. D. Hunter, *Memoirs of a Captivity among the Indians*, p. 437. Cf. S. Powers, *Tribes of California*, p. 249.

[10] J. Heckewelder, *History, Manners, and Customs of the Indian Nations*, pp. 228 sq.

[11] Bossu, *Travels through that Part of North America formerly called Louisiana*, vol. i, pp. 43 sq.

generally employed in the cure of the sick." [1] In Mexico "the doctors were old women, and they had no others." In the province of Goozocooho "they have doctors to cure the sick, and most are women. They are great herbalists and do all their cures with herbs." [2] They also set joints, treated wounds, diseases of the eyes, and gout, and performed phlebotomy.[3] In Patagonia the women are the chief doctors.[4] Among the Araucanians of Chile medicine was practised exclusively by the women.[5] In Kamchatka all knowledge of medicine and pharmacy was in the hands of the women, and their preparations of herbal remedies were quite elaborate.[6]

In early Arabia, and down to the Middle Ages, the treatment of wounds and the practice of medicine were recognised occupations of women. Even at the present day the traditional avocation survives in its original form in the more secluded Muslim countries. "I have often wondered," says Mrs. Bishop, "that the Moslem contempt for women does not prevent even the highest chiefs from seeking a woman's medical help, but their 'hakims' are mostly women, and the profession is hereditary. Some of these women are renowned for their skill as bullet extractors." [7] Among the ancient Germans medical and surgical treatment was carried out solely by the women; [8] and among the Scandinavians "the practice of medicine and surgery was left to them." [9] In Gaul "the women were regarded as specially qualified by nature,

[1] G. M. Sproat, *Scenes and Studies of Savage Life*, p. 172; cf. pp. 168 sq., 255 sq.

[2] A. de Herrera, *Historia general de los hechos de los Castellanos en las islas i Tierra firme*, vol. ii, pp. 260, 121, 188. The same statements apply to Nicaragua. The medical activities of present-day Mexican native women are referred to by E. Berdau ("Der Mond in Volksmedizin, Sitte und Gebräuche der mexicanische Grenzbewohnerschaften der sudische Texas," *Globus*, lxxxviii, p. 381).

[3] B. de Sahagun, *Historia general de las cosas de Nueva España*, vol. ii, p. 36. Amusing details are given by Herrera concerning the treatment administered by Mexican lady-doctors. "They gave clisters through pipes, holding the decoction in their mouths." The technique of Kamtchadal female practitioners appears to have been more advanced; they manufactured syringes out of bladders and quills.

[4] F. Lacroix, *Patagonie, Terre de Feu, et îles Malouines*, pp. 30 sq.

[5] Diego de Rosales, *Historia general de el Reyno de Chile*, vol. i, p. 573.

[6] H. Krasheninnikof, *History of Kamtchatka*, p. 188; B. Dybowski, *Okweslyi Kobiecej*, quoted by M. Lipinska, *Histoire des femmes médecins*, pp. 24 sq.

[7] Mrs. Bishop (I. L. Bird), *Journeys in Persia and Kurdistan*, vol. ii, p. 74.

[8] Tacitus, *Germania*, vii; J. Grimm, *Teutonic Mythology*, pp. 1038, 1150; K. von Müllenhoff, *Deutsche Alterthumskunde*, vol. iv, p. 206.

[9] K. Gjerset, *History of the Norwegian Peoples*, vol. i, p. 90.

and were thought to be able to heal diseases which no one else could cure." [1]

To a far greater extent than is generally realised the sexual differences, both mental and physical, between men and women are products of social development, and are largely the effect rather than the causes of differentiation and of the division of social functions. As we recede towards more primitive conditions they become less pronounced; not only in temperament and mental aptitudes, but even in physical conformation and development the two sexes approximate in their characters to one another. Primitive woman is anything but 'effeminate,' she is anything but delicate and soft, she is, it must be admitted, anything but beautiful; she is not the artificially cultivated product subserving solely sexual purposes, but like the female of animals among whom is no division of labour, she is fully the equal of the man as regards capacity to provide for her needs out of her environment, and to a great extent she is in that respect his superior.

It is commonly supposed that the facts of primitive matriarchal society afford a strong argument in support of the doctrine of feminism, that is to say, the view that the capacity and fitness of women for all the pursuits which, in our social order, are masculine occupations, are equal to those of men. That view, whether correct or no, does not, however, follow from the respective capacities of men and women in primitive society. Within what is called 'woman's sphere,' that is, the sphere of household activities, the respective efficiency of the sexes is much the same in civilised as in primitive societies. The intellectual genius, the master of industry, the capable ruler and leader, the keen competitive business-man, the able administrator, whose places could not be filled in their respective spheres by their wives, would be as helpless babes in the primitive details of life; they would be at a loss in the kitchen, in sewing on a button, or negotiating with the grocer. Primitive culture is almost entirely confined to that household sphere, to those immediate details of life, to direct dinner-providing and housekeeping activities. Primitive industries are connected with the kitchen and the sewing-room; primitive commerce is represented by marketing; primitive law and primitive administration are chiefly family and household management. The man in primitive society contributes the raw materials, not the wages of production or of administration. Those activities which in civilised societies chiefly constitute the sphere of the man are practically non-existent in primitive society; they have developed in the higher phases of culture under patriarchal conditions, as a result

[1] Pomponius Mela, iii. 6.

of accumulation of power in the hands of the aggressive fighter and ruler, of the predatory and competitive male. The predominance of women in primitive society which to many appears incredible and paradoxical, would to a large extent be automatically restored in our own if culture were narrowed down to the range of primitive culture, if our industrial enterprises suddenly reverted to the dimensions of household industries, if the State shrank to the dimensions of the household. The greater equality of the sexes, or the actual superiority of women in primitive society, as regards productive and administrative efficiency, arises not so much from differences in the respective ability of the sexes, as from the profound difference in the spheres of those abilities in primitive and in advanced culture.

In those spheres which at the lower cultural level are of importance, the intellectual advantage is not on the side of the male. The primitive human female, like the animal female, is far more wary, sagacious and ingenious than the male, who is dull and stupid by comparison. Her maternal functions have in the course of a long evolution developed an alertness, a circumspection, an ingenuity, a constructive aptitude, which are foreign to masculine development. The female is accordingly, in primitive conditions, not only the equal intellectually of the male, but often his actual superior. This is observable in all savages where practical affairs are concerned; and it is no wonder that the savage habitually goes to his women-folk for advice. It has been remarked that the Ibibo women of West Africa are mentally of a higher type than the men.[1] Among the Veddahs of Ceylon the men are extremely dull; they scarcely ever speak to one another, and have "the perplexed manner common to people of weak intellect. The women appear sharper and quicker than the men."[2] The same contrast has been noted among the Fuegians: "the women are more intelligent than the men."[3] In Borneo it is noted that the women are much more at their ease in dealing with strangers than are the men.[4] Among thr tribes of the interior of New Guinea, Moskowski remarks: "Generally it was not the men, but the women who received us; their brave consorts hid themselves trembling behind the women."[5] The picture is not overdrawn or unusual; the experience is a

[1] D. A. Talbot, *Woman's Mysteries of a Primitive People*, p. 113.

[2] J. Bailey, "An Account of the Wild Tribes of the Veddahs of Ceylon," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society*, N.S., ii, p. 284.

[3] "La Terre de Feu et ses habitants," *Journal des Missions Évangéliques*, li (1876), p. 313.

[4] C. A. L. M. Schwaner, *Borneo*, vol. i, p. 161.

[5] M. Moskowski, "Die Völkerstämme am Mamberamo in Holländisch-Neuguinea," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xliii, p. 338.

common one among savage races. Among the Eastern Melanesians, where the status of women is more definitely one of subjection than in most other parts of the savage world, it is nevertheless the woman who naturally takes the lead in negotiations with strangers. On entering a Fijian village I have been received by a wizened old hag who advanced to meet me, and introduced her sons, a couple of elderly cannibal chiefs, who hung back like confused schoolboys until dragged forward almost by force by the grinning dame. Among the Bushmen, women went to parley with a strange party while the men awaited the result of the interview before putting in an appearance.[1] "It is not an uncommon sight to see a Mkamba run for life at the sight of a European, while his wife will be found sitting by the roadside undisturbed, and looking as if nothing could induce her to run."[2] Among the Aleuts, "when strangers arrive at a village it is always customary for the women to go out and meet them, while the men remain at home."[3] In Tibet it is the woman who faces the stranger. "The Tibetan woman," says Mr. Landor, "is far superior to the Tibetan man. She possesses a better heart, more pluck, and a finer character than he does. Time after time, when the male, timid beyond description, ran away at our approach, the women remained in charge of the tents and, although by no means cool and collected, they very rarely failed to meet us without a show of dignity. . . . The women seemed much less shy than the men, and conversed freely and incessantly."[4] An early Jesuit missionary remarks that among the North American Indians "the women are everywhere far better managers than the men."[5] The same thing may be observed in the ruder strata of our own societies; the French peasant woman, for instance, is a more intelligent, alert and less awkward person than her man.

Position of Chiefs in Primitive Societies.

It has sometimes been objected against the view that primitive society was essentially matriarchal in its constitution that even

[1] G. W. Stow, "Account of an Interview with a Tribe of Bushmans in South Africa," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, iii, p. 245.

[2] C. Dundas, "History of Kitui," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii, p. 488.

[3] W. Coxe, *An Account of the Russian Discoveries between Asia and America*, p. 262.

[4] A. H. Savage Landor, *In the Forbidden Land*, vol. i, pp. 57 sq.

[5] *Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, vol. iii, p. 107.

in matriarchally organised communities the headman, or chief, is commonly a man.[1] But that the headman should be a male follows as a necessary consequence from the fact that, in the sexual division of labour, hunting and war are male occupations, and that recognised leadership is necessary for the concerted action which they demand. The leader in hunting and in war is a man because he must be a hunter and a warrior. But that position entails nothing analogous to what is habitually associated with the power and authority of a ruler; there is no such power and no such authority in truly primitive societies. The power of the 'headman' in war or hunting is extremely limited and ephemeral; it is, like leadership among animals, purely functional, and no authority attaches to the office apart from its utility to the community. Thus in Australia, where male domination is fully established, and where the influence and authority of the older men is greater than in most primitive communities, they have, nevertheless, no power. Among the Australian aborigines there are, properly speaking, no chiefs. The persons called by Europeans 'headmen' are merely such delegates as may act as spokesmen in intercourse with the white men. It is more than doubtful whether any such institution existed before the arrival of Europeans. Australian 'headmen' have no power to issue commands. They cannot act on their own initiative and personal authority; the collective action of the clan or tribe is governed by the influence of the elder men, but there

[1] See J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, vol. v, pp. 209 sqq. In referring to the matriarchal theory of primitive social evolution, Sir James Frazer is moved quite out of his customary suavity, and his scathing scorn overflows on to his margin and into his index. That fantastic theory is, according to Sir James, "a dream of visionaries and pedants." Yet surely no one knows better than Sir James Frazer that it would be difficult to exhibit, even from the literature of social anthropology, a more pitiable display of pedantic, visionary and utterly foolish absurdities than is presented by the various attempts to interpret the facts of matriarchal society in the light of patriarchal assumptions. We have come upon a few specimens of such interpretations, such as Dr. Hodgson's naïve assumption that the Koch men "are so gallant that they have made over all the property to the women" (see above, p. 301); Champollion's belief that the system of matrilinear descent in Egypt was a late invention due to the 'corruption' of Ptolemaic times (above, p. 379, n). One writer who, like Sir James Frazer, bristles with scorn at the fantastic theory of matriarchy, suggests that the matriarchal features in Spartan society are also a late innovation due to the progress of 'refinement' (C. Jannet, *Les institutions sociales et le droit civil à Sparte*, pp. 88 sqq.). Pages could be filled with such ineptitudes. If it comes to 'calling names,' I scarcely think that a comparison of interpretations inspired by the patriarchal doctrine with those founded on the matriarchal theory of social evolution would show visionary fantasies and pedantry to be a monopoly of the latter.

is no formal council.[1] In northern Melanesia the transacting of any official business with the natives is rendered very difficult owing to the fact that they have no chiefs.[2] In New Caledonia, another centre of male domination under the rudest conditions, "the chiefs often have no great influence and absolutely no political power."[3] In the Banks Islands, in Torres Straits Islands, there are no headmen.[4] In New Guinea the chiefs have very little influence.[5] Among the tribes of Assam "each village is a small republic and each man is as good as his neighbour; indeed, it would be hard to find anywhere else more thoroughly democratic communities. Headmen do exist, but their authority is very small."[6] They are chiefs in name only.[7] Among the Fuegians there are no chiefs. The medicine-men were described by Captain Fitzroy as 'chiefs'; but, says Captain Bove, "they have no authority whatever, they are as often as not derided and despised."[8] The Patagonians "owe no manner of allegiance to any head cacique. . . . Their natural bias is to independence, and rather insubordinate ideas of one man being as good as another." Commander Musters's advice to future travellers among the Indians is: "Don't give yourself airs of superiority, as they do not understand it."[9] The Indians of Brazil, reports an old missionary, "know neither princes nor kings. Each family regards itself as absolutely free, every Indian looks upon himself as independent. As the continual wars which they have to wage against their neighbours place that liberty in danger, they have learnt the necessity of forming a sort of society, and they choose a chief who is called 'cacique.' But in choosing him their intention is not to give

[1] J. Browne, "The Aborigenes of Australia," *The Nautical Magazine*, p. 489; W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 24; E. J. Eyre, *Journals of Expeditions of Discovery into Central Australia*, vol. ii, pp. 315 sq.; J. Mathew, "The Australian Aborigenes," *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales*, xxiii, p. 398; J. Macgillivray, *Narrative of the Voyage of H.M.S. 'Rattlesnake,'* vol. i, p. 151.

[2] H. H. Romilly, *The Western Pacific and New Guinea*, p. 27.

[3] J. G. A. Forster, *A Voyage round the World*, vol. ii, p. 431.

[4] A. C. Haddon, in *Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits*, vol. v, pp. 265 sqq.; J. Macgillivray, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 27.

[5] H. Zöller, *Deutsch-Neuguinea*, p. 229; T. Waitz and G. Gerland, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, vol. vi, p. 656.

[6] A. W. Davis, in *Census of India*, 1891, "Assam," vol. i, p. 243.

[7] T. C. Hodson, "The 'Genna' amongst the Tribes of Assam," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxvi, p. 170.

[8] G. Bove, *Patagonia. Terra di Fuoco. Mari Australi*, p. 134. Cf. C. Spegazzini, "Costumbres de los habitantes de la Tierra de Fuego," *Anales de la Sociedad Cientifica Argentina*, xiii, p. 165.

[9] G. C. Musters, *At Home with the Patagonians*, pp. 184, 188.

themselves a master, but a protector and father, under whose guidance they desire to place themselves. In order to be raised to that dignity it is necessary to have furnished striking proofs of courage and valour." [1] The Iroquois and Delawares "know no magistracy, laws, or restraint. Chiefs are nothing more than the most respected among their equals in rank." Their principal duties were to conduct negotiations with other tribes and with Europeans, and to hold themselves responsible for the carrying out of any agreement thus entered into.[2] For a small mistake they were severely reprimanded; for any neglect of their duties they were cashiered.[3] They "laugh when you talk to them of obedience to kings." [4] A trader in the employment of the Hudson's Bay Company relates the perplexity of the Indians when he spoke of the directors of the Company as his 'chiefs.' They asked, "Who are thy chiefs, and what makes them superior to other men?" He explained that their influence was owing to their great wealth; "but the more I said in their praise, the more contempt I brought upon myself, and if ever I regretted anything in my life it was to have said so much." [5] Several American tribes appointed chiefs in wartime only.[6] The Sioux had no chiefs before the coming of Europeans.[7] Among the Carrier Indians, chiefs "have not much authority or influence." [8] Among the Navahos, "chiefs are but elders, men of temporary and ill-defined influence, whom the youngest man in the tribe may contradict and defy." [9] Among the Blackfeet, chiefs are described as occupying the position of beggars.[10]

Among the Arabs the sheikh "is merely influential; he is respected and deference is paid to his advice, especially if he is a ready speaker, but he is not entitled to issue commands. He is obliged at every turn to consult the tribal council, which is

[1] Father Cat, in *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses*, vol. ix, pp. 355 sq. Cf. G. E. Church, *Aborigines of South America*, pp. 95, 104.

[2] G. H. Loskiel, *History of the Mission of the United Brethren*, vol. i, pp. 30, 130, 133. Cf. D. Jones, *Journal of Two Visits made to some Nations of Indians*, p. 73.

[3] G. H. Loskiel, *op. cit.*, p. 133; H. R. Schoolcraft, *Indian Tribes*, vol. iv, p. 32.

[4] J. Long, *Voyages and Travels of an Indian Interpreter*, p. 30.

[5] C. Mackenzie, "The Missouri Indians," in L. R. Masson, *Les Bourgeois de la Compagnie du Nord-Ouest*, vol. i, p. 384.

[6] H. R. Schoolcraft, *Indian Tribes*, vol. iv, pp. 89, 209.

[7] *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 182; vol. iv, p. 69.

[8] J. Morse, *A Report to the Secretary of War of the United States on Indian Affairs*, p. 344.

[9] W. Matthews, "Some Deities and Demons of the Navajos," *The American Naturalist*, xx, p. 844.

[10] Maximilian, Prince zu Wied, *Reise in das innere Nord America*, vol. i, p. 164.

composed of the heads of the component families of the clan. Without the assent of this assembly war cannot be declared or peace concluded." [1] Among the Kabyls, chiefs were appointed in war-time only.[2] Even in Africa, the land of barbaric despots, chiefs are not always what the European, brought up amid the traditions of a feudal society, is apt to assume, and their existence has sometimes been taken for granted by the white man. What are described as 'chiefs' are often no more than war-leaders. Speaking of the representative tribes of East Africa, the Akamba, Akikuyu, Aketaka, the Hon. H. C. Dundas states: "After the most careful enquiry and consideration of what is still evidence, I feel convinced that these tribes had no heads or leaders who could be dignified with the name of chiefs." [3]

The power of the 'headman' or 'chief' in primitive society, when such exists, is thus unattended with any form of domination, but is exercised at the discretion of the community, for its own purposes, and often at the peril of those who unwillingly exercise it. The primitive headman possesses executive power only, that is, the delegated function of coordinating any collective action which the group as a whole has decided to take. Very generally his main, or sole, function is that of spokesman in any intercourse of the group with other groups. In the internal organisation of the primitive group no compulsion is exercised; tasks are not imposed, 'duties' are not enforced, privilege and domination are not recognised. The place of enforced tasks and duties is occupied by spontaneous psychological sentiments which need no theoretical sanctions and no compulsory enforcement.

The position of male chiefs in primitive social groups, far from constituting a difficulty as regards their matriarchal nature, appears on the contrary, to be irreconcilable with the hypothesis that such groups owed their origin to male instincts, and were formed in the first instance around the authority of a dominant male. The visionary conception of the primitive patriarchal group, dominated by the 'old male' is radically incompatible with the equalitarian character which is everywhere the most conspicuous feature of primitive societies. Authority and domination are products of comparatively late conditions. Where military power has

[1] R. Dozy, *Islam in Spain*, pp. 4 sq. Cf. J. L. Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins and Wahábys*, pp. 66 sqq.; R. F. Burton, *Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to Al-Madinah and Meccah*, vol. i, p. 14.

[2] D. Randall-Maciver and A. Wilk, *Libyan Notes*, p. 16.

[3] H. C. Dundas, "The Organisation and Laws of some Bantu Tribes in East Africa," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlv, p. 238. Cf. G. Lindblom, *The Akamba*, p. 149: "There have never been any chiefs. . . . In times of war, however, experienced warriors were selected as leaders."

developed, the war-leader and the warrior class have naturally acquired domination and absolute authority over conquered peoples. Upon the stranger has that domination first come to be established by right of conquest. Psychologically the desire for domination in the male retains that character; it reduces itself to imposed physical coercion. The criterion of power is the ability to compel others against their will. With woman, desire for domination assumes a different form. Her ambition is not to exercise physical compulsion, but to bend the will of others to her desire, to overcome not physical, but psychical resistances. In accordance with the physical derivation of his notion of power the man delights in its display, is flattered by hostile envy, is almost as gratified by reputation for power as by its reality. He desires his power to be felt and known; the exercise of unrecognised, secret, undetected power is, in his eyes, of small value. With woman the chief use and end of power is to have her way; provided she achieves that end it matters little to her whether that power be felt; she can dispense with the vainglory of triumph.[1] That character of feminine ambition is not a strategy necessitated by weakness; it is the consequence of the primary and primitive functional character of feminine authority, as opposed to the violently imposed domination acquired by the combatant male.

The authority and privileges of the male 'headman' in matriarchal communities are even more insignificant than in other primitive societies. Among the Seri the 'chief' appears to exercise scarcely any other function than to communicate the desires and decisions of the matrons to the men; he is not chosen with regard to his own qualifications, but to those of his wife.[2] The Pueblo Indians had no chiefs.[3] The Khasis of Assam "show no very particular courtesy of bearing towards their rajas; indeed, the latter do not seem to have much power. They have the right of calling on all to bear arms, or send a contribution in case of war."[4] In olden days their function was that of war-leaders. They "can perform no act of importance without consulting and obtaining the approval of the durbar upon which the 'mantris' sit." They "are a very impecunious set of persons." In Khyrim, which appears to have retained a more primitive con-

[1] "Man strives at a direct control over things either through understanding or through coercion; woman aims always at an indirect control" (Schopenhauer, *Parerga und Paralipomena*, vol. ii, p. 647).

[2] See above, p. 275; below, vol. iii, pp. 15 sq.

[3] P. de Castañeda de Naçera, "Relación de la Jornada de Cibola," in *Fourteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 450.

[4] H. Yule, "Notes on the Kasia Hills and People," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, xiii, Part ii, p. 627.

stitution than other tribal districts, the chieftainship is limited to the male relatives of the High Priestess, who controls their administration.[1] Among the Pelew islanders the authority of male chiefs is exercised over the men only; women do not even salute them. They can take no action without consulting the council of matrons. When an important decision has to be arrived at, the chief is shut up in his house in the company of several of the elder women, who assist the potentate in making up his mind.[2] It cannot be supposed that in those communities the nebulous authority of the 'chiefs' has been forcibly and arrogantly seized by the men; the women's authority and influence is paramount, they command every means and every avenue of power. Chieftainship is purely functional; what authority is attached to it is exercised over the men, not over the women, and is subject to the will of the latter.

Even where the theory of male rule has become most completely developed the authority of the woman is freely and expressly recognised within her functional sphere, that is, within the house and the internal economy of the family. She is in the Greek, in the Indian, in the Roman household, the 'lady' of the house. Man is the political ruler of the State, woman the social ruler of her home. But primitively the distinction between 'home' and 'State,' between family group and nation does not exist; the woman by virtue of that rule of the household which is recognised among the most patriarchal peoples is social ruler of the community in all its internal economy. The functional authority of the male comes into play only in the external relations of the community; he is war-leader, he is spokesman of the group in its negotiations with other groups. That division of function has sometimes left its traces in comparatively advanced and highly organised communities. In Hawaii the administration of all internal affairs was under the exclusive control of the queen; the king was concerned with foreign politics only.[3] In his character of warrior, the man is defender of the home, and in him is vested the executive power of action in the relations of the home with a hostile environment. The woman carries children and burdens in order that the hands which bear the weapons may be free. She expects from the male that functional protection, and that his specialised activity in the sexual division of labour shall be used in her interest.

[1] P. R. T. Gurdon, *The Khasis*, pp. 66 sqq.

[2] J. Kubary, *Die socialen Einrichtungen der Pelauer*, p. 39; Id., "Die Religion der Pelauer," in A. Bastian, *Allerlei aus Volks- und Menschenkunde*, vol. i, p. 12.

[3] See below, vol. iii, p. 27.

Position of the Woman's Brother in the Primitive Group.

But that male is not in the primitive group the sexual mate, the husband. The economic conditions which lead to the association of the sexes did not operate in the primitive group, for the economic uses of the sexual division of labour were fulfilled within the group without any association of sexual mates. The cooperation of male and female was already provided for by the presence of brothers and sons within the group. The executive authority delegated to the male and the protective functions exercised by him are accordingly vested in the brother, not in the husband. In the maternal family it is the former who holds the place occupied by the latter in the patriarchal family. The word 'brother,' in Sanskrit 'bhratr,' comes from the root 'bhr,' to 'support.'[1] The brother is the natural supporter and protector of his sister, and of his sister's family.

The position of the eldest brother of the woman, and uncle of the children, is a well-known and widespread feature of primitive society, and is so fundamental that it has frequently survived the original constitution which gave rise to it. In North America, "the relationship of uncle in Indian society is in several particulars more important than any other, from the authority with which he is invested over his nephews and nieces. He is practically rather more the head of his sister's family than his sister's husband. Amongst the Chactas, for example, if a boy is to be placed at school his uncle instead of his father takes him to the mission and makes the arrangements. An uncle among the Winnebogues may require service of a nephew or administer correction which his own father would neither ask nor attempt. In like manner, with the Iowas and Ottawas, an uncle may appropriate to his own use his nephew's horse or his gun or other personal property without being questioned, which his own father would have no recognised right to do."[2] In the southern part of the continent the same relation obtained. Among the Goajiros "the father cannot dispose of his daughter; that right appertains to the mother's brothers. These were regarded by Goajiro law as the natural protectors, the real fathers of the children. It is they who accept or refuse a proposal of marriage with their niece, who fix the amount of the bride-price; it is they who receive the payment."[3] Among the Bakairi "the

[1] A. A. Macdonell and A. B. Keith, *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*, s.v. 'bhratr.'

[2] L. H. Morgan, *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family*, p. 158.

[3] H. Candelier, *Le Rio Hacha et les Indiens Goajires*, p. 208. Cf. F. C.

children obey the uncle rather than the father" ;[1] and we have similar reports concerning the various tribes of Brazil.[2] The same relations existed between maternal uncle and nephew among the Guanches of the Canary Islands, and a man transmitted his property, not to his sons, but to the sons of his sister.[3]

In every part of the African continent the position of the mother's brother is found to have the same character as on the other side of the Atlantic. In South Africa, among the Basutos, "in all family transactions the 'malome,' or mother's brother, has the first right to the cattle and over his nephews and nieces."[4] In East Africa, among the Wamrima, the uncle exercises all authority over his sister's children "by an indefeasible vested right with which even the parents cannot interfere."[5] Among the Masai, the maternal uncle has the same complete control over the children. It is believed that if he were to curse them they would die. "If the uncle desires anything that is the property of his nephew's father, the nephew must buy it from his father, who will at once give it up when he knows for whom it is intended."[6] The same relation obtains among the Nandi ; the nephew cannot be circumcised, or have a tooth drawn without the consent of the uncle.[7] The power of the maternal uncle in Uganda formerly amounted to despotism in the family.[8] Among the Barea the wife obeys her brother, not her husband ; she relies for assistance and advice on the former and not on the latter.[9] Among the Wanyamwesi the woman's brother, not the husband, is the head of the family.[10] Among the Makonde, boys are brought up by their mother's brother.[11] Among the Bahuana of the Congo a man's children are taken charge of, as soon as they attain puberty, by their mother's brother ; the father has no authority what-

Nicholas, "The Aborigines of the Province of Santa Maria, Columbia," *The American Anthropologist*, N.S., iii, pp. 647 sq. : "The parents have nothing to say in the matter, the maternal uncles having full authority which the girl must recognise."

[1] K. von den Steinen, *Unter den Naturvölkern Zentral-Brasiliens*, p. 382.

[2] C. F. Ph. von Martius, *Von den Rechtszustande unter den Ureinwohnern Brasiliens*, p. 690.

[3] A. Carter Cook, "The Aborigines of the Canary Islands," *The American Anthropologist*, N.S., ii, p. 480.

[4] A. Mabille, "The Basutos of Basutoland," *Journal of the African Society*, v, p. 244.

[5] R. F. Burton, *The Lake Regions of East Africa*, vol. i, pp. 37 sq.

[6] J. G. Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, vol. ii, p. 409, after A. C. Hollis.

[7] A. C. Hollis, *The Nandi*, p. 94.

[8] J. G. Frazer, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, pp. 512 sq., after J. Roscoe.

[9] W. Munzinger, *Ostafrikanische Studien*, p. 325.

[10] P. Reichard, "Die Wanjamuesi," *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin*, 1889, p. 255.

[11] K. Weule, *Native Life in East Africa*, p. 314.

ever over them.[1] In West Africa, among the Igalwas, "the father's responsibility as regards authority over his own children is very slight. The really responsible male relative is the mother's elder brother. From him must leave to marry be obtained by either girl or boy; to him and the mother must the present be taken which is exacted on the marriage of a girl; and should the mother die, on him and not on the father lies the responsibility of rearing the children; they go to his house, and he treats and regards them as nearer and dearer to himself than his own children, and at his death, after his own brother by the same mother, they become his heirs."[2] In Dahomey, "the eldest brother is the head of the family, and his heir the brother next of age to himself; if he has no brother his heir is the eldest son of his eldest sister."[3] In Angola, "the closest relation is that of mother and child, the next that of nephew or niece and uncle or aunt. The uncle owns his nephews and nieces; he can sell them, and they are his heirs, not only in private property, but also in the chiefship, if he be a chief."[4] On the Gold Coast "under native law a man may chastise his sister's children and sell or pawn them for his own debts, but under no circumstances may he do so with his own children, since they do not belong to his family, but to the mother's."[5] Among the Filane of Nigeria, a Hausa tribe called Peuls by the French, all male children are taken charge of by their mother's brothers, and though the father may claim the eldest son after a time, his sons commonly remain with their uncles until they marry and may never live with their father.[6] Among the Adiokru of the Ivory Coast Province, while legitimate children are under the care of their father, illegitimate children, who suffer no civil or social disability, are under the care of their mother's brother, who provides for their upbringing and education, no claim being made in this respect on their father.[7] The same rule is observed in Darfur, in the Sudan.[8] The matriarchal and the patriarchal custom thus exist side by side.

Among the Malays of the highlands of Sumatra, the brother of the eldest mother of the 'motherhood' is, as we have seen, the

[1] E. Torday and T. A. Joyce, "Notes on the Ethnography of the Ba-Huana," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxvi, p. 287.

[2] M. Kingsley, *Travels in West Africa*, p. 225.

[3] A. B. Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, p. 207.

[4] H. Chatelain, *Folk-Tales of Angola*, p. 8.

[5] A. ffoulkes, "The Fanti Family System," *Journal of the African Society*, vii, p. 405. Cf. F.-J. Clozel and R. Villamur, *Les coutumes indigènes de la Côte d' Ivoire*, pp. 399 sq.

[6] O. Temple, *Notes on the Tribes, Provinces, Emirates and States of the Northern Provinces of Nigeria*, p. 402.

[7] F.-J. Clozel and R. Villamur, *op. cit.*, p. 440.

[8] Muhammad ibn-Umar Al-Tunisi, *Voyage au Darfour*, p. 213.

executive head and spokesman of the community, and as regards the children is a far closer relation than their father.[1] Similarly, among the natives of Timorlaut, although their social organisation is at the present day essentially patriarchal, the mother's brother, or 'nduwe,' occupies a position which constitutes one of the most fundamental relations of native society. "The word 'nduwe' does not correspond to any conception to be found in Europe." Not only does the mother's brother enjoy a special authority over his nephews and nieces, especially in regard to their marriage, but it is to him that they are expected to turn when in any difficulty or want. In short, it appears that although they inherit name and property from their father, it is their mother's brother who chiefly fulfils towards them the functions of male parent.[2] A similar position, as we shall see, is occupied by the maternal uncle among the Dravidian populations of India; his functions in this case have reference chiefly to the marriage of his nephews and nieces, and the part which he plays in wedding ceremonies is often but a vestigial relic of his position.[3] Among the Ainu of Japan, the mother's brother is the most important member of the family.[4] Among the Aleuts, according to Veniaminoff, the father had nothing to do with his wife's children; it was her brother who looked after and reared his sister's children of both sexes.[5]

In Melanesia "the closest relationship, according to the native customs, is that which exists between the sister's son and the mother's brother, because the mother who transmits the kinship is not able to render the services which a man can give. A man's sons are not of his own kin, though he acts a father's part to them, but the tie between his sister's children and himself has the strength of the traditional bond of all native society, that of kinship through the mother. The youth, as he begins to feel social ties, looks to his mother's brother as to the male representative of his kin. It is a matter of course that the nephew should look to his mother's brother for help of every kind, and the uncle should look upon his sister's son as his special care; the closeness of this relation is fundamental." [6] The mother's brother, says another writer, "takes

[1] See above, pp. 288 sq.

[2] P. Drabbe, "Het heidensch huwelijk op Tanimbar," *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, lxxix, pp. 547 sq.

[3] See below, pp. 541 sq. Cf. W. H. R. Rivers, "The Marriage of Cousins in India," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1907, pp. 629 sqq.

[4] B. Pilsudski, "Schwangershaft, Entbindung und Fehlgeburt bei den Bewohnern der Insel Sachalin, Giljaken und Ainu," *Anthropos*, v, pp. 763 sq.; M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, p. 105.

[5] F. Lowe, "Wenjaminow über die Aleutischen Inseln und deren Bewohnern," *Archiv für wissenschaftliche Kunde von Russland*, ii, p. 476.

[6] R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians*, p. 34.

the chief place in the Melanesian family, and the parents fall into the background before him. The children belong neither to the father nor to the mother, but to the mother's brother or to her nearest kinsman. The maternal uncle has the full right to dispose of his nephews and nieces. When the children are grown bigger they leave their father and mother and go to their 'matuana.' They live in his house and work for him. They have every motive to stand on a good footing with him, for they look to him entirely and are dependent on him. On the death of the matuana, it is not his own children but his nephews who come forward as his heirs."[1] In northern Papua it is the mother's brother who disposes of her children in marriage.[2]

We have already noticed the same relation among the ancient Germans,[3] and we have found distinct traces of it in primitive Rome.[4] Among the Christian Ossetes of the Caucasus before a man can marry he must present a horse to the bride's maternal uncle.[5] No social organisation at the present day is more definitely patriarchal than that of the Ossetes; but such a usage appears clearly to be a survival of a time when a woman's brother, and not her husband, had the disposal of her daughters. In Krete, in the seventh century B.C., when patriarchal usages had become well established, a woman's illegitimate children, who suffered under no dishonour or disability, were brought up by her brother.[6] The same usage, as has been seen, obtains in the Sudan. The constitution of the matriarchal group persists in those instances side by side with patriarchal marriage. A woman's extra-nuptial children in a patriarchal organisation are in the same position as are all her children in a matriarchally organised society; their natural protector is not their father, who belongs to another group, but their mother's brother.

The male partner in the economic association which constitutes the primitive group is not the husband, but the brother. The relation is not a merely formal, juridical and traditional one. The constitution of the primitive group rests ultimately upon economic conditions; but psychological facts, sentiments, feelings, corre-

[1] P. A. Kleintitschen, *Die Küstenbewohner der Gazellehalbinsel*, pp. 190 sqq. Cf. V. Douceré, "Notes sur les populations indigènes des Nouvelles Hébrides," *Revue d'Ethnologie et des Traditions Populaires*, iii, p. 232; D. Macdonald, *Oceania*, p. 184.

[2] R. Neuhauss, *Deutsch Neu-Guinea*, vol. i, p. 302.

[3] See above, p. 414 sq.

[4] See above, p. 423 sq.

[5] M. Kovalewski, *Coutume contemporaine et loi ancienne. Droit coutumier ossétien*, p. 164.

[6] F. Bücheler and E. Zitelmann, "Das Recht von Gortyn," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, N.F., xl, pp. 24, 109.

spond to the relations established by those conditions: the object of the woman's affection is the brother rather than the sexual mate. If we have clearly apprehended the fact that the extension of affection towards the male has for its sole object the enlistment of his cooperation in the maternal function of the female, and that this tenderness differs wholly from the sexual impulse which requires no association, we shall have no difficulty in understanding how it is that a woman's affection for her brother may be quite as lively as her affection for her sexual mate, and may in many instances be deeper and more real. That is, to a certain extent, true of civilised as of primitive conditions; for sexual love always contains a hidden element of opposition, whereas in her affection for her brother a woman can give full play to her sentiments without these being checked by the self-defensive instincts that modify them when directed towards the sexual mate. The latter, even in the conditions of advanced society, is in a sense a stranger; he is not of one's kith and kin. He may be loved with passion, but there is not between him and the woman the deep bond of common blood and common existence that binds her to her own people. It is only after the latter bonds have been severed, and the new ones of a common life of cohabitation and common interests have been forged by time, that the sexual mate can come to stand as close to the woman as her brother. In the constitution of primitive society those new bonds are not formed and the primary ones are not severed; and the relation to the brother remains closer and deeper than the relation to the husband.

In primitive societies the bonds of affection between brother and sister are generally much stronger than those between husband and wife. Whereas the latter are commonly denied and their existence is often, to say the least, doubtful, observers dwell upon the great affection between brothers and sisters. Among the Hovas of Madagascar, where love between husband and wife is said to be "not even thought of," there is "no lack of affection between brothers and sisters."[1] Among the Hottentots a man's sister occupied a position of extraordinary privilege and importance. The elder sister had a recognised authority over her brothers and ruled them completely. If a man chastises or maltreats a slave and the latter pronounces the name of his master's sister, he cannot be beaten.[2] Among the Beni-Amer, where the husband is exploited and downtrodden, and a woman would be ashamed to show him any signs of affection, "the

[1] J. Sibree, *The Great African Island*, p. 250.

[2] M. Ploix, "Les Hottentots ou Khoi-Khoi et leur Religion," *Revue d'Anthropologie*, xvi, p. 272.

affection between brother and sister is very great." [1] Among North American Indians the closest relation existed between sister and brother. If a young warrior captured a horse in warfare, it was to his sister that he presented it; it was invariably his sister who advanced to meet him when he returned from battle, and took charge of his horse; no matter what he asked she never refused him.[2] In the Mortlock Islands "there is great love between brother and sister." [3] Even where traditional usages of avoidance and reserve place a barrier between them, those rules do not loosen the bonds of affection and devotion. In New Caledonia, for instance, where brothers and sisters are hardly allowed to speak to one another, "they are," we are expressly told, "very fond of each other," and "the brother will everywhere protect his sister." [4] In Samoa the character of the relationship of the sister and her family to her brother is "semi-sacred." Sisters "were looked upon as sacred persons, hence the name 'tamasa' (sacred child or person)." [5] The sister of a chief had a right to express her views at a tribal council, and her brother was bound by custom to abide by them.[6] In Sumatra, among the Malays, the relation between sisters and brothers is as close as that between a mother and her children.[7]

"The wife of Intaphernes," Herodotus relates, "who, with all his kindred had been convicted of treason against Darius, came and stood before the king, weeping and wailing." The latter sent a messenger to her to say: "Lady, King Darius gives thee as a boon the life of one of thy kinsmen, choose which thou wilt of the prisoners." She answered: "If the king grants me the life of one alone, I make choice of my brother." Darius was so pleased with her answer that he gave her the life of her eldest son also.[8] The same sentiment is expressed in Sophokles' tragedy of 'Antigone.' She sacrifices herself, not for her lover, who plays a subordinate part in the drama, but for her brother, and expresses in the most direct terms her reasons for the preference.[9] The sentiment

[1] W. Munzinger, *Ostafrikanische Studien*, p. 325.

[2] Maximilian zu Wied, *Journey into the Inner Part of North America*, vol. ii, pp. 349 sq.

[3] J. Kubary, "Die Bewohner der Mortlock-Inseln," *Mitteilungen der geographischen Gesellschaft in Hamburg*, 1878–9, p. 201.

[4] Glaumont, "Usages, moeurs et coutumes des Néo-Calédoniens," *Revue d'Ethnographie*, vii, p. 84.

[5] G. Brown, *Melanesians and Polynesians*, pp. 40sq.

[6] W. von Bülow, "Das ungeschriebenes Gesetz der Samoaner," *Globus*, lxix, p. 193.

[7] A. W. P. Verkerk Pistorius, *Studien over de inlandsche huishouding in de Padangsche Bovenlande*, p. 42.

[8] Herodotus, iii. 119.

[9] Sophokles, *Antigone*, 909 sqq.

of the passage horrified Goethe.[1] But exactly the same sentiments are expressed in the oldest Teutonic literature.[2] Among the southern Slavs, the most binding oath of a woman is by her brother. Serbian poetry represents the affection between sister and brother as the strongest of human ties, and women as sacrificing their husbands to their brothers.[3] A widely current Arab proverb reproduces the indelicate reasoning of the Persian princess and of Antigone: "A husband can be found, a son can be born, but a brother cannot be replaced."[4] An Arab princess openly declared that "brothers are nobler and more magnanimous than husbands."[5]

The Marital Group in Primitive Society.

The family, that is, the group consisting of husband, wife and children, which the uncritical disposition to regard existing institutions as rooted in the foundations of nature, has led theorists in pre-scientific days to regard as the original unit of primitive society, is in many instances scarcely found to exist as a solidary and recognised group. The Yakut who, when they first came in contact with the Russians, possessed a strong clan organisation in which every member was responsible for the acts of every other, and all wealth was in common, denote blood-relationship between the members of the clan by the term "blood-and-flesh." There is no word for the concept of 'family,' except the word 'uru,' which means

[1] J. P. Eckermann, *Gespräche mit Goethe*, pp. 480 sq.: "After the heroine in the course of the tragedy has expressed the noblest motives for her conduct and manifested the elevated nature of a pure soul, she, at the moment of death, gives utterance to a motive which is altogether bad and strikes one as almost comical. She says that she had done for her brother what she would not have done, had she been married, for either her children or her husband. For, says she, had I lost a husband I could have obtained another, and had I lost my children I could have had more by another husband. But with my brother it is otherwise. . . . That is the naked sense of the passage, a passage which, to my taste, when uttered by a heroine going to her death, entirely abolishes the befitting tragic tone. . . . As I have remarked, I wish some good scholar could prove that the passage is a spurious one." The scholars, Jebb, Herman, Moritz, Bock, have done their best.

[2] G. G. Gervinus, *Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung*, vol. i, pp. 95 sq.; L. Dargun, *Mutterrecht und Raubehe*, pp. 50 sqq.

[3] J. Psichari, "La ballade de Lenore en Grèce," *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, ix, pp. 43 sqq.; A. Dozon, *Poésies populaires serbes*, p. 51.

[4] Wacyf Boutros Ghali, *La Tradition chevaleresque des Arabes*, p. 117.

[5] W. Robertson Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Ancient Arabia*, p. 182.

'marriage.'[1] "They have no special word for the precise designation of a family group consisting of a man with wife and children."[2] The sexual mate, or husband, who, according to the hypothesis that the primitive human group was a patriarchal family, ought to be the head of that group, is wherever the primitive social constitution has remained unchanged, a stranger within it, and has neither authority nor executive power or protective functions in that group. Speaking of the natives of East Africa generally, Mr. Joelson says: "For want of a better word I must needs refer to the negro 'family,' but my readers will realise that the term in this connection is used to convey an idea essentially different from the construction put upon it in modern society."[3] "In East Africa," says Dr. Weule, "the husband is nothing, so to speak, but a connection by marriage. He is his children's father, but he is not related to them; in fact, he belongs to another clan."[4] Among the Congo Pygmies, the social group consists of brothers and sisters, and in several camps no husbands and no wives may be found. The men visit their sexual partners in another camp.[5] Of the 'family' in West Africa, M. F.-J. Clozel says, "Although apparently it resembles that of European societies with father, mother and children, the father's authority scarcely exists, and from the civil point of view he is not the parent of his children. The true family among the Alladian only takes account of the uterine parentage. It is on the uterine family that the social organisation is based. The member is called 'etioco,' and it is the eldest 'etioco' who is the real head of the family, whether it be a man or a woman."[6] Among the Fanti "each family includes members on the mother's side only; thus the mother, and all her children, male and female, belong to her family; so do her mother and maternal uncles and aunts; but her father and all his relatives are nothing at all to her, nor are her husband nor any of his relatives."[7] The son of a powerful chief at Bassam, in French Guinea, on being asked whether he would not be a rich man when his father died and he inherited some of his wealth, answered "Why should I? I am only his son."[8] Even where the prin-

[1] M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, pp. 57, 59.

[2] W. G. Sumner, "The Yakuts," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxi, p. 75.

[3] F. S. Joelson, *The Tanganyika Territory*, p. 113.

[4] K. Weule, *Native Life in East Africa*, p. 189.

[5] Mgr. Le Roy, "Les Pygmées," *Les Missions Catholiques*, xxix, p. 102.

[6] F.-J. Clozel, "Land Tenure on the Ivory Coast," *Journal of the African Society*, i, p. 411.

[7] A. ffoulkes, "The Fanti Family System," *Journal of the African Society*, vii, p. 399.

[8] F.-J. Clozel and R. Villamur, *Les coutumes indigènes de la Côte d'Ivoire*, p. 379.

ciples of masculine supremacy and patriarchal organisation are fully established it by no means always follows that the father and husband is 'ex officio' the head of the family. Thus, among the Koryak, the social group is organised on the principle of seniority quite irrespectively of the relation of the man to the group and of uterine or agnatic descent. The eldest male is 'head of the family'; when he dies his eldest brother succeeds him; if there is no brother, his son; and if a son-in-law happens to be the eldest male in the household he becomes the 'head of the family.'[1]

Among the Wyandots, says Mr. Powell, "the family household is not a unit, as two gentes are represented in each, the father must belong to one gens, the mother and her children to another."[2] "The Indians consider their wives as strangers," says an old missionary. "It is a common saying among them, 'My wife is not my friend,' that is, 'she is not related to me and I need not care for her.'"[3] "There was nowhere such a family bond as we find in civilisation," says another writer: "Marriage among members of the same gens was prohibited; therefore since the ties of clanship were very strong, and the links of matrimony very weak, there was no harmonious, firmly united family, but rather a loosely constructed household. Since the child belonged to the mother, and the mother was a member of a gens different from that of the father, there was always a wide gulf separating the individuals of the domicile. The husband was isolated, perhaps even tolerated; plans and secrets existed among the members of the gens rather than between husband and wife."[4] "The affairs of the father's clan," says Mr. Bandelier, "did not concern his wife and children, whereas a neighbour might be a confidant in such matters. The mother, son and daughter spoke among themselves of matters of which the father was not entitled to know, and about which he scarcely felt enough curiosity to enquire."[5] The children do not regard their father as a relative by blood; if he requires assistance they consider that "his people" should look after him.[6] In the event of dispute, of hostilities between one clan and another, the children and the father, in primitive society, stood against one another as enemies.[7]

[1] W. Jochelson, *The Koryak* (*Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. vii), p. 744.

[2] J. W. Powell, "Wyandot Government," *First Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 61.

[3] G. H. Loskiel, *History of a Mission of the United Brethren*, p. 57 sq.

[4] A. J. Fynn, *The American Indian*, pp. 124 sq.

[5] A. F. Bandelier, *The Delight Makers*, p. 14.

[6] G. M. Dawson, "Report on an Exploration of the Yukon District," *Annual Report of the Geological Survey of Canada*, 1887–8, p. 7.

[7] J. Kubary, "Die Bewohner der Mortlock-Inseln," *Mittheilungen der geographischen Gesellschaft in Hamburg*, 1878–1879, p. 260; T. Watt Leggatt,

Among the Haidas "it almost appears as if marriage were an alliance between opposite tribes, a man begetting offspring rather for his wife than for himself, and being inclined to see his real descendants rather in his sister's children than in his own. . . . Husbands and wives did not hesitate to betray each other to death in the interests of their own families." [1] Among the Goajiros, we are again told in so many words, "what we call the family does not exist." [2] In Samoa, "the husband did not by marriage become one of the family . . . a wife does not enter into the family of her husband." [3] "The Malay family in the narrow sense of the word consists solely of the mother with her children. The father does not belong to it." [4] The Mekeo of New Guinea "have no word representing the idea of a family." [5] Speaking of the Kuni tribes of British New Guinea, another writer says: "the family is non-existent, or nearly so." [6] The Fuegians "are devoid of all family bonds." [7] It would thus appear that the group or association which was at one time supposed to be the original unit of human society is somewhat elusive in its more primitive stages.

Not only does it not exist as a psychological, juridic, or social unit; it frequently does not exist as a physical association. It is common in primitive society for husband and wife not to live together. In Australia the women and the men have each their own camp and live quite separately.[8] "In all the Melanesian group it is the rule that there is in every village a building of a public character where the men eat and spend their time." The women and the children live by themselves at home.[9] Such is the rule, for example, in the Banks Islands,[10] and in the New Hebrides;[11]

"Malekula, New Hebrides," *Report of the Australian Association*, iv, p. 706; J. Kohler, "Das Recht der Papuas," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtwissenschaft*, xiv, 352. Cf. above, pp. 291 sq., 337 sq.

[1] J. R. Swanton, *The Haida (Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. v), p. 62.

[2] H. Candelier, *Rio Hacha et les Indiens Goajires*, p. 208.

[3] G. Brown, *Melanesians and Polynesians*, p. 43.

[4] A. W. P. Verkerk Pistorius, *Studien over de inlandsche huishouding in de Padangsche Bovenlande*, p. 42.

[5] R. W. Williamson, "Some Unrecorded Customs of the Mekeo People of British New Guinea," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii, p. 269.

[6] P. H. Eschelmann, "L'enfant chez les Kuni," *Anthropos*, vi, p. 268.

[7] G. Bove, *Patagonia. Terra di Fuoco. Mari Australi*, p. 134.

[8] B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 467 sqq.; R. Brough Smyth, *The Aborigines of Victoria*, vol. i, p. 134; A. C. Bowler, "Aboriginal Customs," *Science of Man*, 1902, p. 203.

[9] R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians*, p. 102.

[10] Id., "Religious Beliefs and Practices in Melanesia," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, x, p. 287.

[11] B. T. Sommerville, "Ethnographical Notes on New Hebrides," *Journal*

the sexes live entirely separate. In New Caledonia, "the wife does not live with her husband," [1] "Domestic life does not exist"; [2] men and women do not live under the same roof, and "one seldom sees men and women talking or sitting together. The women seem perfectly contented with the company of their own sex. The men are rarely seen in the company of the opposite sex." [3] Similarly in British New Guinea, the husband lives in the club-house of the men, and visits his wife only occasionally.[4] In Moto, for example, all the men, married and single, sleep in the common house. Every night the husband leaves his wife and goes to the club to sleep, and as often as not his place is taken by one of the unmarried men.[5] Among the inland tribes of Dutch New Guinea "the lives of man and wife are entirely separate." [6] In northern Papua a man associates with other men, but not with his wife.[7] A Swedish traveller notes, as a remarkable fact, that among the Mekeo family life is far more developed than in any other part of New Guinea which he visited, for husband and wife "sleep together in one house." [8] In Hawaii, men and women did not live together; "the women lived almost entirely by themselves; no social circle existed." [9] In New Zealand husband and wife "behave to each other as if they were not at all related, and it not infrequently happens that they sleep in different places before the termination of the first week of their marriage." [10] In Tahiti, father, mother and children never assemble "as one social happy band"; family life is "quite unknown among them." [11] In Raratonga, "a family, as the term signifies to an English ear, was not known." [12] Similar conditions obtain throughout Polynesia.[13] In Micronesia, the men have their common

of the Anthropological Institute, xxiii, p. 4. Cf. A. Hagen and A. Pineau, "Les Nouvelles Hébrides," *Revue d'Ethnographie*, vii, p. 331.

[1] M. Glaumont, "Usages, Moeurs et Coutumes des Néo-Calédoniens," *Revue d'Ethnographie*, vii, p. 77.

[2] V. de Rochas, *La Nouvelle Calédonie et ses habitants*, p. 229.

[3] J. Garnier, *Océanie, Les îles des Pins, Loyalty et Tahiti*, p. 186.

[4] J. Chalmers, *Pioneering in New Guinea*, p. 163.

[5] J. W. Lindt, *Picturesque New Guinea*, p. 133.

[6] M. Moszkowski, "Die Völkerstämme am Mamberamo in Holländisch-Neuguinea und auf den vorgelagerten Inseln," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xliii, p. 338.

[7] C. Keysser, in R. Neuhauss, *Deutsch Neu-Guinea*, vol. iii, p. 45.

[8] E. G. Edelfelt, "Notes on New Guinea," *Proceedings and Transactions of the Queensland Branch of the Geographical Society of Australasia*, ii, Part i, p. 97.

[9] J. Jarves, *History of the Hawaiian or Sandwich Islands*, pp. 94 sq.

[10] W. Brown, *New Zealand and its Aborigines*, p. 33.

[11] W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, vol. i, p. 229.

[12] W. Gill, *Gems of the Coral Islands*, p. 5.

[13] W. Ellis, *op. cit.*, p. 116; G. Brown, *Melanesians and Polynesians*, p. 43; M. J. Dumont D'Urville, *Voyage pittoresque autour du monde*, vol. i, p. 504.

house and the women theirs; the sexes live almost entirely separate; "there is no family life."[1] Among the Andamanese the men and the women keep to themselves in parties of their own sex.[2] Among the Orang Biduanda tribes of Johore, the husband is no more than an "honoured guest" in the house of his wife.[3] We have seen that his position is similar among the Menangkabau Malays; the longer the marriage lasts, the rarer become his visits.[4] Among the Igorots of Luzon "there is almost an entire absence of anything which may be called home-life."[5] The Nayar husband is not permitted by custom to partake of food in the house of his wife,[6] and it is a universal rule in India that men and women do not eat together.[7] Among all the tribes of Assam and Upper Burma men and women live in separate houses.[8] There is no common life between husband and wife in China; the house is divided into two, and the sexes live in separate apartments.[9] In Korea "family life as we have it is quite unknown."[10] Among the Samoyeds, men and women do not live together; they have their meals apart.[11] The same is the custom with the Eskimo,[12] and the Aleuts.[13]

In all North American Indian tribes there was scarcely any social intercourse between the men and the women; the sexes lived their lives separately. A man did not take his meals with

[1] J. Kubary, *Die socialen Einrichtungen der Pelauer*, pp. 33, 148; Id., "Die Bewohner der Mortlock-Inseln," *Mittheilungen der geographischen Gesellschaft in Hamburg*, 1878–79, p. 250.

[2] M. V. Portman, *A History of our Relations with the Andamanese*, p. 34.

[3] J. R. Logan, "The Biduanda Kallang of the River Pulai in Johore," *Journal of the Indian Archipelago*, i, p. 260.

[4] A. W. P. Verkerk Pistorius, *Studien over de inlandsche huishouding in de Pandansche Bovenlande*, p. 75.

[5] A. E. Jenks, *The Bontoc Igorots*, p. 62.

[6] See above, p. 302.

[7] *The Laws of Manu*, iv. 43 (*The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxv, p. 135); H. T. Colebrooke, *Miscellaneous Essays*, vol. i, p. 194; T. Shaw, "On the Inhabitants of the Hills near Rajamahall," *Asiatic Researches*, iv, p. 59; S. Mateer, *Native Life in Travancore*, p. 204; W. E. Marshall, *A Phrenologist among the Todas*, p. 82.

[8] J. Shakespear, *The Lushei Kuki Clans*, p. 18; T. C. Hodson, *The Naga Tribes of Manipur*, p. 75.

[9] H. S. Plath, "Die hausliche Verhältnisse der alten Chineser," *Sitzungsberichte der Baierischer Akademie*, 1862, ii, pp. 201 sqq.

[10] H. S. Saunderson, "Notes on Corea and its People," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxiv, p. 306.

[11] J. G. Georgi, *Description de toutes les nations de l'Empire de Russie*, vol. iii, p. 14.

[12] H. Egede, *A Description of Greenland*, p. 137.

[13] W. Coxe, *Account of the Russian Discoveries between Asia and America*, p. 259.

his wife; in public and in private they scarcely spoke to one another.[1] "In the lodge the man may be looked upon as the guest of his wife."[2] Among the Creeks, "every family has two huts or cabins, one is the man's and the other belongs to his wife, where she stays and does her work, seldom or ever coming in the man's house, unless to bring victuals and on other errands."[3] So fundamental was the custom that it was kept up by completely Christianised and semi-Europeanised Indians living on the outskirts of Quebec. "The men," says Father Charlevoix, describing the village, "live, according to their custom, in one house, the women and children in another. I say 'house,' and not 'hut,' because those natives are now lodged after the French fashion."[4] Among the Hupas of California, the sexes live entirely separate except during the hunting season in the summer, when light shelters are erected where men and women come together; during the rest of the year the women and children live in the houses, the men, married and single, in the 'sweat-house,' which is also the men's common house.[5] Exactly similar customs obtained among the Pueblo Indians. We have noted charming descriptions of their family-life, but those descriptions refer to them as they are at the present day. "The separation of the sexes having been abolished during the Spanish times, the Pueblo Indian is to-day acquainted with home life and the idea of the family."[6] When the first Spanish padres came, they found the elaborate houses of the Indians occupied by the women and children only; the men did not dwell in them. Even after marriage they spent the night in those singular constructions known as 'kivas,' and called by the Spaniards 'estufas.' "The Pueblo Indians had, in fact, no home life."[7] Among the Hopi "there

[1] P. Jones, *History of the Ojebway Indians*, p. 60; G. H. Loskiel, *History of the Mission of the United Brethren*, p. 59; S. Powers, *Tribes of California*, pp. 24, 244; L. H. Morgan, *Houses and House Life of the American Aborigines*, p. 99; G. Catlin, *Letters and Notes on the North American Indians*, vol. i, p. 202; S. Hearne, *A Journey from Prince of Wales's Fort to the Northern Ocean*, p. 90.

[2] H. R. Schoolcraft, *The Indian in the Wigwam*, p. 77.

[3] Id., *Indian Tribes*, vol. v, p. 272.

[4] F. X. de Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, vol. v, p. 123.

[5] P. E. Goddard, *Life and Culture of the Hupas*, p. 50.

[6] A. F. Bandelier, *Final Report of Investigations among the Indians of the South-Western United States*, Part i (*Papers of the Archaeological Institute of America*, Series III), p. 271.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 140; P. de Castañeda de Nacera, "Relación de la Jornada de Cibola," in *Fourteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 450; Dr. Kroeber expresses the opinion that the customs of the Zuñi have not greatly altered since European times (A. L. Kroeber, "Zuñi Kin and Clan," *Anthropological Papers of the American Musuem of Natural History*, vol. xviii, pp. 48 sq.). But that view is not in accordance with documentary evidence.

exists no private family life in the sense in which we understand it." [1] Among the Caribbean tribes, husband and wife "do not live together as man and wife in the night, because they are persuaded that a child conceived in the night will be born blind; nor do they live together at any time, but occupy separate huts with a great stone between them, to which the woman goes to put the food she has prepared for her husband." [2] Among the Carajas of Brazil, a man's home was not with his wife and children, but with his sister and her children; he was regarded as a member of her household, and not of that of his wife, whom he merely visited.[3] Among the Uaupes of the upper Amazon basin a man and his wife lead separate existences during the day, and very seldom spend the whole night together.[4] Among the Mundrucus the men all live and sleep in a common house apart from the women.[5]

In Africa, husband and wife do not live together in the same hut. "When the husband has attained to a degree of prosperity that will enable him to practise the polygamy natural to his ideas, the several wives each have a separate hut, though the various dwellings that go to make up the family domicile will be enclosed in a quadrangular or circular fence built of reeds or elephant-grass. When the husband eats he is either alone or in the company of male friends, or perhaps one or two of the male children; never do the wives or concubines join in the repast." [6] Among the Bassa Komo of Nigeria, "husband and wife do not live in the same house; but all the men live in one part of the village, and the women in another. The wife visits the husband occasionally, and vice versa." [7] Among the Nuer of the Upper Nile, husband and wife live in different villages, and a common household is never set up until the eldest child is able to walk.[8] Among the Fan, the men live in the 'palaver house,' and the women bring

[1] O. Solberg, "Gebräuche der Mittelmesa-Hopi (Moqui) bei Namengebung, Heirat und Tod," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xxxvii, p. 629.

[2] F. C. Nicholas, "The Aborigines of the Province of Santa Marta, Colombia," *The American Anthropologist*, iii, p. 617. Cf. W. Curtis Farabee, *The Central Arawaks*, p. 47.

[3] P. Ehrenreich, *Beiträge zur Völkerkunde Brasiliens*, p. 27.

[4] H. A. Coudreau, *La France équinoxiale*, vol. ii, p. 171.

[5] J. B. von Spix and C. F. Ph. von Martius, *Reise in Brasilien*, vol. iii, p. 1313.

[6] F. S. Joelson, *The Tanganyika Territory*, p. 118. Cf. Duff Macdonald, *Africana*, vol. i, p. 151; R. M. Connolly, "Social Life in Fanti-Land," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxvi, p. 145; J. L. Wilson, *Western Africa*, p. 182; W. Munzinger, *Ostafrikanische Studien*, p. 526.

[7] F. F. W. Byng-Hall, "Notes on the Bassa-Komo Tribe," *Journal of the African Society*, viii, p. 15. Cf. O. Temple, *Notes on the Tribes, Provinces, Emirates and States of the Northern Provinces of Nigeria*, p. 45.

[8] H. C. Jackson, "The Nuer of the Upper Nile," *Sudan Notes and Records*, vi, pp. 141, 152.

their meals to them there. "I should hesitate," says Miss Kingsley, "to call it a fully developed family." [1] Among the Mumbake, a woman does not live in the same house as her husband until the children are able to walk.[2] Among the Aranda of the Upper Congo, the men and the women live in different villages at some distance from one another; one village being inhabited exclusively by the men, the other by the women and children.[3] In Senegambia, husband and wife do not live under the same roof, and there is no common social life between the sexes.[4] Among the Hottentots the women and the men did not associate, and led entirely separate lives.[5] Among the Zulus, men and women are scarcely ever seen together; if a man and his wife are going to the same place, they do not walk together.[6] Speaking of the Kaffirs generally, Dr. Fritsch says: "Family life, in our sense of the word, cannot be said to exist." [7] The Thonga have a tradition that originally men and women did not live together; "they say that, among the first human beings, the men and the women did not sleep together. The men had their own village and the women also." [8]

Even more extraordinary in the light of our notions than the position of the husband as a stranger, guest, or visitor within the group to which his wife belongs is the fact that he is commonly a clandestine and surreptitious visitor. One of the Japanese words for marriage is 'yome-iri,' which may be interpreted 'to slip by night into the house,' [9] and the expression accurately describes the mode of connubial intercourse among a large proportion of primitive peoples.

Among the Khasis "the husband came to his mother-in-law's home after dark only, and he did not eat, smoke, or even partake of betel-nut there, the idea being that because none of his earnings go to support the house, therefore it is not etiquette for him to partake of food or other refreshment there." [10] Among the Naga tribes of Manipur the husband, until he becomes aged and retires

[1] M. Kingsley, *West African Studies*, p. 211.

[2] O. Temple, *Notes on the Tribes, Provinces, Emirates and States of the Northern Provinces of Nigeria*, p. 285.

[3] G. Burrows, "On the Natives of the Upper Welle District of the Belgian Congo," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxviii, p. 41.

[4] L. J.-B. Bérenger-Féraud, *Les peuplades de la Sénegambie*, p. 373.

[5] C. P. Thunberg, "An Account of the Cape of Good Hope," in Pinkerton, *Voyages and Travels*, vol. xvi, p. 87.

[6] J. Shooter, *The Kafirs of Natal*, pp. 81 sq.

[7] G. Fritsch, *Die Eingeborenen Süd-Afrikas*, p. 114.

[8] H. A. Junod, "Some Remarks on the Folklore of the Ba-Thonga," *Folklore*, xiv, p. 120.

[9] Kojiro Twasaky, *Das Japanische Eherecht*, p. 12.

[10] P. R. T. Gurdon, *The Khasis*, p. 76.

from all active pursuits, only visits his wife clandestinely after dark. Among the Kuki the husband is spared the inconvenience; his wife slips over to his house after dark.[1] The Tipperah husband gains access to his wife's room like a burglar, and leaves it before dawn.[2] Among the Yakut, the husband visits his wife in a similar manner after dark.[3] Among the Samoyeds, the bridegroom must leave the bride before dawn, and effect his departure unobserved.[4] The Kuril never visit their wives publicly, "but steal to them privately in the night."[5] Among the Tartars, the bridegroom likewise slips into the bride's house surreptitiously, and he is particularly careful not to be seen leaving it, for her male relatives are waiting, ready to administer a sound drubbing if they should happen to catch sight of him.[6] The Kirghis bridegroom is secretly introduced into the bride's chamber by the 'go-between,' and he must depart before dawn and avoid meeting her parents during the first few days.[7] In Khorassan, it was the rule for the mother of the bride to introduce the bridegroom secretly into the house by the back door; the male relatives were not supposed to know anything of his visits, and he had to depart before dawn.[8] Among the Cherkiss the husband effects an entrance into his wife's apartment through the window.[9] The observance is similar throughout the Caucasus; the Ossetes husband visits his wife surreptitiously at night, and is not supposed to be seen by anyone.[10] Among the Chevsurs such clandestine relations between the husband and his wedded wife may continue until they have a family of three children.[11]

In some tribes of Central Africa, the bridegroom "was not allowed to see his intended during the day." He only visited her shortly before daybreak.[12] Among the people of Kaffa in East Africa, the men live in a men's common house, and husband and wife only meet at night, and never see each other during the day.[13] Among the Akamba when the bride-price has been paid and all

[1] T. C. Hodson, *The Naga Tribes of Manipur*, p. 76.
[2] H. H. Risley, *The Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, vol. iii, p. 325.
[3] M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, p. 89. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 125.
[5] H. Krashininnikof, *The History of Kamtschatka*, p. 237.
[6] M. Kovalewsky, "La famille matriarcale au Caucase," *L'Anthropologie*, iv, p. 272.
[7] E. and P. Sykes, *Through Deserts and Oases in Central Asia*, p. 120.
[8] Xavier Raymond, *Afghanistan*, p. 40.
[9] T. Löbel, *Hochzeitsbräuche in der Turkei*, p. 70.
[10] M. Kovalewsky, "La famille matriarcale au Caucase," *L'Anthropologie*, iv, p. 272; Id., *Coutume contemporaine et loi ancienne. Droit coutumier ossétien*, p. 169.
[11] G. Radde, *Die Chewsuren und ihr Land*, p. 88.
[12] R. Caillé, *Travels through Central Africa to Timbuctoo*, vol. i, p. 94.
[13] J. L. Krapf, *Travels, Researches and Missionary Labours during an Eighteen Years' Residence in Eastern Africa*, vol. i, p. 58.

arrangements between the families are completed, the bridegroom enters the house of his bride secretly in the middle of the night and steals away with her like a thief. In many cases he continues, after he is married, to visit her secretly at night, and departs before dawn.[1] In the primitive community of Sparta, which presented much the same form of organisation as we find among the American Indians and the Polynesians, the same practice prevailed. The bridegroom slipped into his bride's house by night, and "having stayed with her a short time, he modestly retired to his usual apartment to sleep with the other young men; and he continued to observe the same caution afterwards, spending the day with his companions and reposing with them at night, and only visiting his bride with great caution and apprehension of being discovered by the rest of the family." [2]

Of the Algonkin and Iroquois, Father Lafitau says: "They dare not go to the huts of their wives except during the darkness of the night." [3] Similarly of the Assiniboins, a Siouan tribe of the plains, we are told: "A young man who has taken a wife is under great difficulty; out of modesty, bashfulness, or custom, he appears but seldom in his father-in-law's tent or lodge in the daytime. They always come to sleep with their bride after nightfall, and retire at daybreak." [4] In the same manner the husband of a Pueblo girl was not even allowed to visit her in her home until a child was born of the union; she took her mat outside the house, and they spent the night on the terrace or under the porch.[5] The Caribs of the West Indian Islands similarly visited their wives surreptitiously in the night.[6] So likewise the Bororo husband continues to live in the man's common house and visits his wife by stealth in the night; sometimes his father-in-law has to come and fetch him to encourage and reassure him.[7]

Among the Koita and the Moru tribes of British New Guinea, the young man "waits until the house is quiet and the fire low, when he slips into the house and makes his way to the girl's side. Conversation is carried on in low tones, and it is etiquette for the boy to retire quietly before daylight. Should he, however, over-

[1] C. Dundas, "History of Kitui," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii, p. 520.

[2] Plutarch, *Lycurgus*, 15. Cf. *Lacedem. Apophth.*, p. 224; Xenophon, *de Rep. Lac.*, i, 5.

[3] F. M. Lafitau, *Moeurs des sauvages amériquains*, vol. i, p. 576.

[4] J. McDonnell, "Some Account of the Red River," in L. R. Masson, *Les Bourgeois de la Compagnie du Nord-Ouest*, vol. i, p. 278.

[5] M. C. Stevenson, "The Zuñi Indians," *Twenty-third Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology*, p. 305.

[6] De la Borde, *Relation des Caraïbes*, pp. 594 sq.

[7] K. von den Steinen, *Unter den Naturvölkern Zentral Brasiliens*, p. 501.

sleep himself nothing more serious than a little chaff results." [1] In Port Moresby the husband leaves the bride before dawn.[2] Among the Nufoers of Borneo, the husband likewise retired before daybreak.[3] Among the Sea Dayaks all intercourse was clandestine; the man slipped into the house by night.[4] In Fiji a man slips by night into the house of his wife with the greatest stealth, and the fuzzy-haired cannibals did not know which way to look when the missionaries suggested that they might live under the same roof as their wives.[5]

The suggestion that the clandestine behaviour of the husband in his relations with his wife is due to some innate sense of delicacy, though met with in apologetic literature, cannot be seriously regarded. For, apart fron the fact that Christian missionaries appear to have quite lost that supposed innate sense, the behaviour of the savages who are scandalised at the indelicacy of the missionaries is, in the light of the latter's conceptions, as outrageous as can be conceived. Although they would be filled with the confusion which attends every breach of tribal customs at being seen approaching the hut of their wife, they at the same time have no scruple in indulging in promiscuity and even incest 'coram populo,' and in behaving "like pigs." [6] When the facts are taken into consideration there appears to be strong reason for supposing that originally the relations between husband and wife were in general attended with real danger. The beating which the Tartar husband is supposed to incur at the hands of his wife's people if his matrimonial relations are detected, is sometimes rather more than a ritual. In Kamchatka, the bridegroom is also subjected by the female relatives of the bride to a sound thrashing, and he cannot obtain his bride unless he successfully overcomes the resistance of the viragoes; the thrashing is often, we are told, "beyond a joke." [7] Indeed, a Russian gentleman relates the

[1] C. G. Seligman, *The Melanesians of British New Guinea*, p. 76.

[2] J. Chalmers, *Pioneering in New Guinea*, p. 163.

[3] F. M. Guillemard, *The Cruise of the 'Marchesa,'* vol. ii, p. 287.

[4] S. St. John, "Wild Tribes of North-West Borneo," *Journal of the Ethnological Society*, N.S., ii, p. 235.

[5] B. Seeman, *Mission to Viti*, p. 191. This is, however, somewhat exaggerated. "I have failed to discover," says Sir Basil Thomson, "the author of the fiction, quoted by many anthropologists, that marriage in Fiji was consummated in the bush. This was never the case" (B. Thomson, *The Fijians*, p. 202).

[6] L. Fison, "The Nanga, or Sacred Stone Enclosure, of Wairimala, Fiji," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xiv, p. 28.

[7] J. C. Georgi, *Description de toutes les nations de l'Empire de Russie*, vol. iii, p. 89.

pitiful case of a suitor who "after persevering for seven years, instead of obtaining a bride was rendered quite a cripple through the women handling him so barbarously." [1] The Koryak bridegroom also receives a sound thrashing.[2] Among the Mongols of the Chien Ch'ang valley it is not only the bridegroom, but all his male friends, who are thrashed and violently handled by the dowagers of the bride's family.[3] In the Tibetan province of Spiti the bridegroom and his friends are likewise subjected to a sound drubbing.[4] The bride herself, it is to be noted, takes no part in those sportive battles, and offers no resistance. The same sort of thing, it would appear, happened in ancient Arabia: we read of husbands being waylaid when returning from their wife's tent, and the beating which they got was more than ritual.[5] Among some Germanic tribes a patrilocal wedding appears to have been attended with considerable risk to the bridegroom. The ancient laws of Frisia made provision for the event of his being murdered during the ceremony; the bride was instructed to follow his corpse to his home, if she wished to put in a claim to a share of the inheritance.[6] Most of the numerous customs which have been described as survivals of 'marriage by capture' are insusceptible of that interpretation, but are part of the universal manifestations of hostility between the wife's and the husband's group, especially when the woman is removed from the former and is required to become a member of the latter, and to found a patriarchal family.[7] Mr. Swanton goes so far as to say that among the Haidas the members of the husband's clan and those of the wife's clan frequently regarded one another as "downright enemies." [8] In New Guinea, among the Roro-speaking tribes, although the marriage arrangements are settled between the two families in the most amicable manner, and the wedding is celebrated with a lavish feast, it is the custom for the bride's father to stand, the morning after, outside the house of the bridegroom's father, and pour forth

[1] H. Krashininnikof, *The History of Kamtschatka*, p. 213.

[2] W. Jochelson, *The Koryak* (*Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. vi), p. 742.

[3] E. C. Baber, "Travels and Researches in the Interior of China," *Royal Geographical Society, Supplementary Papers*, vol. i, p. 69.

[4] Sarat Chandra Das, "The Marriage Customs of Tibet," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, lxii, Part iii, p. 9.

[5] W. Robertson Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, p. 96 n.

[6] K. Lamprecht, *Deutsche Geschichte*, vol. i, p. 109; H. Brunner, *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. i, p. 78.

[7] See below, vol. ii, pp. 243 sqq.

[8] J. R. Swanton, *The Haida* (*Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. v, Part i), p. 62.

a volley of abuse. A mock pillage of the houses and gardens of the whole village to which the bridegroom belongs is carried out by the people of the wife's village, and although care is taken not to destroy valuable property, pots are taken and broken, the orchards are plundered, and regular looting takes place in the bridegroom's house.[1]

It thus appears that in the majority of existing uncultured societies, if not indeed in all, the bonds between sexual associates, that is, between the constituent members of the family-group formed by husband and wife, are much looser than in more advanced societies. That group was at one time supposed to have been the germ of human social organisation. As an eighteenth-century exponent of that pre-scientific assumption elegantly puts it: "The husband and the wife of his bosom, whom love unites by the silken ties of matrimony, form the first society; this union is first founded on the call of nature, in mutual assistance, and the sweet hopes of seeing themselves reproduced in a numerous offspring."[2] The facts of ethnology do not appear to accord with the dogma, which it has been sought to revive in our day. In those societies which have preserved a well-marked clan organisation, the fact that husband and wife are members of two different groups is far more prominent than their association to form one group or family. This is, of course, inconsistent with the hypothesis that the clans were formed by the aggregation of family-groups. In many there is no permanent association and cohabitation between husband and wife; the family-group, in the patriarchal sense, does not exist. Such a group is not the product of the natural instincts which have determined human association. Its formation by the removal of a woman from the group to which she belonged to that of her husband, is found to stand in direct conflict with the primal social impulses of humanity in its simpler stages, and to be in sharp opposition with the primitive organisation which it has tended to break up. The group which the sexual patriarchal group has thus constantly antagonised and has ultimately destroyed is the biological group formed by the mother and her offspring, the Motherhood, a group economically self-contained through the cooperation of brothers and sisters, and one of which the sexual mate forms no part. The primitive social instincts of humanity, which constitute the bond that knits that primitive social group and actuate its collective mentality, thus affording the conditions of all human mental and social development, are not the sexual instincts; they are the maternal instincts and the ties of kinship that derive

[1] C. G. Seligman, *The Melanesians of British New Guinea*, p. 269.

[2] J. R. Forster, *Observations made during a Voyage round the World*, pp. 349 sq.

directly from their operation. The forces which make for the association of sexual mates are in uncultured humanity subordinate to those deeper ties, and more primitive bonds of sentiment. " Love of the clan," according to the saying of an old Arab poet, " is greater than the love between husband and wife." [1]

[1] Al-Arabi, cited by R. Dozy, *Islam in Spain*, p. 7.

CHAPTER X

THE INSTITUTION OF MARRIAGE

IT is sometimes said that the purpose of marriage is the procreation of children; but it is evident that marriage is not necessary to achieve that object, and that it cannot therefore have arisen to fulfil a purpose for which it is not required. Among animals association of the sexes takes place for shorter or longer periods in relation to certain economic needs, as is the case with nidicolous birds in particular. Mating is, we saw, far more rare and transitory among mammals than is supposed. There is no evidence of such mating among the quadrumana or anthropoid apes. With those mammalian species in which prolonged mating occurs it usually takes the form of a sexual association which is regarded by nearly all human races as incestuous and is stringently forbidden. The economic requirements which are fulfilled by the association of sexual partners among nidicolous birds and some mammals do not arise in maternal clans constituted like those still found among many primitive peoples; the advantages to be obtained by the child-bearing female from durable association with the male are, in groups so constituted, secured already by her association with male members of the group who are not sexual partners.

Marriage is distinguished by most peoples from sexual relations that do not constitute marriage.[1] In some communities which have fairly elaborate and highly developed forms of marriage institutions marriage is entered into by a small minority of the people only. Thus, in the island of Futuna marriages are contracted with much pomp and ceremony by the aristocratic class; the practice was, however, rare before the introduction of Christianity, the vast majority of the people did not marry, but contracted loose unions "which followed one another in disorder."[2] Similarly, among the Line islanders marriage is a method for the

[1] See below, vol. ii, pp. 93 sqq.

[2] A. Monfat, *Le Missionnaire des Samoa, Mgr. L. Elloy*, p. 346.

conveyance of landed property; it is entered into with many juridic regulations by the small class possessing such property. But ordinary people do not marry at all.[1] So likewise in Hawaii and in the Society Islands marriage was confined to a small portion of the native population. "There existed a union something like marriage among them, but this seems to have been confined almost wholly to higher class chiefs."[2] Or again in the Pageh Islands, marriage is sometimes contracted by men in advanced life, when they wish to provide a home for their old age; but "marriage plays a far less important part in their social customs than free love."[3] Among the Patagonians, few of the men marry; but the relations between unmarried people are unrestricted.[4] Similar conditions are, as we shall see, by no means uncommon in uncultured societies.

It is recognised by even the most fervent upholders of the theory that the group of husband and wife constitutes the primary and original unit of human society, that marriage is a social institution. That view has been shared by most peoples in all stages of culture. The Roman jurists were quite clear on that point. At the very foundation of the majestic edifice of Roman law, which arose out of the necessity of broadening tribal custom into norms of equity applicable with catholic validity to all tribes and nations, lay a clear perception of the distinction between what were termed 'natural' and 'social' or 'juridic' facts. The acute minds of the Roman jurists, breaking through the bondage of tribal values, never lost sight of the distinction between 'natural' law and civil, juridic 'institutions,' that is, between the facts pertaining to man's inherited and innate nature and the products of social tradition. They regarded the one set of facts as pertaining to 'natural law,' 'jus naturale,' and the second as belonging to the province of civil law, 'jus civile.' "Natural law," they defined, "is what nature has taught all animals. It is not a law peculiar to the human race, but common to all creatures of air, earth, or water."[5] Regarding the fundamental principle of organisation of their society the clear-sightedness of those founders and upholders of the patriarchal order was never obfuscated by any prejudice or illusion, or by any

[1] Tutuila, "The Line Islanders," *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, i, pp. 270 sq.

[2] S. S. Hill, *Travels in the Sandwich and Society Islands*, p. 63.

[3] J. F. K. Hansen, "De groep Noord- en Zuid-Pageh van de Mentaweieilanden," *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch Indië*, lxx, p. 210. Cf. below, vol. ii, pp. 124, 154.

[4] A. Guinnard, *Trois ans d'esclavage chez les Patagons*, p. 122.

[5] Justinian, *Institutiones*, i, 2: "Jus naturale est, quod natura omnia animalia docuit. Nam ius istud non humani generis proprium est, sed omnium animalium, quae in coelo, quae in terra, quae in mari nascuntur."

concession to established sentiment. The maternal relation, they considered, is a natural fact independent of all institutions; the paternal relation, on the other hand, belongs to the sphere of juridic institutions.[1] "The terms 'son' and 'mother,'" says Cuiacus, expounding the Roman legal view, "are words denoting natural relations; 'cognate,' that is to say, mother-kin, is also a natural term; 'agnate,' or father-kin, on the other hand, is a juridic term and not one pertaining to the sphere of natural law."[2] And again: "Matrimony is the name of a natural fact, for it derives from the relation of motherhood; 'marriage,' on the other hand, is the name of a civil institution."[3] The Roman legists never regarded marriage in the form in which they themselves contributed so largely to establish as anything else than an institution, and never attempted to represent it as an inborn instinct. The countrymen of Lucretius would, I fancy, have experienced no great difficulty in grasping the fact of organic evolution, but it would have been difficult to persuade the jurists of Rome that marriage was "inherited from some ape-like ancestor."

In rougher and less nicely defined form, the view taken of marriage by the Roman jurists has been held by every other people, primitive and cultured. The Greeks believed that marriage had been instituted by Kekrops; "he promulgated a law that maidens should wed some one man at his desire, and that they should not, during his lifetime, have anything to do with any other. For previously, promiscuous cohabitation was the custom, all people forming unions as they pleased and separating thereafter, wherefore no one could know his father and men procreated after the manner of animals."[4] The Egyptians are said to have ascribed the institution of marriage to their supposed first king, Menes.[5] Indian tradition ascribed the institution of marriage to Svetaketu.[6] The Chinese state that marriage was instituted by Fu-Hi, sexual

[1] *Digesta*, ii. 4; iv. 5; *Institutiones*, iii. 5.

[2] Cuiacus, "In librum primum Pauli ad edictum," *Opera*, vol. v, p. 160: Filius et mater naturae vocabula sunt, cognatus etiam naturae verbum est, agnatus vero civile verbum, non naturae."

[3] Id., "Ad lib. XII digest. S. Juliani," *Opera*, vol. vi, p. 413: "Matrimonium nomen naturale est, quod a matre trahitus: nuptiae, et connubium civilia nomina."

[4] Cedrenus, *Synopsis Historicorum*, 82. Cf. Athenaeus, xii. 2.

[5] J. F. MacLennan, *Studies in Ancient History*, p. 95. I do not know the source of MacLennan's statement. All Egyptian laws were ascribed in a general way to Menes, but no particular mention is made in classical sources of marriage. Sir Gaston Maspéro makes no reference to the tradition, but expresses his conviction, based on an unrivalled knowledge of the facts, that early Egyptian marriage was in fact communal, matrilocal, polygynous and polyandrous (G. Maspéro, *The Dawn of Civilisation*, p. 52).

[6] *Mahâbhârata*, *Adi Parva*, 122. Cf. above, p. 346.

relations having previously been unrestricted.[1] The Peruvians attributed the establishment of the institution of marriage to Manco-Capac.[2] Even quite uncultured people, when they speculate on the origin of their social organisation, regard marriage as having been established by the enactment of some mythical legislator. The institution of marriage is thus accounted for by the Lapps,[3] and by the Wogul.[4] The Australian savages attribute their marriage organisation to a traditional legislator, Daramulum.[5] Nobody supposes that those myths are accurate reports of historical facts; but they are faithful records of the manner in which all peoples have regarded the origin of marriage. They have looked upon it as an institution, a regulation deliberately imposed upon the members of human society, and not as the manifestation of an innate natural instinct indwelling in the constitution of man. No people has ever bethought itself of holding that view; a remarkable circumstance if marriage were indeed the spontaneous manifestation of inherited instincts.

If, as is demanded by the latter hypothesis, the psychological causes leading to the permanent association of sexual partners, that is, the mating instinct, were the forces which originally determined the establishment of the institution, we ought to find those instincts taking precedence, in primitive stages of society at least, over all other factors and considerations. The personal desire of a man and woman to enter into that fundamental sexual and economic association should everywhere be the basis of the social order, and all other principles of organisation ought to be secondary and subordinate to that supposed primary and original foundation of the social structure of humanity. In point of fact the exact reverse is conspicuously the case. Not only is that instinctive association of sexual mates absent, or at least very imperfectly developed in primitive matriarchal societies, but throughout the development of that form of association which we call 'marriage' it is almost invariably regarded as not depending upon the operation of those instincts. That a man and a woman should spontaneously form such an association on their own initiative and without reference to the will and sanction of the groups of relatives to which they

[1] Se-Ma-Ts'ien, *Mémoires historiques*, ed. Chavannes, p. 7; Du Mailla, *Histoire générale de la Chine*, vol. i, pp. 5 sq.; H. Doré, *Recherches sur les superstitions des Chinois*, vol. xii, pp. 1070 sq.

[2] Garcilaso de la Vega, *The First Part of the Royal Commentaries of the Incas*, vol. i, p. 308.

[3] E. Westermarck, *History of Human Marriage*, vol. i, p. 105, after von Duben.

[4] B. Munkácsi, "Die Weltgottheiten der wogulischen Mythologie," *Keleti Szemle*, ix, p. 241.

[5] A. W. Howitt, "On some Australian Ceremonies of Initiation," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xiii, p. 446.

respectively belong, is a proceeding which is nearly everywhere regarded as irregular. It would have shocked our grandmothers. The Australian blackfellows, like most other savages, share the feeling of our grandmothers on the subject; a woman who runs away with a man is regarded amongst them in much the same light as we regard a prostitute.[1] Among the Hidatsa Indians a marriage contracted between the 'parties concerned' and not by an agreement between their respective families, is scarcely looked upon as deserving the name of marriage; indeed they do not call it a marriage, but have a special term for so irregular and disreputable a relation.[2] Similarly, among the Haidas, marriages which have not been arranged by the parents while the parties are still infants are looked upon as irregular and not respectable.[3] A West African negro explained in a Court of Law that a certain person could hardly be regarded as anything better than a bastard, for "his parents married for love."[4] Among the Malays of the Patani States a runaway match is not regarded as legal.[5] That is in fact almost universally true in primitive society, unless steps are subsequently taken to regularise and legitimate such an irregular mode of association.

In England personal freedom of action in such matters has always been considerably greater than in most other countries; yet a marriage without parental consent, when one of the parties was under the age of twenty-one, was up to the eighteenth century accounted null and void. In most other European countries at the present day no such personal contract in the case of a minor is recognised. We are familiar with the manner in which marriages were traditionally contracted in French families; the matter was entirely settled between the respective families while the young lady concerned was finishing her education in a convent, and the interested parties made one another's acquaintance after the 'affaire de famille' had been satisfactorily brought to a conclusion.[6] Even among the French peasantry at the present day it is considered proper that every marriage should be discussed in solemn 'conseils de famille,' and the considerations involved are mainly economic. In Italy, in most aristocratic families, marriage used to be arranged while the principals were still infants,

[1] G. Taplin, in Woods, *The Tribes of South Australia*, p. 11; Id., *The Folklore, Manners and Languages of the South Australian Aborigines*, pp. 34, 50.

[2] W. Matthews, *The Hidatsa*, p. 53.

[3] J. R. Swanton, *The Haida* (*Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. v), p. 50.

[4] M. Kingsley, *Travels in West Africa*, p. 486.

[5] N. Annandale and H. C. Robinson, *Fasciculi Malayenses*, vol. ii, p. 72.

[6] E. and J. de Goncourt, *La femme au dix-huitième siècle*, p. 20.

and the alliance was invariably a matter of pure business. The bride and bridegroom, as often as not, saw one another for the first time on the wedding day.[1] "You must understand," writes a French traveller, "that marriages are not entered into here with the same object as elsewhere; there is no question of love, or even of affection or esteem. If something of the kind happens to be present, so much the better, but the only motives are social alliance and fortune."[2] The traveller's illusion that the conditions he notes are exceptional is, it will be observed, the same in European travel as in ethnological documents. Customs were similar in Spain and Portugal. In Russia, "among the upper classes the bride and bridegroom never saw each other before the wedding; among the people they saw each other, but never dared to speak about marriage, that being a thing which did not depend upon themselves."[3] Among the Romans marriage was purely a family contract. In ancient Athens, remarks K. O. Müller, "so far as my recollection goes, we have not a single instance of a man having loved a free-born woman, and marrying her from affection."[4] The Spartans, who represent a more primitive state of Greek society, "considered marriage not as a private relation about which the State had little interest, but as a public institution."[5] In fact "the modern conception that the marriage relation is a matter of private concern, and that any individual has a right to wed whom and when he will, was one altogether alien to the Greeks."[6] Among the barbarians of northern Europe the same views obtained as among their descendants and the ancient civilised nations. "Marriage was not based on mutual love and affection, but on wealth and social standing. It was a business affair, a contract concluded between the bridegroom and the bride's relatives."[7] The laws of the Aryas expressly condemn as immoral "the voluntary union of a maiden and her lover." Such unions are "blamable marriages," and from them no good can be expected; the issue of such disreputable unions founded merely on love is, we are informed by the sacred text,

[1] E. Rodocanachi, *La femme italienne à l'époque de la Renaissance*, pp. 55 sq.

[2] M. Mission, *Voyage d'Italie*, vol. i, p. 297.

[3] N. de Gerebtzoff, *Essai sur l'histoire de la civilisation en Russie*, vol. i, p. 405.

[4] K. O. Müller, *History and Antiquities of the Doric Race*, vol. ii, p. 292.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 301.

[6] G. Lowes Dickinson, *The Greek View of Life*, pp. 155 sq.

[7] Knut Gjerset, *A History of the Scandinavian Peoples*, vol. i, p. 91. Cf. V. Gudmundsson and K. Kålund, "Skandinavische Verhältnisse," in H. Paul, *Grundriss der germanischen Philologie*, vol. iii, p. 417.

"sons who are cruel and speakers of untruth, who hate the Veda and the sacred law." [1]

In the very elaborate marriage institutions of China the most fundamental principle is that marriage is an alliance between two families, and that the bride and bridegroom have no concern in the transaction. "Marriage," we are told in the 'Lî Kî,' "was intended as a bond of love between two families." [2] So essentially is this the view taken of the institution that it is not uncommon for families to become united by a matrimonial alliance even though one or both of the 'parties concerned' be dead and buried. When an only son dies in a Chinese family, it is usual for the bereaved parents to look about for a family who has lost a daughter. A marriage is then arranged between the two deceased young people; the coffins containing their remains are exhumed and placed side by side, and the marriage ceremony is then performed over them.[3] Not only is the transaction one between families and not between individuals, but it is a matter of the first importance that those negotiations should not even be conducted directly, but through the intermediary of professional 'go-betweens.' That strange institution of go-betweens, or 'Mei-jin,' is looked upon as of a fundamental, moral and quasi-sacred character quite unintelligible to us. Go-betweens were instituted by Niu-Kua, the mythical first female ruler who, with her brother Fu-Hi, instituted marriage, and she was herself the 'great' or 'first' go-between.[4] The emperor offered sacrifices to 'The First Go-Between.' [5] Those whom we call 'the parties concerned' in a marriage have, according to Chinese ideas, no concern whatever in the matter. Parents choose a wife for their son and a husband for their daughter; and the young people first make each other's acquaintance when the transaction is finally completed. Any infringement of those rules is looked upon as profoundly immoral, if not criminal. "When children do not await the decision of their fathers and mothers and the words of the go-betweens, but bore holes in walls in order to see each other, leap over walls in order to meet, their fathers and mothers and all the people of the realm despise and condemn them." [6] "Male and female must not, without the intervention of the go-between, know one another. Unless the marriage presents

[1] *The Laws of Manu*, iii. 32. 41 (*The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxv, pp. 81, 83).

[2] *Lî Kî*, iv. i. ii. 9 (*The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxviii, p. 428). Cf. *Che-King*, i. 8. 6. 13.

[3] S. Couling, *Encyclopaedia Sinica*, p. 334.

[4] M. Martini, *Sinicae Historiae*, p. 17.

[5] *Lî Kî*, *loc. cit.*

[6] *Ibid.*

have been received they shall not hold any communication with one another, nor shall there be any affection between them." [1]

Marriages negotiated by 'Go-betweens.'

The seemingly strange institution of 'go-betweens,' or professional matchmakers, to which such importance is attached by the Chinese, and which is regarded by them as indispensable to the conclusion of a virtuous marriage, is by no means peculiar to the Flowery Land. Besides being observed by the Koreans [2] and by the Japanese,[3] who probably adopted it from the Chinese, it is a time-honoured institution among all the more primitive races of northern and central Asia,[4] who regard it with as much solemnity as do the Chinese themselves. For example, among the Yurak, one of the rudest populations of Siberia, the professional matchmaker is an old man who bears an elaborately carved staff of mammoth ivory as the badge of his office. "If you see a man approaching a 'chum' leaning heavily on such a staff," says Miss Czaplicka, "you will be in no doubt as to his errand. The parents of the suitor have accompanied the matchmaker to within a short distance of the 'chum' where live the parents of the young woman to whom they wish to marry their son. They must not enter the tent, however, though, if the weather is very cold, they may pitch a 'chum' not far away, and in it await the matchmaker, who comes to consult his principals at various stages of the negotiations." [5]

The institution is equally thriving among the Finnish nations

[1] *Lî Kî*, i. 1. 3. 6 (*The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxvii, p. 77). In Tonkin no one can marry without the consent of both father and mother (S. Baron, "The Description of Tonqueen," in Churchill, *Voyages and Travels*, vol. vi, p. 10).

[2] H. S. Saunderson, "Notes on Corea and its People," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxiv, p. 305.

[3] Twasaky Kogiro, *Das japanische Eherecht*, p. 20.

[4] E. R. Huc, *Mongolia*, p. 142; J. Curtin, *A Journey in Southern Siberia*, p. 93; P. Labbé, *Chez les lamas de Sibérie*, p. 51 (Buryat); K. Mielberg, "Eine Excursion nach Chiwa und Audienz beim Chan," *Russische Revue*, xvi, p. 360; I. Koslow, "Das Gewohnheitsrecht der Kirghisen," *ibid.*, xxi, p. 467; E. and P. Sykes, *Through Deserts and Oases in Central Asia*, p. 120 (Kirghis); I. I. Lepechin, *Tagebuch der Reise durch verschiedene Provinzen des russisches Reichs*, vol. i, p. 104 (Kalmuk); J. G. Georgi, *Description de toutes les nations de l'Empire de Russie*, vol. ii, p. 24 (Tartars); M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, pp. 123 (Ostyak), 126 (Yurak), 109 (Yakut, Altaian); F. G. Jackson, "Notes on the Samoyed of the Great Tundra," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxiv, pp. 405 sq.; W. Jochelson, *The Yukaghir and Yukaghirised Tungus*, pp. 89, 94 sq.; Id., *The Koryak*, p. 739; W. Bogoras, *The Chukchee*, p. 585.

[5] M. A. Czaplicka, *My Siberian Year*, p. 111.

of Europe,[1] and among the Poles.[2] Among the Slavs, both those of Russia and the southern, or Jugo-Slavs, the go-between is variously known as 'drurba.' 'svat,' 'starosta,' 'djever.' In Russia, when the parents of a young man heard of a suitable young woman, " they sent a confidential woman to examine and report on the young person, and if the result of that examination was favourable and in conformity with the ideas of the parents, these sent 'svats,' or go-betweens, bearing a fine cock in their hands as the insignia of their office." [3]

The institution of go-betweens is found in much the same form in Tibet,[4] among the tribes of Hindu Kush,[5] of Assam,[6] of the Chittagong Hills,[7] and of Upper Burma.[8] It is old-established among the Aryans of India,[9] and is observed by the pure Rajputs,[10] and the meanest Ckuhia outcasts,[11] no less than among the aboriginal races.[12] We find it among the Tamil populations of Ceylon,[13] among

[1] J. G. Georgi, *Description de toutes les nations de l'Empire de Russie*, vol. i, p. 62 ; L. von Schroeder, *Die Hochzeitsgebräuche der Esten und einiger anderer finnischugrischer Völkerschaften in Vergleichung mit denen der indogermanischen Völker*, pp. 32 sqq.

[2] L. St. Reymont, *The Peasants, Autumn*, p. 19.

[3] N. de Gerebtzoff, *Essai sur l'histoire de la civilisation en Russie*, vol. i, pp. 405 sq.

[4] F. Grenard, *Tibet, the Country and its Inhabitants*, p. 258 ; Sarat Chandra Das, *Journey to Lhasa and Central Tibet*, p. 247.

[5] G. Scott Robertson, *The Káfirs of the Hindu-Kush*, p. 533.

[6] P. R. T. Gurdon, *The Khasis*, p. 128.

[7] R. H. S. Hutchinson, *An Account of the Chittagong Hill Tracts*, p. 96.

[8] T. C. Hodson, *The Naga Tribes of Manipur*, p. 87 ; A. Rose and J. C. Brown, " Lisu (Yawyin) Tribes of the Burma-China Frontier," *Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, iii, p. 262 ; J. Anderson, *A Report of the Expedition to Yunan*, p. 127.

[9] *Râmâyana*, i. 46 ; A. A. Macdonell and A. B. Keith, *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*, vol. i, p. 482 ; E. Haas, " Die Heirathsgebräuche der alten Inder," *Indische Studien*, vol. v, pp. 291 sqq., 380, 411 ; M. Winternitz, " Das altindische Hochzeitsrituell nach dem Apastambîya-Grihyasûtra und einigen anderen verwandten Werken," *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Classe*, xl, pp. 21, 39 sq.

[10] H. H. Risley, in *Census of India*, 1901, vol. i, *Ethnographic Appendices*, p. 82.

[11] H. A. Rose, *A Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Punjab*, vol. ii, pp. 192 sq.

[12] J. Campbell, in *Census of India*, 1901, vol. i, " India," *Ethnographic Appendices*, p. 93 (Marathas) ; H. H. Risley, *Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, vol. i, p. 401 (Khonds), vol. ii, p. 229 (Santals) ; W. Crooke, *The Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh*, vol. i, p. 281 (Bhongi) ; vol. ii, p. 290 (Dhobi) ; *Madras District Gazetteers, The Nilgiris*, vol. i, p. 160 (Chettis) ; R. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of Central India*, vol. ii, pp. 4 (Agaria), 326 (Bhunija), etc.

[13] Joinville, " On the Religion and Manners of the People of Ceylon," *Asiatick Researches*, vii, p. 428.

all the peoples of Cochin-China and of Cambodia,[1] in Siam,[2] in the Malay Peninsula,[3] in Java,[4] in Formosa,[5] and in the Philippine Islands.[6]

The employment of accredited representatives to conduct the negotiation of a marriage is by no means a peculiarly Oriental custom. Among the North American Indians " courtship is always begun by proxy." [7] Among the Pawnees the services of an old man are usually requisitioned to conduct marriage negotiations; and in order to enhance the character of his function he is rubbed all over with the sacred fat of a buffalo.[8] The institution of go-betweens is found among the Tlinkit of Alaska,[9] and among the tribes of British Columbia.[10] It was in full force in ancient Mexico; " old women," Herrera tells us, " drove the contracts." [11] We find it

[1] E. Lunet de la Jonquière, *Ethnographie du Tonquin septentrional*, pp. 206 (Thaï), 241 (Man), 292 (Pa-Teng), 329 (Lolo), 347 (Muong); J. Canivey, " Notice sur les moeurs et coutumes des Moï," *Revue d'Ethnographie et de Sociologie*, vi, p. 2; Silvestre, " Les Thaï Blancs de Phong-Tho," *Bulletin de l'école française d'Extrême-Orient*, xviii, p. 18; J. Beauvais, " Notes sur les coutumes indigènes de la région de Long-Tcheou," *ibid.*, vii, pp. 269 sqq.; E. Aymonier, " Notes sur les coutumes et croyances des Cambodgiens," *Cochinchine française. Excursions et reconnaissances*, 1883, p. 197; M. Abadie, " Les Man du Haut Tonquin," *Revue d'Ethnographie et des Traditions Populaires*, iii, p. 211.

[2] J. Bowring, *The Kingdom and People of Siam*, vol. i, p. 118; E. Young, *The Kingdom of the Yellow Robe*, p. 89.

[3] R. J. Wilkinson, *Papers on Malay Subjects. Life and Customs*, Part i, *The Incidents of Malay Life*, p. 21.

[4] C. F. Winter, " Instelligen en gebruiken der Javanen," *Tijdschrift voor Neêrlands Indië*, v, No. 4, p. 5.

[5] J. W. Davidson, *The Island of Formosa, Past and Present*, p. 573.

[6] C. Worcester, *The Philippine Islands and their People*, p. 492.

[7] H. R. Schoolcraft, *Indian Tribes*, vol. v, p. 268. Cf. F. La Flesche, " Osage Marriage Customs," *The American Anthropologist*, N.S., xiv, p. 129; J. O. Dorsey, " Omaha Sociology," *Third Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 259; F. Russell, " The Pima Indians," *Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology*, p. 183.

[8] G. B. Grinnell, " Marriage among the Pawnees," *The American Anthropologist*, iv, p. 277.

[9] I. Petroff, " Report on the Resources of Alaska, *Tenth Census of the United States*, vol. viii, p. 169; H. J. Holmberg, " Ethnographische Skizzen über die Völker des russischen Amerika," *Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae*, iv, pp. 313 sq.

[10] C. Hill Tout, " Report on the Ethnology of the Stlatlumh of British Columbia," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxv, p. 131; J. Teit, " Thompson Indians of British Columbia," *Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. i, p. 322; F. Boas, " Second General Report on the Indians of British Columbia," *Report of the Sixtieth Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, pp. 575, 594.

[11] A. de Herrera, *The General History of the West Indies*, vol. iii, p. 316; Cf. de Mendieta, *Historia ecclesiastica Indiana*, p. 126.

among the Lenguas of the Paraguayan Chaco;[1] and among the Goajiros custom requires that a demand for marriage shall be made not by the suitor, but by two messengers appointed by him.[2] Similar usages are found in Patagonia.[3]

Among the western Tuareg it is usual to enlist the services of a 'marabut,' or holy-man, to initiate negotiations for a marriage.[4] Go-betweens are an indispensable institution for the negotiation of a marriage among the Arabs.[5] In Cairo, in Lane's day, the first step towards arranging a marriage was to obtain the services of a professional go-between, or 'khatbeh,' who also exercised the profession of hawker, and visited the various harems in that capacity. She would supply information as to what marriageable young ladies were available, and introduce the female relatives of the intending bridegroom so that they might inspect the most likely damsels and make enquiries as to the value of their jewels and the state of their wardrobe. The selection having been made, the further negotiations were carried out through the intermediary of the professional 'khatbeh,' and after the conclusion of the ceremony the happy bridegroom had an opportunity of inspecting the visage of his bride for the first time.[6]

Among the Basutos, the negotiations for a marriage must be opened by a messenger, and the bride's father is not even present while the diplomatic conversations take place, but is kept informed at intervals of the progress of the proceedings.[7] The same ceremonial is observed among the Bambara of West Africa; the marriage negotiations take place entirely between the members of the two families concerned, but they must be carried out through the intermediary of a third party, or go-between.[8] Similar proceedings are habitual among a number of other African people, some of them at the lowest cultural stage.[9]

[1] G. Kurze, "Sitte und Gebräuche der Lengua Indianer," *Mitteilungen der geographischen Gesellschaft (für Thuringen) zu Iena*, xxiii, p. 27.

[2] H. Candelier, *Rio Hacha et les Indiens Goajires*, p. 210.

[3] H. H. Prichard, *Through the Heart of Patagonia*, p. 93.

[4] H. Bissuel, *Les Touaregs de l'Ouest*, p. 105.

[5] J. Wellhausen, *Reste des arabischen Heidentums*, p. 433, n. 1; G. W. Freytag, *Einleitung in das Studium der arabischen Sprache*, p. 202.

[6] E. W. Lane, *An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, p. 157.

[7] A. Mabille, "The Basuto of Basutoland," *Journal of the African Society*, v, pp. 244 sq.

[8] J. Henry, *L'âme d'un peuple africain : Les Bambaras*, p. 200; Fama Mademba, "Die Sansanding-Staaten," in S. R. Steinmetz, *Rechtsverhältnisse von eingeborenen Völkern in Afrika und Ozeanien*, pp. 67 sq.

[9] D. Campbell, *In the Heart of Bantuland*, p. 150 (Wemba); H. Ling Roth, *Great Benin*, p. 38; N. W. Thomas, *Anthropological Report on Ibo-speaking Peoples of Nigeria*, vol. i, p. 65; E. Torday and T. A. Joyce, "Les Bushongo," *Annales du Musée du Congo Belge*, 1910, p. 113; O. Baumann,

The principle that the transaction of a marriage union is a sort of diplomatic negotiation which should properly be carried out through accredited envoys may, in fact, be said to be universal in primitive society. In Australia, among the tribes of south-western Victoria, marriage negotiations are conducted through go-betweens, called 'quapunda.'[1] When a young man wishes to obtain a wife, he communicates with some of his clan-brothers, who undertake the negotiations.[2] In Borneo, among the Dayaks, personal choice and courtship play a greater part in marriage than in most other uncultured societies. The recognised procedure is, however, to send an accredited representative to open negotiations with the young lady's family; it is etiquette to prolong those negotiations, and the matter is seldom settled until the second or third visit of the diplomatic envoy.[3] Similar ceremonials are observed by the Ladrones Islanders.[4] Among the savages of the Banks Islands "a marriage is usually negotiated by a third party who arranges the amount which shall be paid by the bridegroom to the relatives of the bride."[5] In the Loyalty Islands a young man "feels so incapable of doing himself justice that he finds it necessary to secure the help of a friend who accompanies him and pleads his friend's cause with great eloquence and skill."[6]

Marriages arranged by Parents or other Relatives.

For a marriage to be arranged between the parties themselves, the girl being first approached directly by the man, is even more unusual in uncultured societies, including the lowest, than it was

Usambara, p. 45; G. Volkens, *Der Kilimandscharo*, p. 251; H. A. Junod *The Life of a South African Tribe*, vol. i, p. 103; G. W. Murray, "Marriage Ceremonial of the Barabra," *Man*, xvii, p. 108; C. von Overbergh, *Les Mangbetu*, p. 323; Leuschner, "Die Bakwiri," in S. R. Steimentz, *Rechtsverhältnisse von eingeborenen Völkern in Afrika und Ozeanien*, p. 17; F. de Coutouly, "Le mariage et ses coutumes chez les Foula du Koïu," *Revue d'Ethnographie et de Sociologie*, i, p. 283; G. McCall Theal, *Records of South-East Africa*, vol. vii, p. 429; H. Klose, *Togo unter deutscher Flagge*, p. 252.

[1] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 251. Cf. W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 77 n.

[2] W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *op. cit.*, p. 92 sq.

[3] C. Hose and W. McDougall, *The Pagan Tribes of Borneo*, vol. ii, p. 171. Cf. M. T. H. Perelaer, *Ethnographische beschrijving der Dajaks*, p. 47.

[4] C. E. Meinicke, *Die Inseln des Stillen Oceans*, vol. ii, p. 407.

[5] W. H. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society*, vol. i, p. 49. Cf. A. Hahl, "Über die Rechtsanschauungen der Eingeborenen eines Theiles der Blanchebucht und des Innern der Gazelle Halbinsel," *Nachrichten über Kaiser Wilhelms-Land und den Bismarck-Archipel*, 1897, p. 78.

[6] E. Hadfield, *Among the Natives of the Loyalty Group*, p. 185.

among old-fashioned aristocratic families in Europe. Among the latter, in spite of the well-known fact that the pre-arranged alliance was one of 'convenance,' a fiction was kept up that it represented the consummation of a sentimental attraction, and the pompous ceremonies at which bride and bridegroom met for the first time were celebrated with references to Cupid, Venus, and Hymen. The French Jesuit, Father Charlevoix, quaintly marvels at the North American Indians for the lack of sentiment displayed in their marriages. "C'est uniquement entre les parens," he writes, "que se traitent les mariages; les parties intéressées n'y paraissent point du tout. Mais admirez la bizarrerie de ces barbares qui ne se rendent dépendans de leurs parens que dans la chose même où il leur serait permis de n'en point dépendre."[1] That eccentricity prevails in most parts of the world. In Java "the courtship, if it deserves the name, is conducted not by the parties themselves but by their parents. The slightest interference of the young people themselves would indeed be deemed a matter of the utmost scandal."[2] Among the primitive Oraons of Bengal "the boy and girl have absolutely nothing to say in the matter. Everything is settled by the parents."[3]

The world-wide practice of arranging marriages while the parties are still infants, far from being a corrupt abuse of sophisticated and mercenary aristocracies, is much more general in savage than in civilised societies. A distinction should be drawn between the allotting of children of both sexes to one another at birth, or before, and the bespeaking and promising of female infants as the future wives of grown men. The latter practice obtains in societies where women are in a state of subjection, and is a pretty sure index of such a condition. The betrothal or marriage of infants to one another is, on the other hand, consistent with an equal status of the sexes. The allotting of girls at birth, or before, is the universal rule among the Australian aborigines.[4] "As

[1] F. X. de Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, vol. v, p. 421.

[2] J. Crawfurd, *The History of the Indian Archipelago*, vol. i, p. 87.

[3] E. T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal*, p. 194.

[4] J. Macgillivray, *Narrative of the Voyage of H.M.S. 'Rattlesnake,'* vol. ii, p. 8; C. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition*, vol. ii, p. 205; C. Wilhelmi, "Manners and Customs of the Australian Aborigines, in particular of the Port Lincoln District," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Victoria*, v, p. 179; R. Brough Smyth, *The Aborigines of Victoria*, vol. ii, p. 156; P. Beveridge, *The Aborigines of Victoria and Riverina*, p. 22; A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, pp. 60 sq., 177, 194, 196 sq., 210, 216 sq., 219, 222, 232, 236 sq., 241, 249, 250, 251, 260, 262 sq.; Id., "Organisation of Australian Tribes," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Victoria*, vol. i, Part i, pp. 116 sq.; L. Fison and A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, p. 280; W. Ridley, *Kámilaróí and other Australian Languages*, p. 157; J. Dawson, *The Australian Aborigines*, p. 28; J. D. Woods, *The*

soon as a female child is born, nay, sometimes for years before that event, she is promised to some one of the tribe, without reference to his age, although his years may exceed those of her own father." [1]

Province of South Australia, p. 403 ; G. Taplin, " The Narrinyeri," in Woods, *The Native Tribes of South Australia*, p. 10 ; Id., *Folklore, Manners, Customs and Languages of the South Australian Aborigines*, pp. 8, 17, 65, 93 ; L. Schulze, " The Aborigines of the Upper and Middle Finke River ; their Habits and Customs," *Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Society of South Australia*, xiv, p. 236 ; S. Newland, " The Parkengees," *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society of Australasia : South Australian Branch*, ii, p. 21 ; T. M. Sutton, " The Adjahdurah Tribe," *ibid.*, p. 17 ; W. E. Stanbridge, " General Characteristics, etc., of the Tribes of the Central Part of Victoria," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society*, i, p. 288 ; S. Nind, " Description of the Natives of King George's Sound," *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, vol. i, p. 38 ; T. B. Wilson, *Narrative of a Voyage round the World*, p. 144 ; R. E. Mathews, *Ethnological Notes on the Aboriginal Tribes of New South Wales and Victoria*, pp. 96 sq., 100 sq. ; J. F. Mann, " Notes on the Aborigines of Australia," *Proceedings of the Geographical Society of Australia : New South Wales and Victoria Branch*, i, pp. 38 sq. ; J. W. Fawcett, " Customs of the Wanuah-Ruah Tribe," *Science of Man*, 1898, p. 180 ; E. S. Parker, *The Aborigines of Australia*, p. 22 ; J. Fraser, *The Aborigines of New South Wales*, p. 26 ; J. Mathew, " The Australian Aborigines," *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales*, xxiii, p. 407 ; F. Bonney, " On some Customs of the Aborigines of the River Darling," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xiii, pp. 129, 301 ; A. L. P. Cameron, " Notes on some Tribes of New South Wales," *ibid.*, xiv, p. 352 ; J. G. Frazer, " Notes on the Aborigines of Australia : Questions of Professor Frazer and Answers of Various Correspondents," *ibid.*, xxiv, pp. 157 sq. ; J. Forrest, " On the Natives of Central and Western Australia," *ibid.*, v, p. 317 ; A. Oldfield, " On the Aborigines of Australia," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society*, iii, p. 249 ; W. E. Roth, *North Queensland Ethnography, Bulletin No.* 5, p. 23 ; *Bulletin No.* 8, p. 9 ; Id., " North Queensland Ethnography, Bulletin No. 10," *Records of the Australian Museum*, vii, pp. 3, 4, 5, 6 ; F. J. Gillen, in *Report of the Horn Scientific Expedition to Central Australia*, vol. iv, p. 165 ; B. W. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 558 sqq. ; Id., *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 77 n. ; C. Strehlow, *Die Aranda und Loritja-Stämme in Zentral-Australien*, Part iv, i, p. 89 ; T. Petrie, *Reminiscences*, pp. 59 sq. ; C. Lumholtz, *Among Cannibals*, p. 165 ; C. Sturt, *Narrative of an Expedition to Central Australia*, vol. ii, pp. 254 sq. ; G. Grey, *Journals of Two Expeditions of Discovery in North-West and Western Australia*, vol. ii, pp. 229 sq. ; G. F. Moore, *A Descriptive Vocabulary of the Language of Aborigines of Western Australia*, pp. 41, 51 ; A. R. Brown, " Three Tries of Western Australia," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii, p. 156 ; J. D. E. Schmertz, " Ethnological Notes on the Western Australian Aborigines," *Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, xvi, p. 12 ; E. T. Hardman, " Notes on some Habits and Customs of the Natives of the Kimberley District, Western Australia," *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, Series iii, i, p. 71.

[1] J. Browne, " The Aborigines of Australia," *The Nautical Magazine and Naval Chronicle*, 1856, p. 538.

The same usage is prevalent, though not a universal social rule, throughout Melanesia ;[1] and it was common in the case of chiefs and men of distinction among the Polynesians.[2] In New Guinea, on the other hand, the betrothal of infants to one another is the

[1] New Britain Group : R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians*, pp. 237, 241 ; R. Parkinson, *Dreissig Jahre in der Südsee*, p. 63 ; W. Powell, *Wanderings in a Wild Country*, p. 85 ; J. Meier, " Primitive Völker und ' Paradies ' Zustand mit besonderer Berucksichtigung der früheren Verhältnisse beim Oststammen der Gazellehalbinsel in Bismarck-Archipel," *Anthropos*, ii, p. 380 ; F. Burger, *Die Kusten- und Bergvölker der Gazelle-halbinsel*, p. 23 ; A. Hahl, " Über die Rechtsanschauungen der Eingeborenen eines Theiles der Blanchebucht und des Innere der Gazelle Halbinsel," *Nachrichten über Kaiser Wilhelms-Land und den Bismarck-Archipel*, 1897, p. 78 ; F. Sorge, " Nissan-Inseln im Bismarck-Archipel," in S. R. Steinmetz, *Rechtsverhältnisse von eingeborenen Völkern in Afrika und Ozeanien*, p. 407 ; H. H. Romilly, " The Islands of the New Britain Group," *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society*, ix, p. 8 ; E. Stephan and F. Gräbner, *Neu-Mecklenburg (Bismarck-Archipel)*, p. 107 ; G. Brown, *Melanesians and Polynesians*, pp. 111 sq. ; Id., " Notes on the Duke of York Group, New Britain, and New Ireland," *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, xlvii, p. 148 ; B. Danks, " Marriage Customs of the New Britain Group," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xviii, p. 288 ; A. Hahl, " Das mittlere Neumecklemburg," *Globus*, xci, pp. 313 sq. Solomon Islands Group : A. Penny, *Ten Years in Melanesia*, p. 95 ; F. Elton, " Notes on Natives of the Solomon Islands," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xvii, p. 93 ; R. Thurnwald, *Forschungen auf den Salomo-Inseln und Bismarck-Archipel*, vol. iii, p. 12. New Caledonia : V. de Rochas, *La Nouvelle Calédonie et ses habitants*, p. 231 ; Père Lambert, *Moeurs et superstitions des Néo-Calédoniens*, p. 91 ; M. Glaumont, " Usages et coutumes des Néo-Calédoniens," *Revue d'Ethnographie*, vii, p. 76 ; L. Moncelon, " Réponses pour les Néo-Calédoniens au questionnaire de la Société," *Bulletin de la Société d'Anthropologie*, Série iii, ix, p. 367 ; T. H. Hood, *Notes of a Cruise in H.M.S. ' Fawn ' in the Western Pacific*, p. 217 ; J. L. Brenchley, *Jottings during the Cruise of H.M.S. ' Curaçoa ' among the South Sea Islands*, pp. 342 sq. Loyalty Group : S. M. Creagh, " Notes on the Loyalty Islands," *Fourth Meeting of the Australian Association for the Advancement of Science*, p. 627 ; A. Cheyne, *A Description of the Islands of the Western Pacific*, p. 25 ; E. Hadfield, *Among the Natives of the Loyalty Group*, p. 182. Fiji : C. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition*, vol. iii, p. 92 ; T. Williams, *Fiji and the Fijians*, vol. i, p. 167 ; B. Thomson, *Fijians*, p. 201 ; A. B. Brewster, *The Hill Tribes of Fiji*, p. 190.

[2] J. J. Jarves, *History of the Hawaiian Islands*, p. 43 ; W. von Bülow, " Das ungeschriebenes Gesetz der Samoaner," *Globus*, lxix, p. 193 ; J. B. Stair, *Old Samoa*, p. 171 ; G. Kurze, " Die Samoaner in den heidnischen Zeit," *Mitteilungen der geographischen Gesellschaft (für Thuringen) zu Jena*, xix, p. 3 ; W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, vol. i, pp. 267, 270 (Tahiti) ; W. Mariner, *An Account of the Natives of the Tonga Islands*, vol. ii, p. 167 ; E. Best, " Maori Marriage Customs," *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute*, xxxvi, pp. 32, 42 sq. ; A. S. Thomson, *The Story of New Zealand*, vol. i, p. 176 ; E. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, p. 285 ; J. S. Polack, *Manners and Customs of the New Zealanders*, vol. i, pp. 135 sq. ; W. Brown, *New Zealand and its Aborigines*, p. 34 ; L. Tautain, " Étude sur le mariage chez les Polynesiens (Mao'i) des Îles Marquises," *L'Anthropologie*, vi, pp. 644 sq. ; Geiseler, *Die Oster-Insel*, p. 27.

prevalent practice, and the children are formally married and cohabit when hardly able to toddle.[1] The usage is found also in every part of Micronesia and of the Philippines, though it is there an occasional means of cementing alliances between families, and not a general practice;[2] it is much more common in Indonesia.[3]

[1] *Nieuw-Guinea*, pp. 160 sq.; A. Goudswaard, *De Papoewa's van Geelvinksbaai*, pp. 65 sq.; P. R. van der Aa, *Reizen naar Nieuw-Guinea*, p. 149; J. B. van Hasselt, "Die Noeforezen," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, viii, pp. 180 sq.; G. L. Bink, "Réponse au questionnaire de sociologie et d'ethnologie," *Bulletin de la Société d'Anthropologie*, Série iii, xi, p. 397 (Geelvink Bay); N. von Miklucho-Mackay, "Anthropologische Bemerkungen über die Papuas der Maclay-Kuste in Neu Guinea," *Natuurkundig Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch Indië*, xxxiii, p. 245; O. Finsch, *Neu-Guinea*, pp. 102, 116; M. Moszkowski, "Die Völkerstämme am Maberamo in Holländsch-Neuguinea und auf der vorgelagerten Inseln," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xliii, p. 323; J. Kohler, "Das Recht der Papuas," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*, xiv, p. 345; R. Neuhauss, *Deutsch Neu-Guinea*, vol. i, pp. 160 sq.; K. Vetter, "Bericht des Missionars Herrn Konrad Vetter in Simbang über papuanische Rechtsverhältnisse," *Nachrichten über Kaiser Wilhelms-Land und den Bismarck-Archipel*, 1897, p. 89; F. H. H. Guillemard, *The Cruise of the 'Marchesa' to Kamtschatka and New Guinea*, p. 389; R. W. Williamson, *The Mafulu Mountain People of British New Guinea*, p. 170; C. G. Seligman, *The Melanesians of British New Guinea*, p. 745; E. Beardmore, "The Natives of Mowat, Daudai, New Guinea," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xix, p. 460; C. Kowald, "Native Habits and Customs of the Mekeo District (Central Division)," *Annual Report on British New Guinea*, 1892–93, p. 61; A. C. English, "Native Habits and Customs of the Rigo District," *ibid.*, p. 65.

[2] A. Senfft, "Die Rechtssitten der Jap-Eingeborenen," *Globus*, xci, p. 141; Id., "Die Marshall-Insulaner," in S. R. Steinmetz, *Rechtsverhältnisse von eingeborenen Völkern in Afrika und Ozeanien*, p. 434; Id., "Die Insel Nauru," *Mitteilungen aus den Deutschen Schutzgebieten*, ix (1896), p. 106; Jung, "Aufzeichnungen über die Rechtsanschauungen der Eingeborenen von Nauru," *ibid.*, x (1897), p. 66; C. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition*, vol. v, p. 102 (Gilbert Islands); R. Parkinson, "Beiträge zur Ethnologie der Gilbert Insulaner," *Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, ii, p. 37; J. Kohler, "Das Recht der Marschallinsulaner," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*, xiv, pp. 417 sq.; Ras Reyes Lala, *The Philippine Islands*, pp. 90 sq.; C. Worcester, "The non-Christian Tribes of Northern Luzon," *The Philippine Journal of Science*, i, p. 850; W. A. Reed, *Negritos of Zambales*, p. 57; A. E. Jenks, *The Bontoc Igorot*, p. 68.

[3] A. L. van Hasselt, *Volksbeschrijving van Midden-Sumatra*, p. 275; J. C. van Eerde, "Eeen huwelijk bij de Minangkabausche Maleiers," *Tijdschrift voor Indische taal-, land- en volkenkunde*, xliv, p. 451; T. J. Willer, "Verzameling der Battaksche wette en instellingen in Mandheling en Pertibie," *Tijdschrift voor Neêrlands-Indië*, viii, deel ii, p. 174; C. Snouck Hurgronje, *De Atjèhers*, vol. i, p. 319; H. von Rosenberg, *Der Malayische Archipel*, pp. 350 sq. (Java); P. J. Veth, *Java*, vol. i, p. 629; J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua*, p. 21; K. Martin, *Reisen in den Moluken, in Ambon, den Uliassern, Scram und Buru*, p. 289; T. J. Willer, *Het eiland Boeroe, zijne exploratie en Halfoerische instellinge*, p. 107; C. A. Wilken, *De verspreide geschriften*, vol. i, p. 48 (Buru); F. J. P. Sachse, *Het eiland Seran en zijne bewoners*, p. 104; A. C. Kruijt, "De

Infant betrothal is very prevalent among all the peoples of northern Asia,[1] and appears to be an almost universal usage among the Turkic populations of Central Asia.[2] As is well known, infant marriage is the regular practice, and regarded as an obligation among the Hindus, and appears to be likewise an original usage with the Tamil populations of southern India; whereas the aboriginal peoples of northern India are distinguished from other Indian populations by their practice of adult marriage, though the Hindu custom is constantly tending to become adopted by them.[3] Among the primitive forest tribes of Malaya, infant betrothal is the rule.[4] In Africa, where the principle of marriage by purchase has reached its highest development, that purchasing

Timoreezen," *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, lxxix, p. 359; A. F. P. Graafland, *De Minahassa*, vol. i, pp. 314 sq.; S. J. Hickson, *A Naturalist in North Celebes*, p. 270; C. M. Pleyte, "Ethnographische beschrijving der Kei-eilanden," *Tijdschrift van het Kon. Nederlandsch aardrijkskundig genootschap*, 2e Ser., x, p. 808; M. T. H. Perelaer, *Ethnographische beschrijving der Dajaks*, p. 47; C. A. L. M. Schwaner, *Borneo*, vol. i, pp. 194 sq.; P. J. Veth, *Borneo's wester afdeeling*, vol. ii, p. 268.

[1] F. Lowe, "Wenjaminow über die Aleutischen Inseln und deren Bewohner," *Archiv für wissenschaftliche Kunde von Russland*, ii (1842), p. 476; I. Petroff, "Report on the Population, etc., of Alaska," *Tenth Census of the United States*, vol. viii, p. 158 (Aleuts); W. Bogoras, *The Chukchee*, p. 108; M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, p. 108 (Yakut), p. 102 (Ainu); J. Batchelor, *The Ainu and their Folklore*, p. 225; N. Seeland, "Die Ghiliaken," *Russische Revue*, xxi, p. 126; E. G. Ravenstein, *The Russians on the Amur*, pp. 351, 387 (Tungus); M. Lansdell, *Through Siberia*, vol. ii, p. 225 (Gilyak); W. Radloff, *Aus Siberien*, pp. 357 (Teleut), 476 (Kirghis); A. G. Schrenk, *Reise nach dem Nordosten des europaischen Russland durch die Tundren der Samojeden*, vol. i, p. 478.

[2] H. Vámbéry, *Das Türkenvolk*, p. 109; I. Koslow, "Das Gewohnheitsrecht der Kirghisen," *Russiche Revue*, xxi, pp. 466 sq.; A. de Levchine, *Description des hordes et des steppes des Kirghiz-Kazaks*, p. 358; J. G. Georgi, *Description de toutes les nations de l'Empire de Russie*, vol. ii, pp. 23, 52; A. Snessareff, "Religion und Gebräuche der Bervölker des westlichen Pamirs," *Keleti Szemle*, ix, p. 200; Dubeux et Valmont, *Tartarie*, pp. 33, 195; F. Grenard, "Le Turkestan et le Tibet," in J. L. Dutreuil de Rhins, *Mission scientifique dans la Haute Asie*, Part ii, p. 115; A. Wilson, *The Abode of Snow*, p. 233; J. Hutton, *Central Asia from the Aryan to the Cossack*, pp. 248 sq.; C. E. de Ujfalvy, *Les Aryens au Nord et au Sud de l'Hindou-Kouch*, p. 173; Id., in *Expédition Scientifique française en Russie, en Sibérie et dans le Turkestan*, vol. iii, p. 66; G. S. Robertson, *The Káfirs of the Hindu-Kush*, p. 534.

[3] H. H. Risley, *The People of India*, pp. 179 sqq.; J. T. Marten, in *Census of India*, 1921, vol. i, "India," Part i, pp. 157 sqq.; C. N. Barham, "Child Marriage in India," *Westminster Review*, cxxxv, pp. 113 sqq.; Sirdar Argan Singh, "Early Marriage in India," *Imperial and Asiatic Quarterly Review*, 3rd Series, xx, pp. 265 sqq.

[4] W. W. Skeat and C. O. Blagden, *The Pagan Races of the Malay Peninsula*, vol. ii, pp. 64, 75; R. J. Wilkinson, *Papers on Malay Subjects: The Aboriginal Tribes*, p. 56; G. B. Cerruti, *Nel Paese dei Veleni: Fra i Sakai*, p. 139; J. R. Logan, "Five days in Naning," *Journal of the Indian Archipelago*, iii, p. 490.

power is extensively used to secure girls in infancy as future wives.[1] The practice is particularly prevalent in the slave-dealing regions of Western Africa.[2] Betrothal of infants of both sexes is very

[1] G. McCall Theal, *The Yellow and Dark-skinned People of Africa south of the Zambesi*, pp. 159, 219 sq.; D. Kidd, *The Essential Kafir*, p. 211; E. Holub, *Seven Years in South Africa*, vol. ii, p. 314; W. J. Burchell, *Travels in the Interior of Southern Africa*, vol. ii, pp. 53, 564; A. Junod, *The Life of a South African Tribe*, vol. i, p. 99; H. von François, *Nama und Damara, Deutsch-Süd-West-Afrika*, p. 195; H. Schinz, *Deutsch Süd-West-Afrika*, p. 172; G. Pirie, "North-Eastern Rhodesia," *Journal of the African Society*, vi, p. 45; E. W. Smith and A. H. Dale, *The Ila-speaking Peoples of Northern Rhodesia*, vol. ii, p. 47; C. Gouldsbury and H. Sheane, *The Great Plateau of Northern Rhodesia*, p. 156; H. H. Johnston, *George Grenfell and the Congo*, vol. ii, p. 677; J. H. Weeks, *Among Congo Cannibals*, p. 122; Id., "Notes on some Customs of the Lower Congo People," *Folk-lore*, xix, p. 420; Id., "The Bangala," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxix, p. 440; E. Torday and T. A. Joyce, "Notes on the Ethnography of the Ba-Mbala," *ibid.*, xxxv, p. 410; Id., *Les Bushongo*, p. 115; R. Schmitz, *Les Baholoholo*, p. 169; C. van Overbergh, *Les Mayombe*, p. 241; Van der Plas, *Les Kuki*, p. 221; H. H. Johnston, *British Central Africa*, pp. 409, 413; A. Werner, *The Natives of British Central Africa*, pp. 129 sq.; H. L. Duff, *Nyasaland under the Foreign Office*, pp. 311, 315; F. Fülleborn, *Das Deutsche Njassa- und Ruwuna-Gebiet*, pp. 345 sqq.; Gutmann, "Die Frau bei den Wadschagga," *Globus*, xlii, p. 2; H. Dahlgrün, "Heiratsgebräuche der Schambaa," *Mitteilungen aus den Deutschen Schutzgebieten*, xvi, p. 224; K. Weule, *Native Life in East Africa*, p. 305; J. Roscoe, *The Northern Bantu*, pp. 38 sq.; Id., *The Bakitara or Banyoro*, p. 262; H. H. Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate*, p. 747; C. W. Hobley, *Eastern Uganda*, pp. 17, 28; F. H. Lang, "Die Waschanbala," in S. R. Steinmetz, *Rechtsverhältnisse von eingeborenen Völker in Afrika und Ozeanien*, p. 225; P. Desoignies, "Die Machala," *ibid.*, p. 273; A. Knaft, "Die Wapokomo," *ibid.*, p. 287; H. Fabry, "Aus dem Leben der Wapogoro," *Globus*, xci, p. 221; J. W. Gregory, *The Great Rift Valley*, p. 343; M. Merker, *Die Masai*, p. 44; G. Lindblom, *The Akamba*, p. 77; P. Reichardt, "Die Wanjamuesi," *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin*, xxiv, p. 310; C. Dundas, "The History of Kitui," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii, p. 519; A. and G. Grandidier, *Histoire physique, naturelle et politique de Madagascar*, vol. iv, Part ii, pp. 163 sq.; W. Ellis, *History of Madagascar*, vol. i, pp. 167, 200.

[2] W. Bosman, "A New Description of the Coast of Guinea," in Pinkerton, *Voyages and Travels*, vol. xvi, p. 424; B. Cruikshank, *Eighteen Years on the Gold Coast*, vol. ii, p. 192; M. Kingsley, *West African Travels*, pp. 226, 404; A. Hewan, "On some Customs of the People of Old Calabar relative to Pregnancy and Parturition," *The Edinburgh Medical Journal*, x, p. 220; A. B. Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, p. 201; Id., *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples*, p. 183; Id., *The Tshi-speaking Peoples*, p. 281; J. Spieth, *Die Ewe-Stämme*, p. 182; C. Partridge, *Cross River Natives*, p. 254; J. Beecham, *Ashantee and the Gold Coast*, p. 126; T. E. Bowdich, *Mission from Cape Coast Castle to Ashantee*, p. 302; H. Klose, *Togo unter deutscher Flagge*, pp. 252, 507; W. MacGregor, "Lagos, Abeokuta and the Alake," *Journal of the African Society*, iii, p. 474; R. E. Dennett, "Laws and Customs of the Fjort or Bavili Family, Kingdom of Loango," *Journal of the African Society*, i, p. 262; S. and O. Johnson, *The History of the Yoruba*, p. 113; L. Brunet and L. Giethlen, *Dahomey et dépendances*, pp. 320 sq.; E. Foá, *Le Dahomey*, p. 190; L. W. G. Malcolm, "Notes on Birth,

prevalent among the Eskimo,[1] and Alaskan tribes.[2] Among the North American races of the eastern regions and the plains, the betrothal of an infant girl to a distinguished warrior appears to have been only occasionally resorted to as a means of cementing alliances between prominent families.[3] In such matriarchal

Marriage and Death Ceremonies of the Etap Tribe, Central Cameroons," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, liii, p. 389; R. E. Dennett, *Nigerian Studies*, p. 165; Id., *At the Back of the Black Man's Mind*, pp. 198 sq.; A. F. Mockler-Ferryman, *British Nigeria*, p. 232; G. T. Barsden, *Among the Ibos*, p. 69; N. W. Thomas, *Anthropological Report on the Ibo-speaking Peoples of Nigeria*, vol. iv, p. 61; Id., *Anthropological Report on the Edo-speaking Peoples of Nigeria*, vol. i, p. 47; J. Henry, *L'âme d'un peuple africain. Les Bambara*, p. 199; Leuschner, "Die Bakwiri," in S. R. Steinmetz, *Rechtsverhältnisse von eingeborenen Völkern in Afrika und Ozeanien*, p. 18; von Oertzten, "Die Banaka und Bapuki," *ibid.*, p. 35; C. Tellier, "Kreis Kita, Französischer Sudan," *ibid.* p. 154; J. M. Sarbah, *Fanti Customary Law*, p. 45; "Les Attié (Côte d'Ivoire)," par un missionnaire, *Revue d'Ethnographie et des Traditions Populaires*, iii, p. 4; O. Temple, *Notes on the Tribes, Provinces, Emirates and States of the Northern Provinces of Nigeria*, pp. 51, 77, 103, 129, 140, 158, 163, 166, 181, 196, 227, 237, 241, 245, 250, 257, 274, 285, 293, 345, 375, 381; L. Tauxier, *Le Noir du Soudan*, pp. 46, 140, 431; Id., *Études soudanaises : Le Noir du Yatenga*, p. 235; F.-J. Clozel and R. Villamur, *Les coutumes indigènes de la Côte d'Ivoire*, pp. 100, 149, 172 sq., 194, 238, 278, 309, 318, 352, 393, 435, 454, 487, 497, 509; H. Hecquard, *Voyage sur la côte et dans l'intérieur de l'Afrique occidentale*, p. 174; J. L. Wilson, *Western Africa*, pp. 113, 181; G. Bruel, *L'Afrique équatoriale française*, p. 187; A. Delacour, "Les Tenda de la Guinée française," *Revue d'Ethnologie et de Sociologie*, iv, p. 50; D. Westermann, *Die Kpelle, ein Negerstamm in Liberia*, p. 58; J. Matthews, *A Voyage to the River Sierra Leone*, p. 117; T. J. Alldridge, *A Transformed Colony, Sierra Leone*, p. 213.

[1] E. W. Nelson, "The Eskimo about Bering Strait," *Eighteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 290; F. Boas, "The Central Eskimo," *ibid.*, *Sixth Annual Report*, pp. 578 sq.; L. M. Turner, "Ethnology of the Ungava District, Hudson Bay," *ibid.*, *Eleventh Annual Report*, p. 188; J. Franklin, *Narrative of a Journey to the Shores of the Polar Sea*, p. 263; J. Ross, *Narrative of a Second Voyage in Search of a North-West Passage*, p. 269; D. Cranz, *The History of Greenland*, vol. i, p. 146; C. F. Hall, *Arctic Researches and Life among the Esquimaux*, p. 567; L. Kumlien, "Contributions to the Natural History of Arctic America," *Bulletin of the United States National Museum, No.* 15, p. 16; H. W. Klutschak, *Als Eskimo unter den Eskimos*, p. 233; K. Rasmussen, *The People of the Polar North*, p. 63.

[2] F. Boas, "The Indians of the Lower Fraser River," *Report of the Sixty-fourth Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, p. 457; J. R. Swanton, "The Haida," *Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. v, Part i, p. 50.

[3] G. H. Loskiel, *History of the Mission of the United Brethren among the Indians*, vol. i, p. 56; E. James, *Account of an Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains*, vol. i, p. 231 (Omaha); W. H. Keating, *Narrative of an Expedition to the Sources of St. Peter's River*, vol. i, p. 111; M. Lewis and W. Clarke, *Travels to the Source of the Missouri River*, p. 307 (Shoshoni); A. M. Stephen, "The Navajo," *The American Anthropologist*, vi, p. 356; W. Bartram, *Travels through North and South Carolina*, p. 513 (Creeks).

societies traffic in infant girls is out of the question. Among the ruder northern Athapascan tribes, on the other hand, and among the Pacific tribes of British Columbia and California, where a form of marriage by purchase has developed as a means of maintaining the privileges of aristocratic classes, such disposal of infant girls is common.[1] Infant betrothal is also general in South America.[2]

Where patriarchal principles are established and the father is the head of the family, it is almost invariably he who must be approached in reference to the marriage of a daughter. Not only has he the recognised right to dispose of his daughters, but he in many instances arranges the marriage of his son and selects a wife for him. Thus, for example, among the Dagari and the Uhle of the French Sudan, the first or chief wife is chosen by the father of the bridegroom, and the latter has nothing to do with the transaction.[3] Among the Herero "there is no question of

[1] R. C. Mayne, *Four Years in British Columbia and Vancouver Island*, p. 276; R. B. Dixon, "The Northern Maidu," *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*, xvii, p. 240; Id., "Notes on the Achomawi and Atsugewi Indians of Northern California," *The American Anthropologist*, N.S., x, p. 217; E. Sapir, "Notes on the Takelma Indians of South-Western Oregon," *ibid.*, ix, p. 274; D. Cameron, "The Nipigon Indians," in L. R. Masson, *Les Bourgeois de la Compagnie du Nord-Ouest*, vol. ii. p. 265; S. Hearne, *A Journey from Prince of Wales's Fort to the Northern Ocean*, p. 310; A. MacKenzie, *Voyages from Montreal to the Frozen and Pacific Oceans*, p. cxxiii; J. Richardson, *Arctic Searching Expedition*, vol. ii, p. 23; J. Dunn, *The Oregon Territory*, p. 78.

[2] De la Borde, *Relation des Caraïbes*, p. 596; E. F. Im Thurn, *Among the Indians of Guiana*, p. 221; R. Schonburgh, *Reisen in Britisch-Guiana*, vol. ii, p. 460; W. H. Brett, *The Indian Tribes of Guiana*, pp. 99 sq.; W. Curtis Farabee, *The Central Arawak*, pp. 94, 136; J. H. Bernau, *Missionary Labours in Guiana*, p. 59; K.F. Appun, "Die Indianer von Britisch-Guayana," *Das Ausland*, xliv (1871), pp. 124, 446; C. Quandt, *Nachrichten von Surinam*, p. 248; H. Coudreau, *Chez nos Indiens*, p. 127; "Unter den Indianer von Guiana," *Globus*, xlvi, p. 24; C. N. Bell, *Tangweera*, p. 262; O. Stoll, *Die Ethnologie der Indianerstämme von Guatemala* (*Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, Bd. I, *Supplement*), p. 7; R. Rhode, in *Mitteilungen des Kaiserliches Museum*, 1885, pp. 14 sq. (Guatos); C. F. Ph. von Martius, *Beiträge zur Ethnographie und Sprachenkunde Amerika's zumal Brasiliens*, vol. i, pp. 322, 393, 645; K. von den Steinen, *Unter Naturvölkern Zentral-Brasiliens*, p. 501; A. M. G. Tocantins, "Estudios sobre a tribu 'Mundurucu,'" *Revista trimensal do Instituto historico geographico e ethnographico do Brasil*, xl, Part ii, p. 113; *The Captivity of Hans Stade of Hesse in A.D. 1547–1555, among the Wild Tribes of Eastern Brazil*, p. 143; T. Whiffen, *The North-West Amazons*, p. 162; W. C. Farabee, *Indian Tribes of Eastern Peru*, pp. 59 (Piro), 141 (Huitoto); A. Dessalines d'Orbigny, *Voyage dans l'Amérique méridionale*, vol. iii, p. 98; T. Falkner, *A Description of Patagonia*, p. 124; P. King and R. Fitzroy, *Narrative of the Surveying Voyages of the 'Adventure' and 'Beagle,'* vol. ii, pp. 152 sq.

[3] H. Labouret, "Mariage et Polyandrie parmi les Dagari et les Oulé," *Revue d'Ethnographie et des traditions populaires*, i, p. 274. Cf. F. de Coutouly,

love in regard to betrothal and marriage. In most cases the father seeks a bride for his son while the latter is still an infant." [1] Similar usages are common among the Kaffirs of South Africa.[2] Among the Batoro of eastern Uganda the first intimation of his marriage which a young man receives is when his father informs him that he has chosen a wife for him.[3] Among the Madi negroes, when a young man attains marriageable age, his father sets out on a journey among neighbouring tribes to find a suitable daughter-in-law.[4] Similarly among the Indian tribes of Guatemala, a young man's father selects a wife for him in some other clan and makes all the necessary arrangements for his marriage.[5] So again, among the Malaialis of the Salem district in southern India, the father makes enquiries on behalf of his son concerning the desirable girls in the next village, and sets forth wife-hunting, thus saving the young man all the trouble of courtship and love-making.[6] The choice of a bride by the bridegroom's father is a very common practice in India.[7] Among the Pateng and the Man of northern Tonkin the selection of a wife for his son rests likewise entirely with the father.[8] Among the Papuans of Geelvink Bay it is the father who obtains a wife for his son while the latter is still an infant.[9]

Sometimes the selection of a wife for a young man is left to the chief or king. Thus among the Bantu tribes of Portuguese south-east Africa, "when anyone wishes to marry, the king makes the match, so that no marriage can take place unless he names the bride." The aspirant to matrimony, after having collected from

"Le mariage et ses coutumes chez les Foula du Koïu," *Revue d'Ethnographie et de Sociologie*, i, p. 283; L. Tauxier, *Études Soudanaises : Le noir du Yatenga*, p. 235.

[1] J. Irle, *Die Herero*, p. 110. Cf. J. Kohler, "Das Recht der Herero," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*, xiv, p. 301.

[2] D. Kidd, *The Essential Kafir*, p. 212; A. Kropf, *Das Volk der Xosa-Kaffern im östlichen Südafrika*, pp. 133 sq.; G. McCall Theal, *Records of South-East Africa*, vol. vii, p. 429.

[3] J. F. Cunningham, *Uganda and its People*, p. 52. Cf. p. 101 (Bakoki); K. Weule, *Native Life in East Africa*, p. 306.

[4] R. W. Felkin, "Notes on the Madi, or Moru, Tribe of Central Africa," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, xii, p. 328.

[5] O. Stoll, *Die Ethnologie der Indianerstämme von Guatemala* (*Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, Supplement to vol. i), p. 8.

[6] E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, p. 32.

[7] R. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, vol. ii, pp. 4 (Agaria), 43 (Atari), 410 (Chamar), 491 (Dhanwar), vol. iii, p. 556 (Korku), vol. iv, p. 23 (Kunbi).

[8] E. Lunet de Lajonquière, *Ethnographie du Tonquin septentrional*, p. 292; A. Badie, "Les Man du Haut Tonquin," *Revue d'Ethnographie et des Traditions Populaires*, iii, p. 211.

[9] G.-L. Bink, "Réponse au questionnaire de la Société," *Bulletin de la Société d'Anthropologie*, Série iii, xi, p. 396.

his relatives and friends a reasonable dowry, presents it to the king for investment, and requests him to be so good as to select a wife for him. The monarch thereupon sends a message to So-and-so to bring his daughter, and hands her over to the grateful benedick.[1]

In matriarchal societies and in communities which have preserved the traditions of former matriarchal usages, the duty of arranging marriages often devolves upon the maternal uncles of the parties. It is their consent, and not that of the father, which is necessary for the valid conclusion of a marriage among the North American Indians.[2] Thus among the Pawnees a boy's uncle informs him of the choice he has made for him.[3] Among the Caribbean tribes of Colombia the whole of the negiotations for a marriage are conducted between the maternal uncles of the parties; it is they who fix the bride-price, and it is to them that it is paid.[4] So also among the Mortlock Islanders it is the young lady's maternal uncle whom one must approach with reference to a proposed alliance.[5] Among the Menangkabau Malays the whole negotiations are the concern of the maternal uncles of the respective parties.[6] In Tibet and in Sikkim a woman cannot marry without the consent of her mother's brother, and he is the chief personage in all that concerns the marriage.[7] Among the Brahui of Baluchistan there is a very strong feeling that a daughter's wedding is no place for her father. "In older days it would have been a scandal for him to put in an appearance at all; he was expected to quit the house, leaving his wife's brother in possession to act as head of the family."[8] In India among the aboriginal

[1] Francisco Vaz d'Almada, "An Account of the misfortunes that befell the ship 'São João Baptista,'" in G. MacCall Theal, *Records of South-East Africa*, vol. viii, pp. 92 sq.

[2] L. H. Morgan, *Ancient Society*, p. 439; H. R. Schoolcraft, *Indian Tribes*, vol. v, p. 268; W. Bartram, "Observations on the Creek and Cherokee Indians," *Transactions of the American Ethnological Society*, iii, Part i, p. 65; F. La Flesche, "Osage Marriage Customs," *The American Anthropologist*, N.S., xiv, p. 128.

[3] G. A. Dorsey, "Social Organisation of the Skidi Pawnee," *Congrès International des Américanistes, XVe Session* (Quebec, 1906), vol. ii, p. 73.

[4] H. Candelier, *Le Rio Hacha et les Indiens Goajires*, p. 208; F. C. Nicholas, "The Aborigines of the Province of Santa Marta, Colombia," *The American Anthropologist*, N.S., iii, pp. 647 sq.

[5] J. Kubary, "Die Bewohner der Mortlock Inseln," *Mittheilungen der geographischen Gesellschaft in Hamburg*, 1878–79, p. 260.

[6] J. C. van der Eerde, "Een huwelijk bij de Minangkabausche Maleiers," *Tijdschrift voor Indische taal-, land- en volkenkunde*, xliv, pp. 391 sq.

[7] F. Grenard, *Tibet the Country and the People* p. 262; Sarat Chandra Das, "Marriage Customs in Tibet," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, xlii, Part iii, pp. 15 sq.

[8] D. Bray, in *Census of India*, 1911, vol. iv, "Baluchistan," p. 112.

races generally the mother's brother is regarded as closely concerned in the marriage of both his nieces and nephews. So inherent in Indian customs and thought are those usages that a current proverb asks: "If a girl is not given in marriage by her mother's brother, then who will give her?" [1] Thus, for example, among the Agariya and other castes of Bengal the marriage of a boy is arranged by his maternal uncle.[2] Among the Gurkas both bride and bridegroom must receive a dowry from their respective maternal uncles.[3] Among the Krubas a marriage cannot be contracted without the consent of the maternal uncles of the parties.[4] Among the Khonds the bride's maternal uncle takes the bride to her new home, carrying her all the way on his shoulders; should he put her down during the journey, he is liable to a fine of a buffalo.[5] Among the Jogi the maternal uncles perform the whole ceremony of marriage,[6] and the same custom obtains among the Mogers,[7] the Muka Doras,[8] and the Uralis of Coimbatore.[9] Among the Indiga a man cannot get married unless his maternal uncle has previously had a bath.[10]

As already noted it is in many parts of Africa the maternal uncle who disposes of the children, whether male or female, and receives the bride-price paid for the latter.[11] Among the Basutos the maternal uncles take the chief part in the transaction, they bear the chief expenses, and receive the larger share of the price paid. The father of the bride has no concern in her marriage and is not present during the proceedings.[12] In the Congo it is commonly the maternal uncles who in like manner dispose of the girls.[13] Among the Abandia, when a mother is approached with a request for one of her daughters, she refers the suitor to one of

[1] E. A. H. Blunt, in *Census of India*, 1911, "United Provinces of Agra and Oudh," vol. xv, p. 219.

[2] W. Crooke, *The Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh*, vol. i, pp. 3, 58 (Ahirs); vol. ii, pp. 7 (Bhars), 179 (Chamars); vol. iii, pp. 3 (I'ragis), 222 (Khairwas), 236 (Kharwars), 331 (Korwas); vol. iv, p. 65 (Byadha Nats).

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. iii, p. 421. Cf. E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, p. 57 (Madigas).

[4] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, vol. iv, p. 147. Cf. vol. ii, p. 79 (Kallans).

[5] Id., *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, p. 12. Cf. Campbell, in *Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency*, 1885, vol. xviii, Fart i, p. 545 (Raddis).

[6] Id., *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, vol. iv, p. 147.

[7] Id., *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, pp. 80 sq.

[8] Id., *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, vol. v, pp. 103 sq.

[9] Id., *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, p. 83.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 35.

[11] See above, pp. 499 sq.

[12] A. Mabille, "The Basutos of Basutoland," *Journal of the African Society*, v, pp. 244 sq.

[13] J. H. Weeks, *Among the Primitive Bakongo*, pp. 107, 142.

her brothers, giving him the name of the brother "for whom the girl was born"; it is he who receives the bride-price.[1] Among the Vere of northern Nigeria, the bride-price is likewise paid to the girl's uncle.[2] In New Britain, on the Gazelle Peninsula, the brother of the bride's mother receives most of the bride-price. "The latter takes precedence over the father, who has not the slightest authority over his children."[3] In northern Papua it is the mother's brother who disposes of her daughters in marriage.[4] On the Banks Islands it is not a man's uncle, but his aunt, that is, his father's sister, who arranges a marriage for him.[5]

Elsewhere it is the mothers of the respective families who arrange marriages, or have the chief say in the disposal of the daughters and sometimes of the sons also. Among the western Eskimo, mothers are said commonly to select a wife for their son.[6] Among the North American Indians "the first proceedings must be initiated by the matrons."[7] Thus, among the Chippeways, "the business of promoting unions rests principally with the female relations and originates with those either of the man or of the woman."[8] Among the Bushmen[9] and the Hottentots[10] the acceptance of a suitor rests with the mother of the girl. Among the

[1] A. Hutereau, *Notes sur la vie familiale et juridique de quelques populations du Congo Belge* (*Annales du Musée du Congo Belge*, Série iii, vol. i), p. 47. Cf. M. Delafosse, "Le peuple Siena ou Senoufo," *Revue des études ethnologiques et sociologiques*, i, p. 484; W. Munzinger, *Ostafrikanische Studien*, p. 528.

[2] O. Temple, *Tribes, Provinces, Emirates and States of the Northern Provinces of Nigeria*, p. 359.

[3] J. Pfeil, *Studien und Beobachtungen aus den Südsee*, p. 28. Cf. A. Hahl, "Über die Rechtsanschauungen der Eingeborenen eines Theiles der Blanchebucht und des Innern der Gazelle Halbinsel," *Nachrichten über Kaiser Wilhelms-Land und den Bismarck Archipel*, 1897, p. 78; R. Parkinson, *Dreissig Jahre in der Südsee*, p. 62; J. Meier, "Primitive Völker und 'Paradies'-Zustand," *Anthropos*, ii, p. 380.

[4] R. Neuhauss, *Deutsch Neu-Guinea*, vol. iii, p. 302.

[5] W. H. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society*, vol. i, p. 39.

[6] J. Simpson, *Observations on the Western Eskimo and the Country they Inhabit*, p. 252.

[7] F. X. de Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, vol. v, p. 421. Cf., *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses*, vol. i, p. 649; La Potherie, *Histoire de l'Amérique septentrionale*, vol. iii, p. 13; L. H. Morgan, *The League of the Iroquois*, pp. 320, 323; W. L. Hardisty, "The Loucheux Indians," *Smithsonian Reports*, 1866, p. 322; W. J. MacGee, "The Seri Indians," *Seventeenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 192; J. R. Swanton, "The Haida," *Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. v, p. 50.

[8] W. H. Keating, *Narrative of an Expedition to the Source of St. Peter's River*, vol. ii, p. 157.

[9] H. Kaufmann, "Die Auin, ein Beitrag zur Buschmannforschung," *Mitteilungen aus den deutschen Schutzgebiete*, xxiii, p. 156.

[10] C. Wandrer, "Die Khoi-Khoin oder Naman," in S. R. Steinmetz, *Rechtsverhältnisse von eingeborenen Völker in Afrika und Ozeanien*, p. 319.

southern Bantu in olden times every marriage ceremony was conducted by "the mother of the kraal."[1] Among the Baila of northern Rhodesia the selection of a wife for her son is often made by his mother.[2] Among the Yoruba of West Africa "it is generally the duty of the female members of the family to look out for a wife for their male relatives."[3] The disposal of the daughters depends likewise upon their mother in several other parts of Africa.[4] In southern India, among the Paraiyan, it is the mother who performs the wedding ceremony.[5] Among the Dayaks of British North Borneo the mother chooses a bride for her son without consulting him.[6] In the Mortlock and in the Ladrones Islands the marriage of a daughter is the concern of her mother;[7] and in the latter islands the mothers also select their sons' wives.[8] In New Guinea, among the Bagadjin, the mother is recognised as having the disposal of her daughter,[9] and even in Australia, subject to compliance with the formal rules administered by the tribal elders, or when the officially allotted husband dies, the mother is sometimes regarded as disposing of her daughter.[10] In New Britain a man's wife is sometimes selected and paid for by his mother.[11] In the Loyalty Islands the mother also selects the wife of her son. If, in spite of her recognised right to do so, a youth should marry a girl of his own choice of whom his mother does not entirely approve, "the girl is sent back to her own people in spite of the protestations of the young man." "I have heard," says Mrs. Hadfield, "that sometimes the young man has been standing in the road, with tears streaming down his face, gazing after the object of his affection, who was sadly leaving him for good. In such cases the mother rarely relented. She knew what was best for her son."[12]

[1] D. Kidd, *The Essential Kafir*, p. 225.

[2] E. W. Smith and A. H. Dale, *The Ila-Speaking Peoples of Northern Rhodesia*, vol. ii, p. 48.

[3] S. and O. Johnson, *The History of the Yoruba*, p. 113.

[4] H. H. Johnston, *George Grenfell and the Congo*, vol. ii, p. 683; J. H. Weeks, *Among the Primitive Bakongo*, p. 143; K. Weule, *Native Life in East Africa*, p. 307; O. Temple, *Notes on the Tribes, etc., of the Northern Provinces of Nigeria*, pp. 14, 90.

[5] E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, p. 96.

[6] O. Rutter, *British North Borneo*, p. 305.

[7] J. Kubary, "Die Bewohner der Mortlock-Inseln," *Mittheilungen der geographischen Gesellschaft in Hamburg*, 1878–79, p. 260; C. E. Meinicke *Die Inseln des Stillen Oceans*, vol. ii, p. 407.

[8] L. de Freycinet, *Voyage autour du monde*, vol. ii, Part i, p. 385.

[9] B. Hagen, *Unter den Papua's*, p. 241.

[10] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-Eastern Australia*, pp. 117, 198, 217, 222; E. S. Parker, *The Aborigines of Australia*, p. 22.

[11] B. Danks, "Marriage Customs of the New Britain Group," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xviii, p. 288.

[12] E. Hadfield, *Among the Natives of the Loyalty Group*, pp. 183, 187 sq.

No Violence offered to Personal Inclinations.

Those usages obtaining in all primitive and barbaric societies, whereby marriages are pre-determined or contracted by parents or other authorities on behalf of the parties whom we regard as chiefly concerned in those arrangements, have been generally viewed in relation to the latter's freedom of choice and right of consent, which we account the essential equitable condition of association. While many writers refer to those facts as illustrating the habitual disregard of such choice in primitive societies, and the tyrannous compulsion exercised by parents towards their children, or by social groups towards their members, others have been at pains to minimise the testimony of facts, and to show that consideration is in many instances shown for the wishes and inclinations of the partners. Both those opposed points of view rest, it would seem, upon a misconception, and on the usual fallacy of attributing to primitive humanity sentiments that are the product of cultural and social development. The sexual selection represented by those sentiments is, in primitive societies, very rudimentary. The factors and considerations which determine such personal choice as does operate are, moreover, identical in character with those which determine the selection of partners by relatives, parents or other authorities. There is thus, in general, no ground of conflict between the choice made by those authorities and any individual preferences or desires. It is in fact repeatedly noted that objections on the part of individuals for whom marriages are contracted do not arise. Thus, among the North American Indians, the parents "propose the matter to the girl who generally decides agreeably to the wish of her parents and relations." [1] Among the Charrua Indians, "the women," says Azara, "never refuse to conform, and always marry the first man who presents himself, be he never so old or ugly." [2] Among the Yoruba of West Africa, "no girl will marry without the consent of her parents, and it is rare for a girl to refuse the choice of her parents." [3] In British Central Africa, among the Yao, it is rare for children betrothed in infancy to repudiate the match.[4] The same is stated in regard to the Chukchi.[5] Among the Yurak, as indeed among all Siberian peoples, the attitude of the parties concerned in those marriages which have been pre-arranged for them from childhood is one of entire

[1] G. H. Loskiel, *History of the Mission of the United Brethren among the Indians in North America*, p. 57. Cf. *Narrative of John Tanner*, vol. i, p. 234.
[2] F. de Azara, *Voyages dans l'Amérique Méridionale*, vol. ii, p. 22.
[3] S. and O. Johnson, *The History of the Yoruba*, p. 113.
[4] H. H. Johnston, *British Central Africa*, p. 413.
[5] W. Bogoras, *The Chukchee*, p. 577.

acquiescence.[1] Among the Kirghis "girls are always submissive to the will of their parents."[2] In Afghanistan, where it is a strict rule that a young man and a girl can on no account even see one another before the marriage is concluded, when the girl is informed that she is to be married to a certain young man, her usual reply is "Mobarik bashad," "May that be happy."[3] Among the Bataks of Sumatra, girls readily refuse suitors possessing every attraction in order to marry the young man to whom they are assigned by custom. If questioned on the subject a girl replies, "It is the custom, what else is one to do?"[4] Among the Kisans of Bengal "there is no instance on record of a youth and maiden objecting to the arrangements made for them."[5] Or again among the savages of New Caledonia, where a boy's marriage is usually arranged for him by his family without consulting him, "there is no instance of any boy refusing to conform to the arrangement."[6]

The selection of a wife by the father, mother, or tribal brothers of a young man is, indeed, often undertaken by them at his request. It is a wife that he wants, not a particular young woman as his wife. Thus among the Basutos, when a young man wishes to marry, all he does is to drive the cows out of the kraal, and let the calves be suckled by their mothers. The conventional sign is understood, and the young man's parents at once set about procuring a wife for him.[7] Among the Indians of Guatemala, the father's services in selecting a suitable wife are as often as not undertaken at the young man's request.[8] Among the Niam-Niam, when a man resolves on matrimony, the ordinary proceeding is for him to apply to the reigning prince, or to some sub-chieftain, who at once endeavours to procure for him such a wife as may appear suitable.[9] In New Britain a young man expresses to his friends a desire to marry, without having any particular young woman in view; the friends and relatives do their best to supply him with a wife in accordance with their own

[1] M. A. Czaplicka, *My Siberian Year*, p. 103.

[2] A. de Levchine, *Description des hordes et des steppes des Kirghiz-Kazaks*, p. 358.

[3] X. Raymond, *Afghanistan*, pp. 39 sq.

[4] J. B. Neumann, "Het Pane- en Bila stroomgebied op het eiland Sumatra," *Tijdschrift van het Nederlands Aardrijkskundig Genootschap*, 2de Serie, iii, p. 243.

[5] T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal*, p. 132.

[6] Glaumont, *Usages, manières et coutumes des Néo-Calédoniens*, p. 76.

[7] A. Mabille, "The Basutos of Basutoland," *Journal of the African Society*, v, p. 244.

[8] O. Stoll, "Die Ethnologie der Indianerstämme von Guatemala," *Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, Supplement to vol. i, p. 8.

[9] G. Schweinfurth, *The Heart of Africa*, vol. ii, pp. 27 sq.

judgment.[1] Among the Déné, "when a young man attains a certain age and considers himself able to provide for a wife, if the term may be so debased, he acquaints his parents with his wishes and gives himself no further concern about the matter until they have concluded the matrimonial negotiations with the parents of their, not his, intended, whose sentiments are never consulted."[2] Indeed, the 'interested parties,' appear to regard it as essential that their marriage should be arranged for them by someone else. A Catholic missionary among the Déné relates the extraordinary manner in which his converts among the Indians called upon him for his services in the matter. He was frequently consulted by young people as to a proposed match, and at first endeavoured to give them the best advice in his power, discussing with them the 'pros' and 'cons' of the alliance. He soon discovered, however, that this did not meet with the wishes of his parishioners; what they required was not advice, but a peremptory order to marry. Often, too, he would be told by people whose marriage had turned out unhappy that they were perfectly aware when they married that they could not agree, but that they were told to marry, and had, therefore, no option but to do so. "The absurdity of their obedience in this matter," remarks the Reverend Father, "is utterly incomprehensible."[3]

What is shown by the ethnological evidence is not that violence is offered to the choice and preferences of young men and women, but that there is little in the way of such preferences and personal choice. The action of the community or of its representatives constitutes no disregard of the desires of its members, because the will of the group and that of the individual are originally identical. It must be fairly obvious that such universal practices as the allotting of sexual partners by the group authorities could not have arisen, or have been maintained, in equalitarian primitive societies, had there been any real antagonism between such action and the individual desires of each member. The parents or other relatives who arrange a marriage for their children have no notion that they are infringing any rights or doing violence to personal inclinations. "The parents never seem to doubt," observes the Rev. Duff Macdonald, speaking of the natives of British Central Africa, "that they know the minds of their sons and daughters better than they can do themselves."[4] There is no difficulty in

[1] B. Danks, "Marriage Customs of the New Britain Group," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xviii, p. 289.

[2] J. Maclean, *Notes of a Twenty-five Years' Service in the Hudson's Bay Territory*, vol. ii, p. 127.

[3] J. Jetté, "L'organisation sociale des Tan'a," *Quinzième Session du Congrès international des Américanistes, Québec*, 1906, pp. 387 sq.

[4] D. Macdonald, *Africana*, vol. i, p. 119.

showing that in those contracts concluded between groups or families the wishes of individuals are very seldom set aside. In West Africa, for example,—and the remark is of general application—should a girl refuse to fulfil the contract " the tendency is not to bring compulsion to bear on the woman, but to enforce restitution of the dowry paid to the girl's father." [1] Speaking of the Hidatsa Indians, Mr. Matthews says: " Parents sometimes by persuasion, but rarely by any harsh coercion, endeavour to influence a daughter in the reception or rejection of an offer. I have known many cases where large marriage presents have been refused from one party and gifts of much less value accepted from another, simply because the girl showed a preference for the poorer lover." [2] " There is never any compulsion," says another writer, in reference to the North American Indians generally.[3] Among the Seri Indians, notwithstanding the elaborate part taken by the matrons of the two clans in deciding upon a marriage, the objection of the woman is respected.[4]

The deference paid to the personal objections of the young man, and more especially of the young woman, is indeed much more marked in primitive society than in most civilised communities where pre-arrangement of marriages is the rule. In a considerable number of instances the woman has the chief say in the choice of a husband, and as will be shown in another place, there are strong grounds for thinking that in the most primitive forms of human society the initiative and choice was generally exercised by the woman and not by the man.[5] No existing society, be it remembered, is truly primitive, and with the development of discrimination in tastes and sentiments, these may come into conflict with the decisions of the group. The individualistic interests aroused by the profitable disposal of marriageable daughters may, on the other hand, lead to the use of coercion. An antagonism and incompatibility which did not originally exist between the wishes of the individual and the authority of the group thus inevitably tends to become developed. The young man in New Britain may violently protest: " What have I done that I should be compelled to marry? " The young woman may object to the aged husband to whom she has been allotted, and " her friends consider themselves disgraced by her conduct. She ought,

[1] W. McGregor, " Lagos, Abeokuta, and the Alake," *Journal of the African Society*, iii, p. 474.

[2] W. Matthews, *The Hidatsa*, p. 52.

[3] G. H. Loskiel, *History of the Mission of the United Brethren*, vol. i, p. 56.

[4] W. J. McGee, " The Seri Indians," *Seventeenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 280.

[5] See below, vol. ii., pp. 166 sqq.

according to their notions, to fall in with their arrangements with thankfulness of heart. They drag her along, beat her, kick and abuse her; and it has been my misfortune," says Mr. Danks, "to see girls dragged past my house, struggling in vain to escape their fate," [1] The decision of the relatives or group may be evaded by elopement. When this happens, however, it is generally not because the girl's affections are set elsewhere, but because she is allotted to an old and objectionable man. Those conflicts between the wishes of the individual and the decisions of the group are manifestly exceptions to the general rule, for were it not so, the universal practice could not have been maintained. Such conflict and such objections correspond to a stage of development which is in advance of the primitive conditions amid which the social usages which they antagonise originally arose. Those objections are, we are told, a sign of the decay of old customs.[2] The traditional negotiation of marriages by the group and not by the individuals that marry originated in, and corresponds to, a state of society in which there is no source of conflict between the individual and the tribal will.

Marriages contracted and celebrated by all the Members of two Groups.

The authority of the group in reference to the determination of marriage unions is indeed supreme and absolute in character, and parental authority in such matters, 'patria potestas,' derives from that original authority of the group rather than from parental tyranny. Infringement of the group's decisions in such matters is usually regarded in primitive communities as the most heinous crime of which a person can be guilty. Any wretch so abandoned as to marry in defiance of that authority, is usually put to death. But that control of marriage by the group has reference, in its original form, not to unions between individuals, but between groups of individuals. A person, male or female, is bound to marry within a certain group, but within that group freedom of choice is, as a rule, not interfered with. For primitive legislation takes little account of individual and private affairs; it concerns itself almost exclusively with matters which affect the whole group, or in which the group is regarded as a unit. Thus it is that stringent determinism as regards marriage may be combined with the greatest

[1] B. Danks, "Marriage Customs of the New Britain Group," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xviii, pp. 287, 290.

[2] W. H. Keating, *Narrative of an Expedition to the Sources of St. Peter's River*, vol. i, p. 110. Cf. vol. ii, p. 154.

regard for personal wishes and inclinations. For example, among the Arawaks a man is bound to marry, and is in fact from birth allotted to, a certain group of females. To marry outside that group would be an inconceivably impious breach of tribal law. Within that group, however, he is free to choose as he pleases.[1] Countless primitive peoples are, we shall see, in the same situation. A woman may be free to choose from a group of suitors, but the group itself is subject to the choice and approval of the community. Thus among the Gonds and the Bygas, if a brother and a sister have respectively a son and a daughter, it is compulsory for these to marry; but if a girl has several cousins she has the recognised right to choose one of them, and formally signifies her choice either by anointing his head with turmeric or by touching his feet, or else by going to his house and sitting down there.[2] The 'swayamvara,' and all similar exercises of personal choice by a marriageable girl, are never anything more than a selection from a determined group of suitors. The size and constitution of the group within the limits of which such personal choice may be exercised varies greatly; originally the group of allotted partners is a clan, or a certain portion of a clan. When clan-organisation becomes broken up, the group of approved partners may be immensely enlarged, or it may become restricted to the size of a family-group. It is by an extension of the principle that the group or its representatives have the time-honoured right to choose the group of marriageable persons from which a person shall select his or her spouse, that the right comes to have reference to individual partners, and to be exercised by the head of the smaller, or family-group. The 'patria potestas' of the head of the patriarchal family is but a modified survival of the supreme authority of the primitive group in determining the marriages of its members.

In all those transactions in which the father, the maternal uncle, or the mother disposes of the young man or of the girl in marriage, they do so in their capacity of heads or representatives of the family. That deputed authority does, it is true, naturally tend, especially in patriarchal society, to develop into a personal despotism, a claim to do what they please with *their* sons or daughters; but that claim is a later usurpation and abuse. Originally and in principle the head of the family, whether mother, mother's brother, or father, is but the executor and spokesman of the group which enters into the transaction. Scarcely ever is

[1] W. Curtis Farabee, *The Central Arawaks* (*University of Pennsylvania Anthropological Publications*, vol. ix), p. 94.

[2] "The Gonds and Bygas of the Eastern Sathpuras" *The Cornhill Magazine*, xxvi (1872), pp. 604 sqq.

the will of the head of the group exercised without consultation with all the members, the marriageable son or daughter included. The matrons, uncles, elders have in the matter only the precedence and greater influence and authority which pertain to seniority. Even where patriarchal principles, tending towards an autocratic despotism similar to the Roman 'potestas,' are established, the father generally acts in the matter as the representative of the group. Thus, when the Malaiali father sets out to find a bride for his son, he is accompanied by a number of his relatives, and the person whom he first approaches is neither the intended bride nor her parents, but the headman of a neighbouring village. Ceremonial courtesies are exchanged between the two parties, and the object of the deputation is explained; the headman then directs the visitors to the house where a suitable young woman may, in his opinion, be found, and the father declares his willingness to abide, as regards the result of the negotiations, by the voice of a quorum of four men from the bride's village.[1] In the formal and dignified negotiations which are carried out as a preliminary to a marriage among the Yukaghir, between the 'go-between' and the bride's father, the latter states before giving his consent that he will refer the matter to his relatives and find out what they think of it.[2] The same thing takes place in the formal negotiations for a marriage in Tibet.[3] The transaction is one which concerns every member of the group, and in which they are all entitled to a voice.

A Kadir young man, when he wishes to marry, leaves his native village and goes to live and work in some other village for a year, during which time he generally has an opportunity of selecting a bride to his taste. But before he can marry her or even enter into any negotiation with a view to do so, he must return to his native village, inform all the villagers of his intention and obtain their sanction to the proposed match.[4] Among the Eastern Mongols it is not considered proper for the respective families of the bride and bridegroom to negotiate or conclude the marriage transaction in the privacy of their homes; the relatives meet for the purpose in the public market, and the long negotiations which take place on such occasions are adjourned from one market day to another.[5] Among the Kirghis, the negotiations for the marriage of any desirable girl are conducted by all the chief men of the suitor's tribe; the bride and bridegroom do not generally

[1] E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, p. 32.
[2] W. Jochelson, *The Yukaghir and the Yukaghirised Tungus*, p. 89.
[3] Sarat Chandra Das, *Journey to Lhasa and Central Tibet*, p. 247.
[4] E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, p. 33.
[5] E. C. Baber, *Travels and Researches in the Interior of China* (*Supplementary Papers of the Royal Geographical Society*, vol. i), p. 10.

see each other until the contract is concluded.[1] In Tonkin, in the Long-Tshu region, the relatives of both sides assemble in conference, and the consent of each must be obtained before a marriage is contracted.[2] Among the Atjehs of Sumatra, "a marriage does not concern the families, it is a business which concerns the whole 'kampong.'"[3] In Timor Laut "nothing can be done of such importance as the disposal of a daughter without the advice, assistance and witness of all the villagers; women and youths being admitted as freely to speak as elder males."[4] In Buru, marriage "is a transaction between two clans."[5] "In Samoa," says Pritchard, "a man never personally woos his lady-love. The heads of families, who as such are the chief councillors, met in solemn conclave and selected a bride of suitable rank. The ultimate acceptance or rejection of the suit was with the 'tulapale' of the tribe to which the girl belonged, and the decision was supposed to be final."[6] In New Zealand, when a young man married a girl of a different tribe, the permission of both tribes was required; neglect of that rule led to war.[7] "If there had been no betrothal in childhood, a marriage was a very difficult thing to effect and one which took some time, as everyone of both tribes had something to say and must be satisfied ere it could take place."[8] In the Chatham Islands, among the Moriori, whose sexual relations are extremely loose, a marriage could not be concluded unless every relative of both parties, however remote, was present at the celebration. If some relative dwelling at a distance had by chance been overlooked in sending out the invitations to the wedding, and if he had not partaken of the wedding meal, he had a recognised right to dissolve the marriage, and could order the woman to return home.[9] Among the Dieri and adjacent tribes of central Australia, marriages, says Mr. Howitt, are treated as state affairs. A marriage "would be the subject of negotiations for several months. Much diplomacy is used, as one tribe desires if possible to sift the real reasons which induce the other tribe to

[1] E. and P. Sykes, *Through Deserts and Oases in Central Asia*, p. 119 sq.; A. C. Borheck, *Erdbeschreibung von Asien*, vol. i, p. 89.

[2] J. Beauvais, "Notes sur les coutumes indigènes de la région de Long-Tcheou," *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, vii, p. 270.

[3] C. Snouck Hurgronje, *De Atjéhers*, vol. i, p. 324; H. T. Damte, in J. C. van Eerde, *De volke van Nederlandsch Indië*, vol. i, p. 62.

[4] H. O. Forbes, "On the Ethnology of Timor-Laut," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xiii, p. 11.

[5] G. A. Wilken, *De verspreide geschriften*, vol. i, p. 45.

[6] W. T. Pritchard. *Polynesian Reminiscences*, p. 135.

[7] A. Thomson, *The Story of New Zealand*, vol. i, p. 176.

[8] W. Colenso, *On the Maori Races of New Zealand*, p. 25.

[9] A. Shand, "The Moriori of Chatham Island," *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, vi, p. 148.

desire the marriage. As a preliminary, handsome presents, such as spears, boomerangs, carved shields, bags of all kinds, etc., are sent to the woman's father, to the head of the tribe, and to the other principal men. In the event of these negotiations falling through, these presents are returned. . . . The young man and the young woman have no voice in such a marriage, and whether she likes it or not, she must submit to the will of the elders of the tribe."[1] Similarly, in Western Australia, the consent of the whole tribe is necessary to the conclusion of a marriage.[2] So likewise in the Gilbert Islands all the males of the clans must signify their assent before a marriage can take place;[3] and the same thing is required among the natives of San Cristoval, in the Solomon Islands.[4]

Among the Hurons "proposals made to the girl's mother were submitted by her to the women's council, whose decision was final."[5] Among the Pawnees, a marriage was discussed in a solemn assembly by all the relatives of both parties; those living at a distance and unable to attend sent word to excuse themselves and to signify their sanction to the proposed match.[6] Among the Seri Indians the first step in arranging a marriage is that the matter should be discussed by the suitor's clan. "The proposal is formally conveyed by the elderwomen of the suitor's family to the mother's clan-mother, when it is duly pondered, first by the dame and her daughter-matrons, and later, if the proposal is entertained, it is deliberated and discussed at length by the matrons of the two clans involved, who commonly hold repeated councils for the purpose."[7] Among the Natchez and other tribes of the lower Mississippi valley, "it is neither the fathers nor the parents, still less the mothers or the relations, who concern themselves in this matter. It is only the chiefs of the two families, who are usually great-grandfathers and sometimes more. These two old men have an interview in which, after the demand for the girl has been made on behalf of the boy, they examine whether there is any relationship between the two parties who wish to

[1] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 185.

[2] A. Oldfield, "On the Aborigines of Australia," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society*, N.S., iii, p. 248.

[3] A. Grimble, "From Birth to Death in the Gilbert Islands," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlix, p. 104.

[4] C. E. Fox, "Social Organisation in San Cristoval," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, li, p. 104.

[5] F. W. Hodge, *Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico*, vol. i, p. 809.

[6] G. B. Grinell, "Marriage among the Pawnees," *The American Anthropologist*, iv, p. 278.

[7] W. J. McGee, "The Seri Indians," *Seventeenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, pp. 279 sq.

marry, and in what degree, for within the third degree inclusive they never marry. This interview of the old men assumes that the alliance suits them, and that it has been already agreed to by the fathers, grandfathers and others as far up as the family chiefs, for if any one of them disapproves it is never concluded."[1] In Guatemala and San Salvador, when the betrothed are of different tribes, the chiefs are notified and meet in conclave to consult about the expediency of the alliance. The consultations often extend over a period of several months, during which the parents of the bridegroom make presents to the family of the girl. If the council disagrees, the presents are returned and the matter is dropped.[2]

The presents which it is customary to exchange on the occasion of a marriage, or the bride-price which is paid for the bride, are in many of the most primitive forms of the transaction furnished by all the relatives of the one group, and distributed among the various members of the other group. Among the North American Indians such presents are collected from the husband's kindred, and are equally distributed among the members of the wife's family.[3] Among the Araucanians all the relatives share the bride-price.[4] Among the Patagonians the presents which are given by the bridegroom are contributed by all his relatives, and they are distributed amongst all the relatives of the bride.[5] The same thing is noted of the Aleuts.[6] Among the Yakut there are two distinct bride-prices, one payable to the parents of the bride and another to the whole of her clan;[7] the bride-price is similarly shared among all the relatives of the bride

[1] Le Page du Pratz, *Histoire de la Louisiane*, vol. ii, p. 387.

[2] H. H. Bancroft, *The Native Races of the Pacific States of North America*, vol. i, pp. 702 sq.

[3] J. O. Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," *Third Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 261; G. H. Loskiel, *History of the Mission of the United Brethren among the Indians of North America*, vol. i, p. 57; F. La Flesche, "Osage Marriage Customs," *The American Anthropologist*, N.S., xiv, p. 128; L. M. Turner, "Ethnology of the Ungava District, Hudson Bay," *Eleventh Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 270; S. Powers, *Tribes of California*, p. 270; J. A. Teit, "The Thompson Indians of British Columbia," *Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. i, p. 322; Id., "The Lilloet Indians," *ibid.*, vol. ii, pp. 267 sq.; F. Boas, "Second General Report on the Indians of British Columbia," in *Report of the Sixtieth Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science* (Leeds, 1890), p. 643.

[4] R. E. Latcham, "Ethnology of the Araucanos," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxxix, p. 359; E. Pöppig, *Reise in Chili, Peru und auf dem Amazonenstrome*, vol. i, pp. 383 sq.

[5] A. Guinnard, *Trois ans d'esclavage chez les Patagons*, pp. 123, 125.

[6] H. H. Bancroft, *The Native Races of the Pacific States of North America*, vol. i, p. 92.

[7] M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, p. 108.

among the Samoyeds,[1] the Gilyak,[2] the Yukaghir.[3] Among the Ossetes it is an established custom that the bridegroom shall make a present of money to every member of the bride's village.[4] Among the Teleuts all the 'friends,' that is, the tribal brothers of the bridegroom, contribute towards the 'kalym' paid for the bride.[5] Among the Lushai of Upper Burma the payment must be made, not only to the nearest male relatives, but also to the bride's sisters, aunts, and maternal uncles.[6] In Melanesia a wife "is obtained for one member of a man's family by the contributions of the whole,"[7] and the goods are similarly distributed among the members of the wife's clan.[8] In Samoa, the immediate relatives of the bridegroom "had to go on begging expeditions to all who were connected with them and collect from them large quantities of property," and the family of the bride did the same, in order that the property should be exchanged between the members of the two clans.[9] In Africa, among the Basutos, the members of a man's family are informed of his proposed marriage, and each contributes a head of cattle towards the price paid for the bride. The animals are distributed among all the members of the latter's family. The contributions are made ungrudgingly because the daughters of the family, when they in turn get married, will likewise bring in cattle to all members.[10] Similar procedures are widespread in every part of Africa.[11] Among the tribes of the French Sudan the bride-

[1] M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, p. 124; P. S. Pallas, *Merkwürdigkeiten der obischen Ostjaken, Samojeden*, etc., p. 66.

[2] M. A. Czaplicka, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

[3] W. Jochelson, *The Yukaghir and the Yukaghirised Tungus*, p. 95.

[4] M. Kovalewski, *Coutume contemporaine et loi ancienne. Droit coutumier ossétien*, p. 175.

[5] M. A. Czaplicka, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

[6] J. Shakespear, "The Kuki-Lushai Clans," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxxix, p. 359.

[7] R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians*, p. 244.

[8] R. Thurnwald, "Ermittlungen über Eingeborenrechte der Südsee," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*, xxiii, p. 377. Cf. Id., *Forschungen auf den Salomo-Inseln und dem Bismarck-Archipel*, iii, pp. 13, 18; R. Parkinson, *Im Bismarck-Archipel*, p. 98; Mg. Douceré, 'Notes sur les populations indigènes des Nouvelles Hébrides," *Revue d'Ethnographie et des Traditions Populaires*, iii, p. 233.

[9] G. Brown, *Melanesians and Polynesians*, pp. 120 sqq.

[10] A. Mabille, "The Basutos of Basutoland," *Journal of the African Society*, v, p. 244; T. Wangemann, *Die Berliner Mission in Bassuto-Lande*, p. 41.

[11] *The Natives of South Africa, their Economic and Social Condition*, edited by the South African Native Races Commission, p. 30; E. W. Smith and A. M. Dale, *The Ila-speaking Peoples of Northern Rhodesia*, vol. ii, p. 50; J. Halkin and E. Viaene, *Les Ababua*, p. 275; J. Roscoe, *The Bakitara or Banyoro*, p. 268; G. Bruel, *L'Afrique équatoriale française*, p. 187; R. W. Felkin, "Notes of the Madi, or Moru Tribe of Central Africa," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, xii, p. 320; W. Munzinger, *Ostafrikanische*

price required to obtain a wife for any member of the clan is paid by the chief out of his own pocket, so to speak; the expenses thus incurred are compensated for by the profits which he makes on the marriage of any of the girls, for the bride-price is also payable to him alone. Marriage transactions are thus conducted by him as representative of the community.[1] Among the Alfurs of Buru a man's wife is paid for by the whole of his clan collectively, and the payment is distributed among all the members of the wife's clan.[2] The whole clan likewise contributes to the payment among the natives of Central Ceram,[3] and the Toradjas of Central Celebes.[4] In British New Guinea a large number of presents are offered by the relatives of the bridegroom to the clan of the bride; every member of the former group contributes his share, and the presents are, when the agreement is concluded, distributed among all the members of the bride's clan.[5] A like distribution takes place among the natives of northern Papua [6] and of Dutch New Guinea.[7]

Marriages are commonly celebrated by all the members of the two families; sometimes the 'parties concerned' are absent from the ceremony. Thus the bride and bridegroom do not appear at the wedding celebration among the Kirghis,[8] the Yurak [9] or the Buryat.[10] Among the Pathans the one person who is conspicuous by his absence in the wedding procession is the bridegroom.[11] Among the Lambadis of Mysore the bridegroom is not present at the wedding; indeed, the whole ceremony is performed between the females of the respective families, no male, except the officiating Brahman priest, being permitted to attend.[12] Among the Ja-Luo of the Upper Nile the bride is brought home and entertained by the bridegroom's brother, and a feast is held; but throughout the

Studien, p. 487; J. Barton, "Notes on the Suk Tribe of the Kenia Colony," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xli, p. 96.

[1] L. Tauxier, *Le Noir du Soudan*, pp. 137, 217, 253, 255, 366.

[2] G. A. Wilken, *De verspreide geschriften*, vol. i, pp. 45 sq.; K. Martin, *Reisen in den Molukken, in Ambon, den Uliassern Seran (Ceram) und Buru*, p. 289.

[3] O. D. Tauern, "Ceram," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xlv, p. 172.

[4] N. Adriani and A. C. Kruijt, *De Bare'e-sprekende Toradja's van Midden-Celebes*, vol. ii, p. 25.

[5] C. G. Seligman, *The Melanesians of British New Guinea*, pp. 76, 77, 267, 270, 363, 504, 710.

[6] B. Hagen, *Unter den Papua's*, p. 224.

[7] M. Moszkowski, "Die Völkerstämme am Mamberano in Holländsch-Neuguinea und auf den vorgelagerten Inseln," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xliii, p. 322.

[8] E. and P. Sykes, *Through Deserts and Oases in Central Asia*, pp. 119 sq.

[9] M. A. Czaplicka, *My Siberian Year*, p. 113.

[10] P. Labbé, *Chez les Lamas de Sibérie*, p. 52.

[11] D. Bray, in *Census of India*, 1911, vol. iv, "Baluchistan," p. 111.

[12] E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, p. 58.

proceedings the bridegroom himself does not appear.[1] Among the Massims of New Guinea the wedding is elaborately celebrated by both clans; but the bride and bridegroom are not present.[2]

The wedding banquet, in which all members of the bride's and bridegroom's families join, might at first sight appear to be an institution which calls for no explanation beyond the very natural one that it serves as an occasion for conviviality and a festive meal. But a closer examination leads one to suspect that this is not the whole explanation of its origin and significance. The eating of food together by the bride and bridegroom is among many peoples the essence of the marriage ceremony, and in many instances the only occasion in which they partake of a meal together.[3] It seems probable that in taking part in that rite the two families are in principle joined together in matrimony. That conjecture is strengthened by the forms which the banquet sometimes assumes. Among the Yakut the bride and bridegroom do not take part in the wedding banquet, but sit in a corner behind the door with their faces towards the wall, while their relatives partake of the wedding meal. "In front of each guest, on a horsehide which serves as table-cloth, is placed a large piece of boiled meat with the bones attached. The relatives of the young couple exchange these pieces of meat, and this performance is the principal part of the Yakut marriage ceremony, symbolising the union between the families, which henceforth are to forget all enmity, and for the future be 'flesh of one flesh and bone of one bone.'"[4] Among the Yao and other tribes of British Central Africa, the wedding feast, consisting of native porridge and a fowl, is cooked by the parents of the bride. "Unless this porridge and fowl are eaten by the parents of both parties to the marriage, it is neither legal nor binding, hence this meal may be regarded as their marriage ceremony."[5] In Duke of York's Island at one of the wedding banquets—for there are several on the occasion of a marriage—each man on one side exchanges food with another man on the other. In another part of the celebrations some food prepared by the tribal sisters of the bride is ceremoniously eaten by all the tribal sisters of the bridegroom, but it must on no account be partaken of by any woman who is not a tribal sister of his, that is, by any of the women whom he might have married.[6] With the Rajbansis of Purnea, in Bengal,

[1] H. H. Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate*, p. 790.

[2] C. Seligman, *The Melanesians of British New Guinea*, p. 505.

[3] Many illustrations of the rite are given by Mr. E. S. Hartland, *The Legend of Perseus*, vol. ii, pp. 343 sqq.

[4] J. Stadling, *Through Siberia*, p. 95.

[5] A. Werner, *The Natives of British Central Africa*, p. 131.

[6] G. Brown, *Melanesians and Polynesians*, pp. 115 sq.

unless and until a banquet has been partaken of by the clan-brothers of the pair a marriage is null and void. A man who is too poor to afford such a meal may marry a woman with elaborate religious ceremonies, but until he has saved up enough money to provide a wedding meal, he is regarded as living in a state of concubinage.[1] Among the Chuhra of the Panjab it is essential that all the women of the bride's family should partake of the mixture of rice and sugar served by the family of the bridegroom. This is called 'bharmdáta,' that is, 'union of the families.' "If they do not have this meal they do not admit the other party to family privileges."[2] The wedding-cake is, of course, an essential constituent of such banquets. In India it is called 'meher,' and is eaten with sacramental solemnity. Among the Kolarian tribes, portions of the cake are presented to the totems of the respective parties. Thus certain clans who have trees for their totems go to the sacred trees before the wedding and offer them some wedding-cake; others, who belong to the cobra clan, deposit pieces of wedding-cake in the holes where those reptiles are known to dwell; others again, who have lions or tigers for their totems, have at the wedding images of those animals made of dough, and invite them to partake of the feast. Certain Basors, who, like the dancing dervishes, express their religious emotion by violent exercise, partake of the wedding-cake while performing somersaults. The remains of the sacred food are ceremoniously buried. It is, of course, obligatory on all the guests, that is, on the families of the bride and bridegroom respectively, to partake of the wedding-cake. But among the Kols it would be highly improper for any persons who are forbidden by law to intermarry to be included in the respective parties of bride and bridegroom; for, if such persons partook of wedding-cake together they would be in fact married, and would thus be guilty of incest.[3] Among the Kurubas, a tribe of Southern India, the wedding banquet consists in laying before the guests a large metal tray filled with a mixture of rice, curds, sugar and other ingredients. Round this tray the relatives of bride and bridegroom sit, and they must gulp down the food as quickly as possible without wasting a moment. Should any of them choke during the proceedings or afterwards be seized with flatulence or indigestion, this is regarded as a grave omen, betokening the greatest misfortunes.[4] Similarly, among the

[1] L. S. S. O'Malley, in *Census of India*, 1911, vol. v, p. 315.

[2] H. A. Rose, *A Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Punjab and North-West Frontier Province*, vol. ii, p. 196.

[3] R. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, vol. i, p. 149; vol. ii, pp. 445 sq.; vol. iv, pp. 62 sq.

[4] E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, p. 76.

Yurak, a Samoyed tribe of Siberia, the wedding guests, that is, the relatives of the bride and bridegroom, accompany them to their new home, where the carcase of an animal has been prepared for their entertainment. But they are under the obligation to eat the meat with the greatest possible expedition, and to depart immediately the last mouthful has been swallowed.[1] It would seem, then, that in those instances the wedding banquet has not quite the character of the convivial gathering which we are prone to assume to be its essential nature. Those hurried wedding meals, in fact, resemble other ritual meals we know, which are means of effecting a communion of flesh between the participants; and it would thus seem that they are intended to unite in one bond not only the bride and the bridegroom, but also their respective families.

Another common form of marriage rite is the marking of the bride and bridegroom with blood, the contract of marriage being assimilated to the blood-bond by which a person becomes adopted into the tribe. In some instances not only are the bride and bridegroom thus united by a blood-bond, but all their relatives also. Thus in Cambodia the priest when performing a wedding ceremony marks the forehead of all the relatives with the sign of blood.[2] Among the Papuan savages of the western coast of New Guinea the essential marriage rite consists in the bride and bridegroom making a scratch on one another's foreheads. But the blood rite is not performed by the bride and bridegroom only; all their relatives draw blood in like manner from one another's foreheads.[3] In some parts of Polynesia it is not the 'parties concerned' who mingle their blood, but their respective mothers; it is the mothers of the bride and bridegroom, and not they themselves who are formally married.[4] Similarly, among the Mundar, the mothers and aunts of the bride and bridegroom sprinkle one another with holy water by means of a mango leaf, and wash one another's feet, after which they embrace.[5]

Reasons for instituting a Marriage Agreement between two Groups.

Marriage, then, is almost universally regarded as an agreement or contract, not between a man and a woman, but between the groups, whatever their constitution, to which those individuals respectively belong. No feature of that social institution is more

[1] M. A. Czaplicka, *My Siberian Year*, p. 115.
[2] A de Rémusat, *Nouveaux Mélanges Asiatiques*, vol. i, p. 116.
[3] C. Meyners d'Estrey, *La Papouaisie, ou Nouvelle Guinée occidentale*, p. 94.
[4] W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, vol. i, p. 272.
[5] L. S. S. O'Malley, in *Census of India*, 1911, vol. v, p. 328.

marked and more general; it is even more pronounced in the most primitive than in the most advanced phases of social development. It is not, therefore, a feature of the institution which has developed with the progress of social organisation, or one which is the effect of adventitious or local conditions, but has been from the first a fundamental character of the institution of marriage, which has persisted throughout the evolution of its various forms. The blackfellows of Australia, the wild Seri of Tiburon, are at one with the Chinese and with the French 'noblesse' in viewing marriage as a matter which concerns not two given individuals, but first and chiefly the two contracting groups to which those individuals belong.

A little consideration of the conditions of primitive societies makes it obvious that an agreement or contract between the two groups concerned, and regarded as a whole, must of necessity be of far greater importance than any regulation concerning the individual relations between the members of those groups, and must, as a juridic action and transaction, have anteceded any individual contract.

By virtue of the rule of exogamy sexual association between members of the same group is almost everywhere strictly prohibited. A man or a woman must obtain his or her sexual partners from another group. But that is by no means an easy matter in primitive conditions. As already noted, there exists with peoples in the lower stages of culture very little intercourse between groups, and such intercourse as may take place is attended with all manner of difficulties and restrictions.[1] The members of one's own group are in primitive society 'our people'; all other individuals are 'strangers,' which is synonymous with 'enemies.' Clans or tribes of the same race and living in close proximity, such as those of the aborigines of the Andaman Islands or of the Veddahs of Ceylon, hold scarcely any intercourse with one another. A member of one group cannot, in any primitive society, visit another group without observing elaborate ceremonial precautions designed to satisfy the members of the group which he is visiting that no hostile or treacherous purpose is contemplated. In Australia, remarks Mr. Mathew, "when a blackfellow crosses the boundary line of his own territories, he takes his life in his hands, unless he be on special business for his tribe."[2] Clandestine visiting is even more difficult than open intercourse; it is, in fact, impossible. Love-making in primitive, as in civilised societies, generally takes

[1] See above, p. 158 sq.

[2] J. Mathew, "The Australian Aborigines," *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales*, xxiii, p. 404.

place after dark; but nearly all savages are restrained by superstitious fears from stirring out of their camp after sunset. For a lover to pay a stealthy visit in the night to a female of a strange group is thus almost impracticable; and unless there exists some friendly understanding between the two groups, it is equally impossible in the daytime. Secret or open relations, or even negotiations between individuals of two different groups, are in those conditions impossible. It is remarked of the Orang Kubu of Sumatra, that intermarriage between their various clans or tribes is out of the question, because they hardly ever come in contact with one another.[1] The same remark applies to most races on the lowest planes of culture. The Bakyiga, a warlike people inhabiting the southern slopes of the Ruwenzori mountains and the neighbouring shores of Lake Edward, are divided into a number of clans by whom the rule of exogamy is strictly observed; a man must procure his wife from one of the other clans. As all the clans are in a perpetual state of deadly war with one another, it is quite impossible for any man of one clan to visit, or hold any intercourse with, another clan without running the almost certain risk of being murdered. Negotiations for marriages have accordingly to be conducted by women only; some of the female relatives of the young man betake themselves to the hostile clan and arrange a marriage for him with one of the daughters of his foemen. When the chosen bride comes to join her prospective husband, she is brought by some of her female relatives; for if her father or brothers were to accompany her, they would certainly be killed on approaching the home of their son- or brother-in-law.[2]

Association between the sexes being prohibited within the group, and from the nature of primitive social conditions practically impossible outside it, the difficulties in the path of true love are indeed formidable. There are, in fact, but two ways in which those difficulties could be overcome. Females might be forcibly stolen or captured from a neighbouring tribe. Such capture takes place with many warlike populations in various parts of the world, but it does not appear that there is any authenticated instance of that being the habitual way of obtaining wives; such a practice necessarily entails perpetual warfare, and would lead to mutual extermination.[3] Even where it prevails that state of things would naturally tend to bring about a compromise or understanding that should put an end to an intolerable situation.

[1] B. Hagen, *Die Orang Kubu auf Sumatra* (*Veröffentlichungen aus dem stadtischen Völker-Museum, Frankfurt am Main*, ii), p. 130.

[2] J. Roscoe, *The Bagesu and other Tribes of the Uganda Protectorate*, p. 177.

[3] See below, vol. ii, pp. 230 sqq.

Among the ancient Arab tribes, which were, like those of many primitive peoples, in constant deadly warfare with one another, friendly relations between two tribes "were never constituted except by a 'casāma' or formal covenant."[1] There is, in fact, but one way in which the otherwise insuperable difficulties of providing for the needs of reproduction, while at the same time observing the prohibition of incest, could be overcome in the conditions of primitive society; and that is by some pact or agreement between two groups, such as that which the sons of Hamor proposed to the sons of Jacob: "Then will we give our daughters unto you and we will take your daughters to us."[2]

And this is, in fact, what takes place in primitive societies. There is in nearly all the surviving examples of such societies an understanding whereby the members of a given group obtain their sexual partners from some other particular group, or groups, the members of which have intermarried with their own for generations. To marry into a totally strange group, between which and the group of the suitor there exists no established custom of intermarriage and no understanding in this respect, is an unusual and difficult procedure. Those elaborate tribal conferences, negotiations, diplomatic parleys and conciliatory exchanges of presents, which have been noted in Australia, Melanesia, or Polynesia, do not, of course, take place on the occasion of every marriage; but they are necessary in the case of the marriage of members of two different tribes between whom a regular practice of intermarriage has not already become established. A man cannot marry into a strange group without an agreement being concluded by the two groups which will permit of intermarriage between their members. Those negotiations and that agreement have reference secondarily and incidentally only to the particular individuals concerned; it is not the relation between those individuals, but the relation between the two groups which is considered and discussed. The contract, if concluded, is not an individual contract, but a group-contract, and will permit of further intermarriage between members of the two groups without the necessity of new negotiations. The considerations affecting the relations between the groups, and not those between given individuals, are paramount, and are the object of the transaction, the formal, diplomatic and juridical character of the proceedings having reference to the former and not to the latter. Marriage, in the most advanced societies, has preserved that character; it is a formal juridic transaction. But that juridical character had not originally reference to the relations established

[1] W. Robertson Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, p. 97.
[2] *Genesis*, xxxiv. 16.

between the man and the woman, but to the relations between the groups to which they respectively belong. In the ideas of more advanced phases of society the direct purpose of the contract is to legalise the relation between the man and the woman, giving it a juridic sanction, and thus distinguishing it from 'illegitimate' sexual relations. But such is not quite the original character and purpose of the juridic transaction; its prototype is the agreement whereby intermarriage is rendered possible between the members of two groups. Such a contract is, in the most rudimentary and primitive human societies, a primary necessity if the rules against incest are to be observed; and it must of necessity have been the first 'institution,' or juridic regulation, of marriage. The original purpose of the institution of marriage was thus quite other than the regulation of sexual relations or the safeguarding of claims to individual possession. It had not reference to individuals, but to collective groups; it was not an individual marriage contract, but a group-marriage contract.

The Marriage of Cross-Cousins.

Such an agreement between two groups implies that every member, male or female, of each group shall marry into the other group. The establishment of that reciprocal relation, if continued generation after generation, will result in a relationship between all the members of the two groups, all the wives and husbands being, in terms of our nomenclature of kinship, the sons and daughters of brothers and sisters. Let us suppose, for the sake of simplicity, that each of the two primitive groups, which we will call 'Bears' and 'Wolves,' consists of two generations only, a mother and her brother or brothers, and her progeny of sons and daughters. All the Bear men will be married to Wolf women, and all the Bear women will be married to Wolf men. As the eldest male Wolf will be married to a Bear woman, the father of every Bear will be a Wolf, and similarly the father of every Wolf will be a Bear. The wives of the younger Bear men will be Wolf women, that is, they will be the daughters of their father's sister, and they will also be the daughters of their mother's brother. In short, every Bear man and every Wolf man will marry a daughter of his mother's brother, and every Bear woman and Wolf woman will marry a son of her mother's brother; or, counting the relationship from the father's side, every member of each group will marry a son or daughter of his or her father's sister. In other words, all unions in the two groups will be between cross-cousins. That relationship, it will be observed, is indepen-

dent of any which may have originally existed between the two groups, and will be the same if the two groups were originally quite unrelated; it results solely from the circumstance that every member of one group marries into the other group. The relationship of father's sister's child and mother's brother's child is not distinguished in our current nomenclature of degrees of relationship from the relation of father's brother's child or mother's sister's child; they are both called by us 'first cousins.' But among the vast majority of peoples a sharp distinction is drawn between the two. The first kind of cousins are known by a special name; we call them, for want of a better word, cross-cousins; in Southern India they are called 'machuna.' And further, among a large number of peoples, while marriage with a daughter of a father's brother or of a mother's sister is looked upon as incestuous, those relatives being regarded as brothers and sisters, the same does not apply to cross, or 'machuna,' cousins. Marriages between 'machuna' cousins are allowed, and marriages between the other kind of first cousins are prohibited. The reason of the distinction is manifest by reference to the constitution of the primitive social group; the daughters of a father's brother or of a mother's sister were members of the same group, that is, clan sisters, while the daughters of of a mother's brother or of a father's sister were members of different groups. The distinction has no meaning in the patriarchal 'family' of husband and wife, and it can only be interpreted in terms of a grouping altogether different from that which patriarchal hypotheses suppose to have been rooted in the fundamental social constitution of humanity.

But that is not all. Not only are marriages between 'machuna' cousins permitted, while those between other first cousins are prohibited, but among a large number of peoples in every part of the world the former kind of marriage is regarded in a peculiar light as the most proper and desirable union, or even as a moral obligation.

Among the Australian aborigines marriages are generally regulated by exactly such relations between intermarrying groups as have just been described. Accordingly, a man's destined wife is his cross-cousin. Thus, for example, among the tribes of the 'wild North-West' the men and the women are automatically allotted to their cross-cousins, "own mother's brother's son and own father's sister's daughter being betrothed to each other."[1] As this interchange between exogamous groups is adhered to as rigorously as possible, we find, in the Kariera tribe, for instance,

[1] D. M. Bates, "Social Organization of some Western Australian Tribes," *Report of the Fourteenth Meeting of the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science*, 1913, p. 391.

that the girl whom a man is obliged to marry is at the same time the daughter of his mother's brother and the daughter of his father's sister; and that is regarded by the natives of those tribes as the ideal union.[1] Similarly in the Urabunna tribe of Central Australia the marriage of cross-cousins is regarded as obligatory.[2] So again in the Ucumble tribe of Queensland it is noted that a man is regularly expected to marry the daughter of his mother's brother; "the arrangement, with reversions, continues from generation to generation."[3] The relation is regarded in the same light among the tribes of the south-eastern region.[4] The prescriptive sexual partners may, in many tribes, be more remote cousins, but they stand in a similar relationship to one another; "a man may only marry a woman who stands to him in a relation equivalent to that of mother's mother's brother's daughter's daughter."[5]

In Melanesia the same intermarriage contract between two groups is the foundation of social organisation; and accordingly cross, or 'machuna,' cousins are from birth one another's predestined sexual partners. Thus in the New Hebrides the children of a brother and his sister are betrothed from infancy, while, on the other hand, relations between the children of two brothers or of two sisters would be regarded as an abominable incest.[6] Similarly in New Britain a man is expected to marry the daughter of his mother's brother, but could on no account marry the daughter of his mother's sister.[7] In New Caledonia, likewise, the regular and proper marriage is that between the children of a brother and those of his sister, while relations between the children of two brothers or of two sisters are regarded with horror.[8] In Futuna,

[1] A. R. Brown, "Three Tribes of Western Australia," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii, pp. 155 sq. Cf. J. D. E. Schmeltz, "Ethnographical Notes on the Western Australian Aborigines," *Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, xvi, p. 12.

[2] W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 61 sqq.; Id., *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 73 sq.

[3] W. T. Wyndham, "The Aborigines of Australia," *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales*, xxiii, p. 36.

[4] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, pp. 77, 101, 195 sq., 262.

[5] A. R. Brown, "Notes on the Social Organisation of Australian Tribes," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, liii, p. 427; cf. p. 48.

[6] W. Gray, "Notes on the Tannese," *Report of the Fourth Meeting of the Australian Association for the Advancement of Science*, 1892, pp. 674, 677; D. Macdonald, "The New Hebrides," *ibid.*, p. 709; W. H. Rivers, art. "New Hebrides," in Hastings's *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. ix, p. 353.

[7] F. Burger, *Die Küsten- und Bergvölker der Gazellehalbinsel*, p. 28.

[8] Père Lambert, *Moeurs et superstitions des Néo-Calédoniens*, pp. 94, 114 sq.

also, the marriage of cross-cousins is looked upon as a moral obligation.[1] In Fiji the organisation into intermarrying groups which is so general throughout Melanesia has long disappeared, though there are clear traces of its former existence; but the relations which such an arrangement between intermarrying groups necessarily involves survives as one of the most fundamental principles of pagan Fijian society. "The young Fijian is from birth regarded as the natural husband of the daughters of his father's sister and of his mother's brother." 'Machuna' cousins are, in fact, "born husband and wife."[2] A man regards himself as married to the daughter of his mother's brother without any previous negotiation or formality. In cases of rape brought before European Courts in recent times the defence has been set up that the woman was the cousin of the accused and therefore his wife.[3]

In the islands of Torres Straits no payment is required for marriage with the daughter of a mother's brother, while marriage with the daughter of a father's sister is regarded as the next best thing.[4] In the Marshall Islands, while the children of two brothers or of two sisters may not marry, marriages between the children of a brother and a sister are favoured.[5] So likewise in the Philippines, among the Tinguianes, marriage between cousins, presumably cross-cousins, is preferred.[6]

Among the majority of the more primitive populations of the southern portion of the Malay Archipelago marriage with a 'machuna' is regarded, as among the natives of Australia and of Melanesia, as a moral obligation. Thus, in the island of Timor-laut or Tenimber, it is by native law, or 'adat,' obligatory that a boy shall be married to the daughter of his maternal uncle. One son at least, in each family, whether the eldest or the youngest, must marry a daughter of his mother's brother; the others may marry other 'machuna' cousins, or, with the consent of their maternal uncle, a girl of another family. The natives have no term for 'nephew' or 'niece'; the children of two brothers or of two sisters are called 'brothers' and 'sisters,' and a union between them, or even between their descendants, would be regarded as incest.[7] Similarly in the Kei Islands a man is regarded as betrothed from birth to the

[1] W. Gunn, *The Gospel in Futuna*, pp. 205 sq.

[2] Basil Thomson, *The Fijians*, pp. 184 sqq.

[3] W. H. R. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society*, vol. i, p. 296.

[4] *Ibid.*, vol. i, p. 184.

[5] A. Senfft, "Die Marshall-Insulaner," in S. R. Steinmetz, *Rechtsverhältnisse von eingeborenen Völkern in Afrika und Ozeanien*, p. 435.

[6] F.-C. Cole, *Traditions of the Tinguian*, p. 12.

[7] P. Drabbe, "Het heidensch huwelijk op Tanimbar," *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, lxxix, pp. 551 sqq.

daughter of his mother's brother. If she is much younger than himself, he must wait until she grows up. Should the uncle have no daughter he is obliged to provide a suitable wife for his nephew by adopting a girl. Failure to marry one's 'machuna' cousin is visited with a heavy fine. But, on the other hand, a similar fine would be imposed on anyone who had incestuous relations, as they are considered, with his father's brother's or his mother's sister's daughter.[1] So again in the large island of Timor, marriage between the children of a brother and of a sister is regarded as particularly praiseworthy.[2] The same customs obtain in the various islands of the southern Moluccas, and also in Ceram. The name by which a man's cross-cousins are known is the word meaning 'wife'; and even should he be married to another woman, he has recognised rights of intimacy with his 'machuna' cousins.[3] In Sumatra, among the Lubus of the Mandailing district, 'machuna' cousins are regarded as married from birth; no formalities attend their union, and failure to fulfil that duty is regarded as provoking the anger of the gods.[4] Among the Bataks marriage of a man with his cross-cousin is "deeply interwoven in the Batak conception of family bonds upon which their whole social life rests."[5]

Marriage with one's mother's brother's daughter, or as it is called, 'menarikam,' is a fundamental social law with a large proportion of the aboriginal races of India. The principle is illustrated in some of those elaborate marriage ceremonies prevalent in India, which frequently assume the proportions of little dramatic performances full of symbolism. Thus among the Musu Kammas a basket filled with earth is placed before the bridegroom, and he pretends to plough the miniature field, using a stick as a plough. His sister pretends to prevent him from doing so, and covers the earth with a cloth. But her brother

[1] C. M. Pleyte, "Ethnographische Beschrijving der Kei-Eilanden," *Tijdschrift van het Koninklijk Nederlandsch Aardijkskundig Genootschap*, Ser. ii, x, p. 808.

[2] A. C. Kruyt, "De Timoreezen," *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, lxxix, p. 352.

[3] Van Schmid, "Aanteekeningen nopens de zeden, gewoonten en gebruiken, benevens de vooroordeelen en bijgeloovigheden der bevolking van de eilanden Saparoea, Haroekoe, Noessa Laut, en van een geedeelte van de zuid-kust van Ceram," *Tijdschrift voor Neêrlands Indië*, v, Part ii, pp. 596 sq.; J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua*, pp. 385, 416, 474.

[4] J. Kreemer, "Die Loeboes in Mandailing," *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, lxvi, p. 321; T. J. Willer, "Verzameling der Battahsche wette en instilligen in Mandheling en Pertibie," *ibid.*, viii, deel ii, p. 174.

[5] J. B. Neuman, "Het Pane- en Bila-stroomgebied op het eiland Sumatra," *Tijdschrift van het Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig Genootschap*, Ser. ii, iii, p. 243.

turns towards her and repeats several times the words: "I will give my daughter to your son"; whereupon the sister relents and allows the marriage to proceed.[1] Marriage of a boy with his mother's brother's daughter is not only a universally honoured practice, but is regarded in the light of a sacred obligation. In the 'Kanyaka Purana,' or sacred books of the Komatis, the injunction is laid down with great emphasis. "Be sure," it is written, "to give your daughters in marriage to the sons of their father's sisters, even though the young men should be black-skinned, plain, blind of one eye, senseless, of vicious habits, and though the horoscopes should not agree and the omens be inauspicious."[2] The rule is observed by all the aboriginal races of southern India.[3] It is observed by the most primitive tribes, such as the Todas,[4] the Kasubas,[5] Irulas and Kurumba of the Nilgiri Hills,[6] and probably among the Veddahs,[7] who in this agree with the Singhalese,[8] as well as among the highest castes, including the Nayars.[9] It has apparently spread to the Aryan populations of the same region.[10] The same social law is observed by the

[1] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, vol. i, p. 144. Cf. *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 382. [2] *Ibid.*, vol. iii, p. 314.

[3] H. A. Stuart, in *Census of India*, 1891, vol. xiii, "Madras," Report, pp. 212, 233; E. Thurston, *op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. 49 sq., 129 sq., 238, 265; vol. ii, pp. 265, 278, 311, 356; vol. iii, pp. 76 sq., 215, 217, 314 sqq., 325, 351, 418; vol. iv., pp. 35, 371, 441; vol. v, pp. 52, 55, 63, 73, 103 sq., 136, 244; vol. vi, pp. 94, 190, 264, 387, 455; vol. vii, pp. 184, 191, 206 sq., 300 sq., 407; H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnological Survey of Mysore*, vol. i, p. 118; vol. ii, pp. 1, 7; vol. iv, pp. 5 sq.; vol. vii, p. 7; vol. xi, pp. 1 sqq.; vol. xii, p. 5; vol. xvi, pp. 1 sq.; vol. xvii, pp. 1 sqq., 11; vol. xxiii, pp. 1 sq.; A. F. Cox, *Madras District Manuals: North Arcot*, vol. i, pp. 205 sq.; F. Dahmen, "The Paliyans, a Hill-Tribe of the Palni Hills," *Anthropos*, iii, p. 27; Id. "The Kunnuvans, or Mannalis, a Hill-Tribe of the Palnis, South India," *ibid.*, v, p. 325; *The Imperial Gazetteer of India*, vol. i, pp. 296 sqq.; W. H. R. Rivers, "The Marriage of Cousins in India," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1907, pp. 611 sqq.; J. G. Frazer, *Folk-lore in the Old Testament*, vol. ii, pp. 99 sqq.; J. E. Padfield, *The Hindu at Home*, p. 152; *Census of India*, 1901, vol. xv, Part i, pp. 141, 169, 181.

[4] W. H. R. Rivers, *The Todas*, pp. 502, 509, 512 sq.

[5] C. Hayavadana Dao, "The Kasubas, a Forest Tribe of the Nilgiris," *Anthropos*, iv, p. 179.

[6] W. Francis, *Madras District Gazetteers: The Nilgiris*, vol. i, pp. 153, 156.

[7] C. G. and B. Z. Seligman, *The Veddas*, pp. 64 sq.

[8] A. A. Perera, *Glimpses of Singhalese Social Life*, p. 3; J. Bailey, "The Wild Tribes of the Veddahs," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society*, N.S., ii, p. 294.

[9] L. K. Anantha Krishna Iyer, *The Cochin Tribes and Castes*, vol. ii, p. 22; K. M. Panikkar, "Some Aspects of Nayar Life," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlviii, p. 270.

[10] E. Thurston, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 382; vol. vii, p. 60; *The Imperial Gazetteer of India*, vol. i, p. 376; Anantha Krishna Iyer, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 19; *South Canara Manual*, 1894, p. 151.

Dravidian populations of Central India,[1] and as far north as Mirsapur they " adhere to the old Gond rule by which first cousins, provided they are not the offspring of two sisters, by preference intermarry."[2] Among the Parga of the Central Provinces, there are old bachelors who have never thought it worth while to marry ; but, as it is a general belief that every man should get married before he dies, they comply with the sentiment, when they feel that they have not much longer to live, by being formally wedded to their mother's brother's daughter, even though she may be an infant at the breast.[3]

The rule of marriage with ' machuna ' cousins is equally in force among the tribes of Assam and of Manipur. Thus among the Garos " there is an exception to the rule that a girl may choose her husband. This exception occurs when one daughter of a family is given in marriage to the son of her father's sister. Should she not have such a cousin she must marry a man of her father's ' motherhood,' who is chosen as a substitute."[4] Among the Mikirs a boy, if he should object to marry his cousin, would receive a sound thrashing from his uncle.[5] Among the Rabhas marriage with maternal cross-cousins is usual, while other cousins are forbidden to marry.[6] Among the Khasis " marriage is contracted with near relatives, such as cousins, in preference to other women."[7] Among the Kuki marriages are generally contracted between cross-cousins.[8] In Upper Burma, among the Kachin tribes, " it seems to be a general rule that a man should marry his first-cousin on the female side, or, more precisely, the daughter of a mother's brother."[9] Among the Karen and the Kien tribes all marriages except those between cousins are prohibited.[10]

Among the more primitive populations of northern and central Asia similar customs appear to be widespread, though, owing to

[1] R. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, vol. ii, pp. 325 sq., 271, 515 sq. ; vol. iii, pp. 71, 160, 189 sq. ; vol. iv, pp. 22 sq., 510, 515 sq. ; J. Forsyth, *The Highlands of Central India*, p. 186.

[2] W. Crooke, *The Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh*, vol. ii, p. 417 ; cf. p. 412 ; vol. iii, p. 345 ; H. Risley, *The Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, vol. i, pp. 346, 425, 436 ; vol. ii, p. 30.

[3] R. V. Russell, *op. cit.*, vol. iv, p. 374.

[4] A. Playfair, *The Garos*, p. 68.

[5] E. Stack, *The Mikirs*, pp. 17 sq.

[6] J. E. Friend-Pereira, " The Rabhas," in *Census of India*, 1911, vol. iii, pp. 142 sq.

[7] F. R. T. Gurdon, *The Khasis*, p. 78.

[8] J. Shakespear, " The Kuki-Lushai Clans," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxxix, p. 381.

[9] C. J. F. S. Forbes, *British Burma*, p. 255. Cf. *Census of India*, 1911, vol. i, Part i, p. 256.

[10] J. G. Scott and J. P. Hardiman, *Gazetteer of Upper Burma and the Shan States*, Part i, vol. i, pp. 384, 540.

the ambiguity of our terms of kinship, our reports do not always make it clear whether cross-cousins are meant. The Aleuts, according to Father Veniaminoff, "marry by preference the daughter of their uncle."[1] A similar preference is shown by the Ainu,[2] the Kamchadals,[3] the Chukchi,[4] the Koryaks.[5] With the Gilyak, we are expressly told, the correct marriage is with the daughter of the mother's brother.[6] Among the Miao of China cousin marriage is obligatory;[7] it is also usual among the Mongols,[8] and cousin marriage is likewise the custom in Tibet, and no marriage can be concluded without the sanction of the bride's maternal uncle.[9] Among the Kurds "by tribal law a cousin has first refusal of a lady's hand," and so sanctified is that usage that a breach of it is regarded as worthy of death and has led to murders.[10]

The marriage of cross-cousins is regarded in the same light in several parts of Africa as it is in India. In East Africa, "after the Makonde boy has been circumcised he does not return to his parents' home, but remains in that of his maternal uncle. There he has nothing further to do but grow up and wait till his girl cousins grow up likewise. If the uncle has no daughter, the nephew first waits till one is born, and after the event has taken place he has again to wait. . . . If in due course he has a son, the son must again marry a cousin, the daughter of his father's sister."[11] Among the Bakongo the marriage of a woman's children with those of her brother is regarded as the prescriptive union, and is looked upon as particularly commendable and blessed. The sentiment is expressed in a current proverbial saying to the effect that "The children of the maternal uncle marry his nephews and nieces." Indeed, a man will usually refer to his son as the husband of his nieces.[12] Again, among the Herero, who, there is reason to believe, represent in one of its most unmodified forms the original

[1] F. Lowe, "Wenjaminow über die Aleutischen Inseln und deren Bewohnern," *Archiv für wissenschaftliche Kunde von Russland*, ii, p. 476.

[2] J. Batchelor, *The Ainu and their Folk-lore*, p. 228.

[3] H. Krasheninnikoff, *The History of Kamtschatka and the Kuriski Islands*, p. 215.

[4] W. Bogoras, *The Chukchee*, p. 576.

[5] H. Krasheninnikoff, *op. cit.*, p. 232.

[6] M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, p. 99, after W. Sternberg.

[7] J. Kohler, "Kleinere Skizzen aus der ethnologischen Juriprudenz," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtwissenschaft*, vi, p. 406; A. Schotter, "Notes ethnographiques sur les tribus de Kouy-tcheou (Chine)," *Anthropos*, vi, p. 320.

[8] *The Book of Ser Marco Polo*, translated by Sir Henry Yule, vol. i, p. 221.

[9] C. Puini, *Il Tibet secondo la relazione del viaggio del P. Ippolito Desideri*, p. 129; F. Grenard, *Tibet: The Country and the People*, p. 262. Cf. below, p. 657.

[10] W. R. Hay, *Two Years in Kurdistan*, p. 45.

[11] K. Weule, *Native Life in East Africa*, p. 314.

[12] Père van Wing, *Études Bakongo: histoire et ethnologie*, pp. 191 sq., 133.

social organisation of Bantu tribes, the moral obligation of marrying one's 'machuna' cousin is expressly recognised. "Marriages between cousins are especially preferred, but only between children of a brother and sister, not between the children of two brothers or of two sisters."[1] Among the Baila,[2] the Ashanti, and the Wagonde the daughter of a maternal uncle or of a paternal aunt is termed 'wife.'[3] Among the Bechuana "the marriage of cross-cousins is so common as almost to be considered the general practice of the tribe. Cross-cousins have certain claims upon each other, the male in each case having a prior claim to the hand of the female in marriage. While this right to become the wife of her cross-cousin may not be enforced by the mother of the girl, neglect to seek such marriage on the part of her brother would be looked upon as a great slight by her, and would almost certainly lead to family strife. If he wishes it a male has the right to claim his female cross-cousin as his wife with all the privileges attached to husbandhood, which privileges may be exercised before the actual ceremony."[4] Among many other African peoples a clear distinction, we are told, is drawn between those cousins and the children of two brothers or of two sisters, for while marriage between the latter is rigorously forbidden, marriage between the former is freely allowed.[5] It thus appears that in Africa, as elsewhere, there exists a tradition which establishes a definite distinction as regards marriage between the two kinds of cousins, and which gives the preference to 'machuna' cousin, notwithstanding the prevalent prejudice against the marriage of near kin.

We have numerous testimonies to the strict manner in

[1] E. Dannert, *Zum Rechte der Herero*, pp. 33, 37; J. Kohler, "Das Recht der Herero," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*, xiv, p. 300.

[2] E. W. Smith and A. M. Dale, *The Ila-speaking Peoples of Northern Rhodesia*, vol. i, p. 318.

[3] B. Z. Seligman, "Marital Gerontocracy in Africa," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, liv, p. 241.

[4] J. T. Brown, *The Bantu of Central South Africa* (MS.).

[5] S. R. Steinmetz, *Rechtsverhältnisse von eingeborenen Völkern in Afrika und Ozeanien*, p. 318; J. Kohler, "Das Recht der Hottentotten," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*, xv, p. 318; G. M. Theal, *Ethnography and Condition of South Africa*, p. 261; E. Nigmann, *Die Wahehe*, p. 60; H. Claus, *Die Wagogo*, p. 58; S. Heese, "Sitte und Brauch der Sango," *Archiv für Anthropologie, N.F.*, xii, p. 134; R. E. Dennett, *At the Back of the Black Man's Mind*, p. 36; R. S. Rattray, *Some Folklore Stories and Songs in Chinyanga*, p. 202; J. M. Sarbah, *Fanti Law and Custom*, p. 46; G. Zündel, "Land und Volk der Eweer auf der Sclavenküste in Westafrika," *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin*, xii, p. 390; N. W. Thomas, *Anthropological Reports on Sierra Leone*, Part i, p. 101; O. Temple, *Notes on the Tribes, Provinces, Emirates and States of the Northern Provinces of Nigeria*, p. 401 (Filane); Colle, *Les Baluba*, p. 305; F.-J. Clozel and R. Villamur, *Les coutumes indigènes de la Côte d'Ivoire*, pp. 192, 195.

which the Eskimo observe the rules of prohibited degrees, but we are told that, nevertheless, "they frequently marry first-cousins."[1] Among the western Déné, the daughter of his mother's brother or of his father's sister is the woman whom a man is "by time-honoured custom almost bound to marry."[2] The same appears to be the rule among the Haidas;[3] and the same sort of marriage has been observed among the Hopis.[4] Among the central Arawaks "by custom a man must marry his cousin. Being exogamous and marrying cousins, a man must marry either one of his father's sister's daughters or one of his mother's brother's daughters. A man may have his choice of several cousins near his own age or, if he happen to be the youngest son of the youngest daughter, he may have little choice, and that between girls much older than himself. Where there is opportunity for selection the boy is free to make his choice without suggestion from parents. If, however, there is a cousin near his own age, she is often spoken of as his wife even while both are small."[5] The rules here described appear to have been common to all the Caribbean races of Central America. Speaking of them, Father Lafitau tells us that the men "are born married, so to speak, by virtue of the rule laid down in their law, and of the right which male cousins have over their female cousins."[6] Among the Jivaros of the upper Amazon, a man has the first right to marry his cousin together with all her sisters.[7]

Thus among a considerable number of peoples in every quarter of the world, and in phases of culture so widely different as those of the Australian and Melanesian savages, and of the aristocratic castes of Malabar, the marriage of 'machuna' cousins, that is, of the children of a brother and a sister, is looked upon either as an obligation or in the light of a particularly commendable and morally praiseworthy union, while at the same time marriage between the children of two brothers or of two sisters is regarded

[1] E. W. Nelson, "The Eskimo about Bering Strait," *Eighteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 291.

[2] A. G. Morice, "The Western Dénés, their Manners and Customs," *Proceedings of the Canadian Institute, Toronto*, Third Series, vii, p. 119. Cf. Id., art. "Déné," in Hastings's *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. iv, p. 637; C. Hill Tout, *The Natives of British North America*, p. 145.

[3] J. R. Swanton, *The Haida (Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. v), p. 654; cf. pp. 717, 719.

[4] W. H. R. Rivers, *Kinship and Social Organisation*, p. 55, on the authority of Miss Freire-Marreco.

[5] W. Curtis Farabee, *The Central Arawaks*, pp. 93 sq.

[6] J. F. Lafitau, *Moeurs des sauvages amériquains*, vol. i, p. 560; cf. p. 557; C. de Rochefort, *Histoire naturelle et morale des Îles Antilles*, p. 544.

[7] W. Curtis Farabee, *Indian Tribes of Eastern Peru* (*Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology*, vol. x), p. 118.

as incestuous. The commendation by tribal law of that relationship between persons who are pre-allotted to one another as sexual partners, is the direct consequence of the primitive arrangement whereby the difficulties in the way of observing group-exogamy are overcome by an agreement between two groups, providing for the mutual supply of sexual partners to their respective members.

Such arrangements are still widely prevalent in every part of the world among primitive people. "Marriage among the totem societies of Australia, America and India is both exogamous and endogamous; a man is forbidden to marry either within his own clan or outside a certain kinship group."[1] In the aboriginal societies of Australia and of Melanesia, which have remained isolated from the rest of the world, and whose social organisation has in many respects persisted unmodified by contact with other cultures, or by the development of culture and the consequent interests of private property in their own midst, the importance attached to the marriage of 'machuna' cousins is part and parcel of the fundamental social organisation of those peoples into intermarrying groups. Thus, as Dr. Codrington very lucidly explains in speaking of the Melanesians, "in the native view of mankind, almost everywhere in the islands which are here under consideration nothing seems more fundamental than the division of the people into two or more classes, which are exogamous, and in which descent is counted through the mother. This seems to stand foremost as the native looks out upon his fellow-men; the knowledge of it forms probably the first social conception which shapes itself in the mind of a young Melanesian of either sex, and it is not too much to say that this division is the foundation on which the fabric of native society is built up."[2] The intermarrying groups may be entirely separate, the one dwelling in one village, the other in another village. Thus among the savages of New Caledonia the men of one village are obliged to obtain their wives from a certain other village, and may not marry a woman either in their own or in any other village except the one to which their own little community is, so to speak, married.[3] It is evident that two such neighbouring communities between which a perpetual marriage contract is established will, like the sons of Hamor and

[1] J. G. Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, vol. i, p. 64.

[2] R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians*, p. 21.

[3] Père Guis, "Les Canaques," *Les Missions Catholiques*, xxx (1898), p. 45. This statement appears to have escaped the searching eye of Sir James Frazer, who writes that "the most notable exception to this general statement (that over the whole of the Melanesian Islands, either exogamy or totemism, or at least traces of them have been found) is presented by the large island of New Caledonia, where, so far as I know, neither totemism nor exogamy has been discovered" (J. G. Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, vol. ii, p. 65).

of Jacob, tend to become 'one people' and dwell together; the result will present the appearance of one group divided into two intermarrying classes. Both those arrangements are commonly found in the same region. Thus in the Dobu district of New Guinea, as in New Caledonia, the corresponding marriage groups live in separate villages; in New Britain, on the other hand, a person obtains his or her sexual partner from the same village, the latter being divided into two marriage classes.[1] In some of the western islands of Torres Straits we may witness the transition from the one arrangement to the other. Thus in the island of Mabuiag the various clans, which are strictly exogamous, each being permitted to marry into one of the others only, formerly occupied separate districts of the island, and are still known by the names of those districts. But at the present day all the clans live together in one village, and members of different clans are commonly to be found in the same house.[2]

In Australia it was the usual practice in the Kurnai tribe for men to obtain their wives from the neighbouring Tatugolung tribe. There exists a good deal of social intercourse between the two tribes, and festivities, or 'dances,' are held which are attended by marriageable young people of each tribe. At such gatherings, matches are arranged between them, and they elope together. The proceeding is attended with a ceremonial show of resentment on the part of the parents of the girl; but this is merely formal, and intended to obtain some due compensation, such as another girl from the family of the bridegroom, the whole proceeding being founded upon an understanding between the two tribes that wives shall be obtained in this way from one another.[3] Similar arrangements for the mutual exchange of girls exist in various parts of Australia between tribes which Mr. Curr calls "associated tribes."[4] Between certain tribes in Western Australia there exists, we are told, scarcely any other intercourse or relation, except the interchange of women.[5] The more common arrangement, however, is for a tribe to be divided into two groups of which the members are prohibited under pain of death from marrying amongst themselves, and are obliged to draw their sexual partners from the other group; or instead of two exogamous groups there

[1] W. E. Bromilow, in G. Brown, *Melanesians and Polynesians*, p. 29.

[2] W. H. R. Rivers, in *Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expediton to Torres Straits*, vol. v, pp. 159 sq.

[3] L. Fison and A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, pp. 200 sq. Cf. A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, pp. 269 sqq.

[4] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race*, vol. i, pp. 63, 67. Cf. J. Mathew, "The Australian Aborigines," *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales*, xxiii, p. 398.

[5] C. P. Hodgson, *Reminiscences of Australia*, p. 213.

may be four or even eight. Those subdivisions may be clans bearing different totemic names and badges, or they may be simply 'marriage-classes,' having no reference to the totems of each clan. In a large number of instances the two forms of intermarrying divisions exist simultaneously, so that in order to determine what woman a man may marry it is necessary to take into consideration both the totemic group and the marriage class to which each belong. Very complicated arrangements thus result, but it is fairly evident that the original arrangement in Australia and in Melanesia was the outcome of an agreement between two groups or clans, to intermarry;[1] the practice, once established, has undoubtedly led to its being artificially imitated, when expedient, by groups being arbitrarily subdivided. In Australia, where a tribe is divided into four intermarrying groups, which is a very prevalent arrangement, a man often may only marry in one particular section or sub-section.[2]

Among the Haidas of Queen Charlotte Sound, it is a general rule for certain families to take their wives or husbands from certain other families in some other village, and whole villages are thus, as it were, married to one another.[3] The Tlinkit of Alaska are divided into two groups of clans, which are probably subdivisions of two original clans, and are known as the Raven group and the Wolf group; members of the Raven group may marry members of the Wolf group only, and members of the Wolf group may marry no others than members of the Raven group.[4] Among the North American Indians the preference for alliances between cross-cousins appears to have been noted only in regard to the northern Athapascan tribes. But Father Charlevoix informs us that in all the tribes, especially among the Algonkins, important families might intermarry with certain other families only.[5] The effect of such a rule would, of course, be that they habitually married their cross-cousins. Similarly among the tribes of the lower

[1] See L. Fison and A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, pp. 70 sqq.; W. H. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society*, vol. ii, pp. 557 sqq.

[2] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, pp. 98 (Milpulko), 123 (Buandik), 194 (Wilya), 187 sq. (Yendakarangu); W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 59 sq.; Id., *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 187 sq. (Urabunna).

[3] J. R. Swanton, *The Haida* (*Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. v, part i), p. 236.

[4] A. Krause, *Die Tlinkit-Indianer*, pp. 112, 220; I. Petroff, 'Report on the Population, etc., of Alaska," *Tenth Census of the United States*, vol. viii, pp. 165 sq.; H. J. Holmberg, "Ethnographische Skizzen über die Völker des russischen Amerika," *Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae*, iv, pp. 293, 313; A. Pinart, "Notes sur les Koloches," *Bulletin de la Société d'Anthropologie*, 2e Série, vii, pp. 792 sq.

[5] F. X. de Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, vol. v, p. 420.

Congo " it is not a hard and fast rule, but it is a rule very generally followed, for the sons and daughters of one clan to marry only the daughters and sons of one other clan, and not to intermarry with several different clans." [1] Among the Hausas, the men of the Python clan generally marry in the clan to which their mother belongs, " in other words, the men of this clan prefer to intermarry with the women of one particular clan only." [2] Among the Suk, the first question to be enquired into when a marriage is mooted is whether the clans of the respective parties have intermarried before.[3]

Among the Samoyeds it is an old-established rule that a man not only may not marry a woman of his village, but must take a wife from one particular village only. Thus a Wanotja Samoyed is obliged to take his wife from the Laja tribe, and vice versa, the two tribes being, as it were, intermarried ; " and this rule is observed, even though the two tribes dwell at opposite extremities of a desert ' tundra,' and although there may exist no intercourse or association of any kind between them, except in regard to this one matter of intermarriage." [4] Or, as another writer puts it, a Samoyed man is obliged to obtain his wife from the same clan from which his mother came, however near the relationship between bride and bridegroom may be.[5] Thus, although we are nowhere, as far as I know, expressly told that the Samoyeds marry their cross-cousins, it is evident that their brides must in every case be a daughter of a tribal brother of their mother, and most commonly an actual cross-cousin. With the Gilyak, who regard the marriage of ' machuna ' cousins as obligatory, the obligation rests, as with the Australian and Melanesians, upon the similar obligation to obtain their sexual partners from one given tribe only, and they express that rule in the same manner as do the Samoyeds. " The most important regulation of Gilyak marriage is implied in their saying : ' Thence whence you came forth—from the clan of your mother—you must take your wife.' " [6] Among the Jhalawans of Baluchistan, who hold strong views as to the meritorious character of cross-cousin marriages, " it used to be the correct thing for one group

[1] J. H. Weeks, " Notes on some Customs of the Lower Congo People," *Folk-lore*, xix, p. 410.

[2] J. G. Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, vol. ii, p. 607, after H. R. Palmer.

[3] J. Barton, " Notes on the Suk Tribe of the Kenia Colony," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, li, p. 96.

[4] A. G. Schrenk, *Reise nach den Nordosten des europaischen Russlands durch die Tundras der Samoyeden*, vol. i, p. 478.

[5] Archimandrite Benjamin, reported in " Über den religiösen Glauben und die Ceremonien der haidnischen Samojeden im Kreise Mesen, nach dem Russischen," *Zeitschrift für allgemeine Erdkunde*, N.F., viii, p. 55. Cf. P. S. Pallas, *Reise durch verschiedene Provinzen des Russischen Reichs*, vol. iii, p. 76.

[6] M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, p. 98, after L. Sternberg.

of families to interchange marriages, generation after generation, with another group, which belonged very possibly to a quite different tribe altogether. Such a group called the other its 'shalvar,' or 'breeches,' for breeches are as essential to a Brahui bride as a bridal veil to a bride in Europe." [1]

Among the Kachin tribes of Upper Burma, "there is an arrangement whereby a family is, so to speak, parents-in-law to another family generally, and gives females only to the members of the latter family." [2] Among the Karen tribes of the same region, who, as we have noted, regard marriage to a cross-cousin as a moral duty, the above principle is carried in some instances to a quite ridiculous extreme. The members of one of those tribes, known variously as Zayeins, Let-htas, or Sawng-tüng, and also by some of their neighbours as Gung-to, are absolute martyrs to those rules, which are enforced by a council of elders who exercise a spiritual tyranny as guardians of public morals in this respect. No man or woman is permitted in any circumstances to marry a person who is not his or her maternal cross-cousin. Every plan of marriage has to be submitted to the elders, who carefully investigate whether the proposed spouses are really own cousins of the proper kind, and make all necessary enquiries to ensure against fraudulent representations and evasions, before they give their sanction to the proposed marriage. The consequence is that the tribe is full of grey-headed bachelors and old maids who have the misfortune not to possess a relative of the proper sort with whom it would be morally permissible to marry. But that is not all; it is further necessary that in any village a man's wife or a woman's husband should be drawn from one particular village, and from no other. The villages of the Zayeins are thus strictly intermarried. Between the members of the same village any suggestion of marriage or of sexual relations is regarded in the light of the most horrible incest. The unmarried males and females dwell separately in two large houses at the opposite ends of the village, and so afraid are they of incurring the suspicion that any amatory relations exist between them that they are careful to lower their eyes discreetly when they happen to meet on the road. Should such a crime as an improper relation between a man and a woman of the same village come to the knowledge of the elders, the wretched culprits are obliged to dig their own grave. They are led to the place of execution with a rope round their necks; the rope being firmly secured at one end, while they stand by the deep grave they have them-

[1] D. Bray, in *Census of India*, 1911, vol. iv, "Baluchistan," p. 102.

[2] C. Morgan Webb, *Census of India*, 1911, vol. ix, p. 152; J. G. Scott and J. P. Hardimann, *Gazetteer of Upper Burma and the Shan States*, Part i, vol. i, p. 404.

selves dug, they are pushed into it, and the earth is shovelled over the miscreants. It can cause no surprise to learn that the Zayeins are steadily diminishing in numbers. Their vexatious rules lead to frequent infringements, and two Zayein villages are entirely peopled by couples who have contracted illegitimate unions and have escaped from the jurisdiction of their spiritual rulers. It must not, however, be imagined that the Zayeins are fanatical Puritans as regards sexual morality as we understand it, or that the numerous elderly unmarried men and women are condemned to spend their lives in continence. Whenever the members of villages which are properly intermarried come together, as on the occasion of a wedding, the celebrations are, we are told, utterly scandalous in their unfettered licentiousness, and it appears that no moral blame whatever attaches to the freest extra-connubial sexual relations, provided always that they take place between members of those corresponding villages only between which marriage and sex relations are permissible.[1]

Among the Chirn and the Chawte, two clans of the Old Kukis, " the particular family of the clan out of which a young man must choose his bride is decreed by custom, and any young couple that transgresses this rule are refused at the family meals." [2] As with the tribes of Burma, so also with those of Assam the moral obligation to marry a ' machuna ' cousin is associated with that of marrying in one particular group only. Among the Garos " a man may not marry a woman of his own ' mahari,' but must take his wife from one of the clans with which his family have from time immemorial exclusively allied themselves. Some of the noblest families have only one clan with which, as a rule, they intermarry." [3] Similarly in the Chittagong Hills, there has been noted " the curious way Kulin Brahmins have of marrying into only a ' palti,' or ' corresponding,' family. Hence if there are many girls in one family, he must marry all the girls. If there are no males in the ' palti ' family, the girls can never get married." [4]

[1] F. M. Giles, in J. G. Scott and J. P. Hardımann, *Gazetteer of Upper Burma and the Shan States*, Part i, vol. i, pp. 538 sq. Cf. A. Fytche, *Burma, Past and Present*, vol. i, p. 343, and below, vol. ii, pp. 45 sq.

[2] J. Shakespear, " The Kuki-Lushai Clans," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxxix, p. 381.

[3] E. T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal*, p. 63.

[4] J. G. Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, vol. ii, p. 619, from a personal communication of Mr. J. D. Anderson. Cf. H. Risley, *Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, vol. i, pp. 147 sq. Sir Herbert Risley and Sir James Frazer are of opinion that the usage of the Kulin is of comparatively recent introduction. That, of course, is quite likely, and it can scarcely be supposed that in any instance a clan or family now existing has intermarried with the same corresponding clan or family since the dawn of human society. But, as in countless other instances, an existing usage does not the less illustrate a primordial

Among the Rajputs the principal rule of marriage is that while a person may not marry in his own clan, a woman may marry only in a clan higher than her own. The requirements as to the right and proper clan with which a marriage alliance may be contracted are so exacting that they have led to great practical difficulties in arranging marriages, and have been the cause of female infanticide being extensively practised rather than that girls should marry into an unsuitable clan. Consequently, regular intermarriage for generations between the same clans and the same families is the general rule among the Rajputs. In Gurdaspur, for instance, such marriages between cousins in associated clans or families has gone on for centuries, producing the closest interbreeding.[1] Among the Lhodi, an important agricultural caste of northern and central India, who claim, probably rightly, to be Rajputs, the fundamental rule of marriage is expressed by the maxim: "Marry with those who have been married with you."[2] In other words it is deemed correct that the members of a clan or family should marry into the same group from which it has been customary with their ancestors to obtain their sexual partners. The same rules which obtain among the noblest castes are likewise observed by some of the lowest. Thus among the Mathars, a menial caste of the Maratha country, a man is obliged to obtain his wife in the clan from which his mother or his grandmother came; that is to say, a clansman is bound to marry into one particular clan only.[3] The same rules restricting marriage within certain clans of proper rank as are observed by the Hindus of the Panjab obtain also among the Nayars of Southern India; and the usual and most favoured marriage amongst them is accordingly that between 'machuna' cousins.[4] There is, as we shall see, reason to think that the customs and social organisation of the Nayars represent in their most characteristic form those which were once general among the Dravidian races of Southern India. Among the Kondayamkottai Marvars, a tribe of that race dwelling in the neighbourhood of Cape Comorin, a man is not only debarred from marrying a woman belonging to his own clan, but is under the obligation to marry none but a woman belonging to one particular clan.[5]

principle because in that particular instance the principle has been merely revived.

[1] H. A. Rose, *A Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Panjab and North-West Frontier Provinces*, vol. iii, p. 277. Cf. D. Ibbetson, *Report on the Census of the Punjáb*, 1881, vol. i, pp. 355 sq.

[2] R. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, vol. iv, p. 116.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. iv, p. 133.

[4] See below, p. 703.

[5] F. Fawcett, "The Kondayamkottai Marvars, a Dravidian Tribe of Tinnevelly, Southern India," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxiii, p. 62.

The custom of cross-cousin marriage is thus with those races a direct consequence of the rule that members of a group are obliged to obtain their connubial partners from one other particular group and from no other. The two customs are not only commonly associated in fact, but are so also in thought and in name. The Gonds, one of the most representative Dravidian races of Central India, among whom, as we have seen, the utmost importance is attached to the observance of the rule of cross-cousin marriage, are divided into numerous totemic clans ; but each tribe is moreover divided, like those of the Australian aborigines, into two or four groups of clans, and a man is not only forbidden to marry within his own clan, but must take his wife from a clan in the opposite marriage group. The relation between those marriage classes is spoken of by the Maria Gonds as 'mamabhai,' that is to say, "maternal uncle's son." [1] The rule that it is imperative for a girl to marry her maternal uncle's son is thus identified with the social organisation of the tribe, for marriage purposes, in intermarrying classes. Apart from the association so generally found between the two social phenomena, the dependence of the one upon the other is the only interpretation of which those usages and the sharp distinction which is drawn between 'machuna' cousins and children of two brothers or of two sisters are susceptible ; for, as Dr. Rivers remarked, "it would seem impossible to find any direct psychological explanation in motive of any kind, whether religious, ethical, or magical. They seem to be meaningless except as a vestige of an old social order, while when considered from that point of view they become at once intelligible and natural." [2]

The suggestion has been made that the custom might be accounted for by economic advantages secured by keeping family property undivided.[3] It is, of course, quite possible that in some instances such a purpose is served, and that the beneficial economic effect of the practice may favour its observance. But it is difficult to see how the writers who have adduced this as an alternative interpretation of the custom imagine it to apply to the savages of Australia, Melanesia and the Caribbean Islands who do not transmit any family property; or how they conceive the observance of the rule by the Karen tribes of Burma, who rebel

[1] R. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, vol. iii, p. 64 sq.

[2] W. H. Rivers, "The Marriage of Cross-Cousins in India," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1907, pp. 623 sq.; Cf. J. G. Frazer, *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament*, vol. ii, pp. 221 sqq.; J. Kohler, "Zur Urgeschichte der Ehe," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*, v, pp. 121, 143.

[3] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. ii, pp. 76 sq.; F. J. Richards, "Cross-Cousin Marriage in India," *Man*, xiv, pp. 194 sqq.; C. Hill Tout, *The Far West, the Home of the Salish and Déné*, pp. 145 sq.; J. Ch. Molony, in *Census of India*, 1911, vol. xii, Madras, Part i, p. 107.

against the vexatious superstition, to be inspired by economic interests.

Considerations of property and inheritance are, in general, of very little importance in primitive matriarchal societies, for the simple reason that there is, as a rule, in those societies little inheritable property. It is precisely when those considerations come to be of supreme importance that individualistic interests inevitably tend to bring about a change from matriarchal to patriarchal rules of succession. Yet those patriarchal societies which have adopted the form of cousin marriage that is manifestly of the greatest economic importance by keeping property in the same family are, by comparison with the societies that practise cross-cousin marriage, very rare. The practice of marrying the daughter of one's father's brother is, in fact, almost entirely confined at the present day, as an established usage, to the Arabs,[1] and to some other Muhammadan peoples in Egypt,[2] the Sudan,[3] Morocco,[4] and India.[5] It has also been mentioned as being practised by some Basuto tribes.[6] In Madagascar it is said to be common for the children of two brothers to marry,[7] but, on the other hand, marriage between the children of two sisters is regarded as incest.[8] These are, so far as I am aware, all the instances which have been reported of the practice of marriage between ortho-cousins; it is in every instance stated to be adopted with the express object of keeping property in the same patriarchal family.[9]

[1] J. L. Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins and Wahábys*, pp. 64 sq., 154; R. F. Burton, *Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to Al-Madinah and Mecca*, vol. ii, p. 84; W. Robertson Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, pp. 82, 138, 164; A. Jaussen, *Coutumes des Arabes au pays de Moab*, pp. 45 sqq.

[2] E. W. Lane, *An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, p. 156.

[3] J. W. Crowfoot, "Customs of the Rubjatab," *Sudan Notes and Records*, i, p. 124; G. W. Murray, "The Ababda," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, liii, p. 420.

[4] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. ii, pp. 69 sq.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 71.

[6] G. M. McCall Theal, *The Yellow and Dark-Skinned Races of Africa south of the Zambesi*, p. 209; Id., *Ethnography of South Africa*, p. 261; *Records of South-Eastern Africa*, vol. vii, p. 432; D. Kidd, *The Essential Kafir*, p. 211.

[7] A. and G. Grandidier, *Histoire physique, naturelle et politique de Madagascar*, vol. iv, Part ii, p. 167.

[8] J. Sibree, *The Great African Island*, pp. 244, 248.

[9] I am very much disposed to think that the custom of marriage with the daughter of one's father's brother among the Arabs and some converts to their religion, although manifestly serving an economic interest, is in reality derived in the first instance from an older rule of cross-cousin marriage, and that it is, in fact, essentially an adaptation of the matriarchal rule to a patriarchal organisation of kinship. The patriarchal clan—that is, clan organisation with paternal descent—is itself undoubtedly a modification and adaptation of the original maternal clan, as is clear, for example, in the clans

The most explicit instance of that juridic device is afforded by ancient Greek legislation. The usage, which also obtained at Athens, is set forth in great detail in the laws of Gortyna. "An heiress," it is laid down, "shall be married to the brother of her father, to the eldest of such brothers as there may be. If there be several heiresses and several brothers, let each of the younger ones be married to one of the brothers in the order of their ages. If there be no brothers of her father, but sons of such brothers, then let the heiress marry the son of the eldest brother. . . . And until such time as the person who has a right to marry her be of age, or until she herself be of age, the house, if there be one, shall belong to the heiress, and of all interests accruing from the property one-half shall belong to the person who has the right to marry her."[1] The matriarchal practice of inheritance through the daughters is here adapted to patriarchal economic aims, not by cross-cousin marriage, but by the form of cousin marriage which matriarchal custom condemns. It would be more than strange, if the purpose of cousin marriage had been an economic one, that it should not have been adopted more frequently in patriarchal societies, where succession to property is of importance, than in matriarchal societies where it is not; whereas the exact reverse is the case. Nor is it at all likely that a custom which owed its origin to the advantage of keeping the property of a matriarchal family undivided should have been preserved under a patriarchal system; for the chief object of that system is precisely the transmission of a man's property to his son, and the change from matriarchal to patriarchal customs is scarcely likely to have shown any particular respect for a usage intended to promote a mode of inheritance which it was the chief purpose of the change to abolish. And, in fact, we constantly find that the marriage of 'machuna' cousins retains its prescriptive and semi-sacred character, while the rules for the transmission of property have become changed from the matriarchal to the patriarchal usage. Among the Bakongo tribes, for instance, the social organisation is interesting and significant in many respects; for while the clan organisation which constitutes the foundation of Congo society is strictly matriarchal, each exogamous clan being regarded as the offspring of a common ancestress, and descent being reckoned in the uterine line, the family group is constituted on equally strict patriarchal principles, the father being the absolute head of the family and property being transmitted in the male line according to patriarchai

having paternal descent in Australia, or in the paternal clans of the Yakut which were preceded by maternal clans. The change in the rule of cousin marriage would naturally follow the change in the reckoning of descent.

[1] F. Bücheler and E. Zitelmann, "Das Recht von Gortyn," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, N.F., xl, Erganzungsheft, pp. 30; cf., p. 149.

rules of succession. Bakongo society offers, in fact, a striking illustration of the essentially matriarchal character of clan organisation and the patriarchal character of the family group. Yet the rule of cross-cousin marriage is more strictly and superstitiously observed by the Bakongo than by any other African people, although its observance runs directly counter to every economic purpose as regards keeping the family property undivided.[1] Similarly, among the Rabhas of Assam social organisation is in a state of transition from matriarchal to patriarchal usages; while descent is counted exclusively in the female line, property is transmitted from father to son. Yet among them also those cousins whose marriage would keep the family property undivided are strictly forbidden to marry, while marriages between cousins which result in the dispersion of that property are favoured.[2]

Many, even among the most primitive Indian tribes, such as the Todas, are patriarchally organised, yet whatever economic interests as regards inheritance are involved in their marriages are overruled by their attachment to 'machuna' cousin marriage. Among the Bataks of Sumatra, with whom 'machuna' cousin marriage is "interwoven in the conception of family bonds upon which their whole social life rests," advantageous alliances are, we are told, deliberately set aside in favour of what is regarded in the light of a moral duty.[3] And, in fact, as regards keeping any family property united, the custom of 'machuna' cousin marriage is among them as irrelevant as the Gilbertian "flowers that bloom in the spring;" for the Bataks are at the present day organised upon the most strict and severe patriarchal principles; "women hold no property and have no civil rights."[4] The most detailed account of the usage of cross-cousin marriage as practised by any one people, with which I am acquainted, is the admirable study by Heer P. Drabbe of the custom as observed by the natives of Tenimber, or Timor Laut. The writer wisely abstains from expressing any views or theories of his own, and merely reports the usages and views of the natives themselves. There is no reference to any economic considerations, which would indeed be, as with

[1] R. P. van Wing, *Études Bakongo : histoire et sociologie*, pp. 118, 187, 131 sqq.

[2] J. E. Friend-Pereira, "The Rabhas," in *Census of India*, 1911, vol. iii, pp. 142 sq.

[3] J. B. Neumann, "Het Pane- en Bila-stroomgebiet op het eiland Sumatra," *Tijdschrift van het Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig Genootschap*, 2de Serie, iii, p. 243.

[4] F. Junghun, *Die Battalander auf Sumatra*, vol. ii, p. 135; H. Ris, "De onderafdeeling klein Mandailing Oeloe en Pahantan en hare bevolking met uitzondering van de Oeloe's," *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, xlvi, pp. 472 sqq.

the Bataks, quite irrelevant, since property passes patriarchally from father to son. In the native mind the enormous importance attached to the observance of such marriages is connected with the special position of authority and responsibility which, as among so many peoples, the maternal uncle occupies as regards his nephews. If a youth did not marry his maternal uncle's daughter, they argue, that special relation and authority as regards his children would pass out of the family and be exercised by the brothers of the young man's wife.[1] Their marriage customs are thus referred by them to another usage which is itself a clear survival of a social organisation entirely different from their present one, and in which a young man was under the care and authority of his mother's brother and not under that of his father, and was bound to obtain a wife from the same clan as his kinsmen in the maternal line.

Dr. Westermarck, who refers to economic reasons and the strengthening of the bonds of friendship in elucidation of the custom of cross-cousin marriage, takes occasion to give very clear expression to the fundamental objection to the doctrine of evolution as applied to human society which forms the guiding principle of his theories. "Here again," he says, "I must protest against the method of trying to explain customs and institutions which may be satisfactorily accounted for by known facts as survivals of unknown and entirely hypothetical conditions in the past."[2] It is difficult to imagine what class of readers the writer intends to inform that intermarriage between groups, which we have seen to be commonly associated with cross-cousin marriage, is an "unknown and entirely hypothetical condition in the past." It is equally difficult to perceive that any of the opinions and entirely hypothetical suggestions of various writers which he adduces belong to the category of "known facts," or that they account, either satisfactorily or at all, for the custom. A sounder and more scientific rule of interpretation may, I think, be laid down. It is this: wherever a usage of world-wide distribution is found to be observed by races standing on widely different levels of social culture, the true explanation of its origin is to be looked for, not in any interpretation which may appear applicable to the more advanced societies, while it is inapplicable to the more primitive, but in interpretations which apply to the least advanced among the peoples who observe the usage. That principle is of universal application; for it is one of the most constant laws in the development of sentiments and customs that social traditions dating from the

[1] P. Drabbe, "Het heidensch huwelijk op Tanimbar," *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, lxxix, pp. 551 sq.

[2] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. ii, p. 79.

infancy of the race continue to be handed down and observed long after the conditions or ideas that originally gave rise to them have disappeared. The people who observe the inherited custom 'explain' it, if they think it necessary to explain it at all, in the light of current ideas and in terms of any purpose with which those customs may incidentally harmonise; those current ideas, those advantages and uses, real or supposed, are to them the only "known facts," and they regard them as having been the source of the custom or institution in the first instance. In reality their conduct is determined by social heredity, and the explanatory justification of it given in terms of existing sentiments and conditions is but the new label which every generation tacks on to inherited usages that arose amid wholly different social and psychological conditions. "A theory which can in a satisfactory manner explain a social phenomenon by existing conditions," writes Dr. Westermarck, "must certainly take precedence of one which explains it as a survival of something hypothetical in the past."[1] There are few social phenomena for which some aetiological explanation cannot be discovered in the existing sentiments of the people that exhibit it. The older theorists had no doubt that the rule of exogamy was satisfactorily explained as a provision against the injurious effects observed to result from inbreeding. But whether the explanation is satisfactory will depend on quite other canons of evidence than any alleged claim of existing sentiments connected with the usage to precedence. However plausible the principle may at first sight appear, it is in reality the most fallacious that can be applied to the interpretation of social facts. It is from such principles of interpretation that have arisen the naïve misconceptions which abound in the writings of old travellers and missionaries, and which are apt to raise a smile in the modern reader. To combat the inveterate bias towards such a method is one of the chief and most difficult tasks of scientific anthropology. The fallacy of the rule lies in the fact that usages, customs and institutions endure and become adapted to existing conditions, while the sentiments and the purposes which are associated with them change. Amid changing sentiments and conditions, those associated with a phenomenon calling for explanation are the least likely to be identical with those from which it arose. By virtue of the above principle we should have to interpret the observance of monthly or weekly Sabbath days as having had its origin in sensible considerations as to the advisability of regular intervals of rest, whereas we know the original intention of the institution to have been quite different.[2] In accordance with that principle we

[1] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. i, p. 262.

[2] See below, vol. ii, pp. 421 sqq.

should regard the practice of circumcision as having originated from considerations of hygiene; but, whatever the true interpretation of the custom, no modern anthropologist will be prepared to accept that explanation based upon "existing conditions." Or again, the chief motive which under existing conditions prompts the observance of mourning and funeral customs is affection, reverence and regret for the dead; but the same usages which now serve as an expression of those sentiments have in their primitive form an entirely different motive, the pervading dread of dangers to the survivors from the perturbed spirit of the departed. So again, there is perhaps no practice which has been the subject of more careful and systematic consideration from the point of view of existing conditions, of public interest and of expediency than the infliction of the death penalty; it has been, after the most judicial discussion from every point of view, justified as an indispensable deterrent to crime. But anthropological evidence clearly shows that no such wise considerations have had anything to do in the first instance with the punishment of murder by death. The rationale of punishment presents, indeed, a continuous evolution and a series of complete transformations in the motives for its infliction, and the best-informed legal authorities whose business it is to weigh the validity of those motives are the first to recognise the fact.[1] Practices, institutions and customs continue essentially unchanged; the 'motives' which justify them change completely. Those customs which abound in every countryside and which we class under the rubric of 'superstitions' are, one and all, relics and survivals of something in the past of which, in the vast majority of instances, the memory has been lost; and the interest which attaches to the study of folklore lies in tracing such customs to the ideas and conditions which gave rise to them in the first instance. As in the domain of folklore, so also in the domain of social institutions and ethical standards, customs that bear no relation to existing conditions survive after those amid which they arose have passed away. Yet, while nobody disputes the relation in reference to customs that are devoid of ethical significance, or suggests that May-day usages or the practice of raising one's hat to a magpie must be explained by reference to existing conditions and not to any hypothetical conditions in the past, the same methods raise fierce opposition when applied to social institutions or to usages bearing upon established ethical standards. Both orders of phenomena are, nevertheless, equally products of social evolution, both are survivals transmitted from long-past ages when they arose amid totally different social conditions and conceptions. Such is the continuity of social tradition as regards usages and

[1] See, e.g., H. Oppenheimer, *The Rationale of Punishment.*

institutions, such is the constant change in the mental and social conditions amid which they continue to endure, that to give precedence as a matter of course to the interpretation which appears to harmonise with existing sentiments and existing conditions is in the vast majority of instances to court fallacy and misconception. Even where direct evidence is absent we are compelled to postulate that conditions existed formerly which exist no longer. All existing human races have remarkably complete and elaborate languages, yet we are obliged to assume that there was a time when speech was rudimentary; most human races cook their food, yet we must suppose that at one time the use of fire was unknown to all. To trace back the transmitted products of long development to their origin is, in anthropology as in biology, the method of evolutionary science; to take account of existing conditions, of established ideas, of current approved sentiments only, and to regard them as having existed from all time, is a survival of doctrines of special creation and innate ideas, of intellectual conditions which have held supreme sway in the past, but which should have no place in the existing conditions of science.

The Change from Clan-Kinship to Family-Kinship.

The obligatory or morally commendable character of marriage between 'machuna' cousins among some peoples is among many others not only unknown, as well as the distinction between such cousins and the children of two brothers or of two sisters, but both forms of marriage between first-cousins are equally condemned as incestuous, and the condemnation very often extends to third, fourth, and even more remote cousins. The flat contradiction between the attitude of the one set of peoples and that of the others in this matter does not arise from a difference in their notions of ethics, but from a difference in their notions of kinship. The primary motive which leads the Australian aborigines, the Melanesians or the people of Upper Burma to provide for intermarriage with a group different from their own, and the first and foremost consideration which governs all their marriage regulations, is the dread of incest and the desire to avoid it by every possible means. But, paradoxically as it may appear, the very means adopted to avoid marrying a person belonging to their own group and related to them, leads them to marry persons who are, we should consider, closely related to them, the practice of intermarriage between two groups creating between the members of those groups the relationship of first-cousins. According to the system of kinship of primitive peoples organised in clan groups, such as the

Australians, Melanesians, the people of Upper Burma or of Assam, or the Herero, those particular first-cousins whom they marry are not relatives, but members of a different group, while the other kind of first-cousins are tribal brothers and sisters. But when once the primitive maternal clan organisation has broken down, and kinship comes to be viewed in relation to another form of group, the family, both kinds of cousins become equally close relatives; they are no longer distinguished, but are both, as with us, 'first-cousins.' It is, therefore, inevitable that where clan organisation has given place to family grouping the anxiety to avoid close kinship in marriage should cause that very relationship to be condemned which, under the system of clan grouping, is prescriptive in marriage partners. The transition between the two forms of sentiment under different conditions is clearly observable even in India, where with some tribes and castes 'menarikam' marriage is looked upon as a sacred obligation, with others as commendable, with others again as permissible, while amongst others it is falling into disuse, and others again condemn it as reprehensible. "There are some sects of Brahmins who are opposed to this 'menarikam' rule, thinking the blood-relationship too close for marriage." [1] In a similar manner it is, as we have seen, a rule with many peoples in India and elsewhere that a man shall marry into the clan from which his mother came. But, from the point of view of the family system of kinship, that primordial rule of exogamy becomes open to suspicion on the score of too close an affinity; accordingly, among many Indian castes and tribes, as among the Aryans themselves at the time at which our records begin,[2] marriage in the mother's clan is expressly forbidden.[3] The transition between the one rule and its opposite is plainly noticeable in many instances at the present day. Thus the primitively organised Santals, while they still favour marriage into the clan of their mother, think it necessary to justify a usage opposed to prevalent Brahmanical sentiment; they have a proverb that "No man heeds a cow-track, or regards his mother's sept." [4] Or again in the plains of the Panjab, Sir Denzil Ibbetson writes, "the people are beginning to add the mother's mother's clan to those into which a man is forbidden to marry, or even to substitute it for the father's mother's clan, and this is apparently the last stage in the change of relationship through women to relationship through men." [5]

[1] J. E. Padfield, *The Hindu at Home*, p. 113.

[2] See above, p. 359.

[3] H. H. Risley, *The Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, vol. i, p. xlix.

[4] H. H. Risley, *op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. xlix sq.

[5] D. Ibbetson, in *Report on the Census of British India*, 1881, vol. iii, Appendix, p. clvi.

The primitive form of social organisation in clan groups tends everywhere to break down in course of time into an organisation in family groups, and a corresponding change in the rules of marriage concomitantly takes place. While exogamous clans or marriage classes are general throughout Australia, Melanesia and the more primitive races of Indonesia, there are scarcely any traces of them in Polynesia. Yet there can be little doubt that they were originally as general among the Polynesians as with neighbouring races. "The Polynesians," says Kubary, "had exactly the same organisation, although several tribes could not maintain their solidarity and broke up into families." This disintegration he ascribes chiefly to the impossibility of sufficient segregation of the clans on small islands.[1] The natives of Lua Niva, a small coral island in the Lord Howe group, are pure Polynesians, though they have for a long time been completely isolated. They originally came from the Ellice group, which was itself peopled from Samoa. The natives of Lua Niva are divided into two exogamous marrying divisions in the manner that is usual in Melanesia, but is at the present day unknown in Polynesia. It follows that the Samoans, before the separation of the people of Ellice, must have had the same marrying divisions as the Melanesians.[2] And in fact local exogamy was the rule in Samoa in recent times. Both marriage and sexual intercourse between the unmarried were prohibited between members of the same village, but were free between members of neighbouring villages.[3] Or again the Yakut were formerly organised in clans, and so strictly was the rule of exogamy observed that it was thought that blindness was a punishment from heaven upon a trespasser. But at the present day a man marries any woman outside his own family.[4] The Iroquois tribes consisted, like those of Australia, of eight clans each, grouped into two phratries or intermarrying divisions; a man might marry into any of the clans of the opposite phratry, but not into a clan belonging to the same phratry as his own. During the period over which our observations extend, the rule gradually broke down, and a man may take a wife from any clan but his own.[5] In the same manner the Pueblo Indians were organised in groups of clans, and a man might neither marry a woman belonging to his own clan

[1] J. Kubary, "Die Bewohner der Mortlock Inseln," *Mitteilungen der geographischen Gesellschaft in Hamburg*, 1878–79, p. 245.

[2] G. Brown, *Melanesians and Polynesians*, pp. 414 sqq. Cf. p. 40, and W. W. Gill, *Life in the Southern Islands*, pp. 25 sq.

[3] C. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Expedition*, vol. i, p. 138; E. von Hesse-Wartogg, *Samoa, Bismarck Archipel und Neuguinea*, p. 238.

[4] M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, pp. 111 sq.; cf. pp. 56 sqq.

[5] L. H. Morgan, *The League of the Iroquois*, pp. 79 sq.; Id., *Ancient Society*, p. 70.

nor one belonging to his own phratry or group of clans. At the present day, however, those rules have so completely broken down that a man commonly marries, not only within his own phratry, but even a woman of his own clan.[1] Some reminiscence of the older custom appears, however, to survive among the Hopi Pueblos in the preference shown for marriage between 'machuna' cousins.[2] Similarly, in Fiji, as in every other part of Melanesia, the people were divided into exogamous marriage classes,[3] but the system has so completely fallen into decay that until recently no trace of that division could be discovered.[4] It has, however, survived in the rigorous observance of the rule of cross-cousin marriage to which the natives, even after their conversion to Christianity, clung with more persistence than to any of their ancient customs. In like manner clan organisation is everywhere breaking down in India. Thus, the Jhadi Telenga, or 'jungle Telugus,' were formerly organised in exogamous clans which were further, for purposes of marriage, arranged in two groups in the same manner as among the Australians, Melanesians, or Iroquois. A man of the one group was not only debarred from marrying in his own clan, but was bound to marry a woman belonging to one of the clans of the opposite marrying division. The rule, however, is now being constantly violated; but the most suitable match is considered to be that with the daughter of a father's sister.[5] So again among the Bahnas, a large caste of cotton-cleaners, clan organisation is falling into utter decay, for while some still have regular exogamous clans, amongst others all such organisation has disappeared. The latter, however, "simply regulate their marriages by rules of relationship," that is to say, they observe the rule that a man should marry the daughter of his mother's brother.[6]

That rule is a translation in terms of family-relationship of the rule imposed by the conditions of primitive society that a man can obtain a sexual partner from a group only with which his own group has entered into an agreement permitting of such intermarriage. In the same manner the rule of exogamy as it comes to be interpreted amongst ourselves, extending a man's choice without restriction outside the prohibited degrees, is the term of the process

[1] L. H. Morgan, *Ancient Society*, p. 180; M. C. Stevenson, "The Sia," *Eleventh Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 19.

[2] See above, p. 572.

[3] A. M. Hocart, "Notes on the Dual Organisation in Fiji," *Man*, xiv, pp. 2 sq.

[4] J. G. Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, vol. ii, p. 135.

[5] R. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, vol. iii, pp. 238 sq.

[6] Id., *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 71.

of disintegration of clan-organisation, and a translation of the marriage rules associated with it in terms of family-relationship. So likewise the marriage agreement in which the contracting parties are two families corresponds to the marriage agreements in which the contracting parties are two clans. In fact, all the rules which have reference to the relations between the sexes necessarily vary according as they are founded upon an organisation in clan-groups or on one in family-groups, and the rules which are observed in the latter form of organisation are a translation in terms of family-relationship of the rules originally formulated in terms of clan-relationship. The maternal clan, or motherhood, is the primitive analogue of the family-group; the rules which applied to the former have of necessity been transmitted to the latter, and the rules which apply to the family formerly held good in the mother-clan.

Primitive Kinship and Group-Motherhood.

We must dismiss entirely from our minds the notion that, while the patriarchal family is a sexual group depending upon certain intimate relations, reproductive and economic, the clan is a group resting upon some other principle; that while the one is a reproductive group, the other is a social or political organisation. There is nothing of which primitive humanity is more innocent and careless than of social or political organisation. Organisation through the delegated authority of a chief or ruler is a very late phenomenon not found in primitive societies;[1] organisation through any form of deliberate democratic institutions is very much later still. "The cohesion of a community," remarks Mr. Mathew in speaking of the Australian aborigines, "depends entirely upon consanguinity and derives no strength at all from governmental authority."[2] That consanguinity is reckoned and thought of in terms of the clan-group. The primitive notions and terms of kinship which were associated with that form of group differ considerably from those which we employ in relation to the family-group. According to the former all male members of the clan of about the same age, including those whom we should call 'cousins,' are reckoned as 'brothers,' and all females as 'sisters'; all the older male members are called by a term which includes both 'father' and 'uncles'; all older female members by a term which includes both 'mother' and 'aunts.' The younger members of the corresponding marriage class, that is, a wife's 'sisters' or a husband's 'brothers,' are called

[1] See above, pp. 499 sqq.

[2] J. Mathew, "The Australian Aborigines," *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales*, xxiii, p. 398.

respectively 'wives' and 'husbands.' L. H. Morgan, who first drew attention to that primitive form of kinship-nomenclature, which, with minor variations, is general in primitive societies, called it the 'classificatory' system, and that which obtains in our own societies the 'descriptive' system of relationship. Those terms, which have been generally adopted in speaking of clan and family notions of kinship, are far from satisfactory, and it must also be admitted that the numerous discussions to which those notions of kinship have given rise have been, on the whole, very inconclusive and futile.

The fundamental misconception which appears to pervade those discussions is essentially similar to the fallacy which is liable to pervade all interpretations of the facts of social anthropology, namely, the strong liability to assume that the notions, ideas, customs and standards current in our own society are 'natural,' founded upon basic characters of human nature or immutable natural facts, whereas any notions, ideas or customs which appear to differ radically from those standards must be in some manner 'artificial,' abnormal, due to some accidental deviation or corruption, or in reality different from what they appear to be. That assumption is contained in the names given by Morgan to the clan-system and to the family-system of relationship. The latter is called 'descriptive,' as if it accurately described the actual facts of kinship as they are, while it is suggested that the 'classificatory' system is an arbitrary and artificial one which ignores those facts and has reference to some social convention. That this is the case has been assumed in most attempts to interpret the nature of that social convention. The assumption appears obvious; and many who are on their guard against the common fallacy which creates a bias in favour of the validity of our own notions are disposed to admit that in this instance the estimate is justified. It is pointed out, in effect, that in whatsoever way the notion of kinship may be regarded, it must ultimately rest upon the concrete facts of generation and on the relation created between parents and offspring; that, even allowing that the relation between father and child may not be obvious or may not be recognised among some primitive peoples, there is at least one relation about which there can be no possible mistake or illusion and upon which any system of relationship must necessarily be based, namely, the relation between mother and offspring. That surely, it is considered, must be the starting-point of any system of reckoning relationship. And if we find, as we do in the 'classificatory' system, that the term 'mother' is applied equally to all the women of the same generation as the actual mother, and the terms 'son' and 'daughter' to all the children of those women indifferently, including those which we should call 'nephews' and 'nieces,' such a terminology, we

conclude, cannot have reference to the facts as actually known and conceived, but to some social and conventional relations or functions. Thus, Mr. N. W. Thomas, in discussing the marriage regulations of the Australian aborigines and the undifferentiated use of the terms 'wife' and 'husband' in reference to all members of corresponding intermarriage groups, points to the circumstance that "all mothers call the children of the same age-grade, that is, the children of their sisters (own and tribal), 'sons' and 'daughters,'" as the strongest argument against attaching any literal significance to the terms 'husband' and 'wife' as used by them. Their use of the term 'mother' is, Mr. Thomas thinks, a 'reductio ad absurdum' of the supposition that the terms 'husband' and 'wife' really mean what they imply. "Finding that the term which is translated 'son,'" he exclaims, "is equally applied by the remainder of the group of women to the son of the individual woman, we may discard the former hypothesis (that 'wife' means wife, and 'husband' husband) and come to the conclusion that if there was a period of group-marriage there was also a period of group-motherhood. This interesting fact may be commended to the attention of zoologists." [1]

But I do not think that Mr. Northcote Thomas would receive from zoologists the support on which he appears to rely so confidently. Nothing, in fact, could well be more disastrous to his argument, and the similar arguments urged by critics of the interpretation of the 'classificatory system,' than such an appeal. Zoologists would inform him that scarcely any fact of zoology is more definite, clear and conspicuous than the entire absence among animals of any relation between the operation of the maternal instinct and actual physiological consanguinity or kinship. From the lowest invertebrates in which the most rudimentary physiological forms of the reaction of maternal instinct are exhibited to its highest development among the nearest animal allies of the human species, the maternal instinct acts irrespectively of any actual relationship, and in the vast majority of species there is no indication

[1] Northcote W. Thomas, *Kinship Organisation and Group-Marriage in Australia*, pp. 121. Cf. E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. i, p. 267: "The whole of this argument (that "a classificatory term may actually represent the relationship expressed by the term") is overthrown by the fact that the same term is also applied to the mother and to the mother's sisters and cousins or (in the Hawaiian system) to the father's sisters and cousins as well, and that a woman applies the same terms to her sisters' and cousins' children as to her own sons and daughters. It is conceivable that uncertainty as regards fatherhood might have led a savage to call several men his father, but uncertainty as regards motherhood could never have led him to call several women his mother, or could never have led a woman to call other women's children her sons and daughters."

of any recognition of her individual offspring by the mother.[1] Mother-care, motherhood as regards the operation of the maternal instinct, is with some mammals actually communal. Among mice and rats, females attend to and protect with the utmost devotion one another's offspring indifferently, and in a group of females with young, it is not possible to tell from the behaviour of the mothers which is the actual offspring of any particular female.[2] With bats, among which the general habit is for large numbers of females to gather together with their young in complete segregation from males, the suckling and rearing of the offspring is communal, the broods passing at haphazard from one female to another.[3] The operation of the maternal instincts in animals is, as already noted, not brought into play by the physical event of birth ; there is, indeed, in all mammals as also in the human female, an interval after that event and before those instincts are awakened during which the offspring may stand in actual danger from the mother. When once the association of the female and young has been established the operation of the maternal instincts takes place quite irrespectively of the actual physiological relation of kinship. " Foster-motherhood is developed among animals," remarks Büchner, " to an astonishing degree ; it appears, in fact, that in this respect animals leave mankind far behind." [4] Cats and bitches show the same care, devotion and concern for substituted broods as for their own.[5] Nor is this the result of undetected deception ; they commonly of their own accord adopt the young of another mother. The instance is mentioned of a cat which, " perhaps from resentment at the pain caused by their birth," killed all her kittens ; another cat having, a day later, brought forth a litter, the self-bereaved mother forcibly obtained possession of it and with the utmost gentleness brought it up as her own.[6] Some animal females show a downright mania for adopting young broods. A retriever bitch that had already had

[1] E. Rabaud, " L'instinct maternel chez les mammifères," *Bulletin de la Société Zoologi que*, xlvi, pp. 74 sqq., 79 ; A. Giard, " Les origines de l'amour maternel," *Oeuvres diverses*, vol. i, pp. 227 sq. ; G. Loisel, " Relations entre les phénomènes du rut, de la lactation, de la mue et de l'amour maternel chez une chienne hybride," *Comptes rendus de la Société de Biologie*, lx, p. 255 sqq.

[2] E. Rabaud, *op. cit.*, pp. 74 sq. ; Manouvrier, " Un rapt de progéniture entre femelles de rat blanc," *Bulletin international de Psychologie*, 1905, cited in the foregoing.

[3] H. Gadeau de Kerville, " Faune de la Normandie," *Bulletin de la Société des Amis des Sciences Naturelles de Rouen*, 3e Serie, xxiii, p. 231.

[4] L. Büchner, *Liebe und Liebes-Leben in der Thierwelt*, p. 179.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 192.

[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 185 sq.

two broods of her own was constantly on the look-out for young animals to adopt, and appropriated young kittens, and even goslings and chickens. She was filled with delight when given a litter of twelve days' old dachshund pups, which she brought up with exemplary devotion.[1] One of Brehm's baboons evinced the same capacious maternal affection, and not only adopted young of other species, but continually carried about puppies or kittens which she had appropriated.[2] The propensity of female monkeys to adopt foster-children has been frequently and particularly observed; the extreme solicitude which is characteristic of the manifestations of the maternal instincts in monkeys, the pathetic grief which they show at the loss of their young, often carrying their corpses about and refusing to surrender them, are exhibited equally in reference to foster-young and to own offspring.[3] The maternal instincts of animals are not limited in their scope by identity of race, species or even class, and the most incongruous and astonishing maternal groups result from their indiscrimate operation. The solicitude of small singing-birds for the young cuckoos that have been foisted upon them, their tragic anxiety when the unwieldly foster-brood gets into difficulties owing to the disproportion between their size and that of the foster-parents' nest, are familiar. Birds of prey, such as sparrow-hawks and buzzards, display the same tender care towards a substituted offspring of chicks or ducklings, devotedly attempting to feed them with meat, as towards their own natural broods.[4] Bitches readily bring up litters of kittens, and cats litters of pups.[5] Cats have even been known to rear with tenderness litters of mice,[6] leverets, squirrels.[7] Such ignoring of all zoological classification is not unknown in humanity itself. The widespread habit of savage women of suckling young animals has its counterpart in the attachment shown by women in civilised societies towards animal pets, and may have played a not unimportant part in the domestication of animals. "A European woman of the illiterate class, the wife of a drayman at North End, Port Elizabeth, lost her baby when it was a few days old," relates Mr. Fitzsimons. "She developed what is commonly known as 'milk fever,' and a neighbour induced her to nurse a little mite of a baboon which had been found clinging to his mother's breast after she had been

[1] L. Büchner, *Liebe und Liebes-Leben in der Thierwelt*, pp. 185 sq.
[2] A. E. Brehm, *Thierleben*, vol. i, p. 156.
[3] *Ibid.*, vol.i, pp. 120, 153, 156; C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, vol.i, p. 106.
[4] L. Büchner, *op. cit.*, p. 181.
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 189 sq., 192.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 182.
[7] G. White, *The Natural History of Selborne*, Letter lxxvi.

shot in the act of helping herself to some fruit in the orchard. For some months this woman suckled the baby baboon, and when I saw the little fellow he was robust and chubby and full of fun. The instant a stranger approached, he, with cries of alarm, rushed to his foster-mother, climbed up her dress, and clung to her neck, looking over his shoulder with a comical expression of fear in his face. I asked the woman in jest, if she would sell him to me, whereupon gleams of fierce anger shot from her eyes, her face hardened, and she with an oath, ejaculated, 'Sell my little darling! No, never! not for a thousand pounds.'" [1]

Like the maternal instinct, so also the reciprocal filial sentiment operates identically whether the mother be own or foster.[2] The derivative sentiment between members of the same brood is likewise the same, even when these belong to different species. Brehm describes the instance of a young lioness which was reared, as is frequently done in menageries, by a bitch together with her own brood. The lioness and the pups grew up on terms of close fraternal affection; a strange dog, on the other hand, was invariably greeted by the lioness with fierce growls, and rabbits were immediately torn to pieces with native ferocity.[3] Among those gregarious animals which show developed parental instincts, such as the members of the ox-tribe and some antelopes, the defence of the young is undertaken collectively and quite irrespectively of any individual parental relations.[4] The same appears to be the case with monkeys.[5] In short, it may be said that among animals the maternal and derivative parental, filial and fraternal instincts operate in accordance with the 'classificatory,' and not with the 'descriptive,' system of relationship. It would appear that it is the former that is in a biological sense 'natural,' and the latter which is 'artificial.'

The misconception that any system of relationship, however primitive, must as a matter of course rest upon the 'actual fact' of generation arises in part from the common fallacy of ascribing to primitive ideas an intellectualistic character which is wholly foreign to them. That fallacy is embodied in the very word 'system' applied to primitive notions of kinship. It is assumed that the reckoning of kinship is of the nature of a deliberately devised and analytical 'system' constructed on the basis of what in such a scheme would be the intellectual data. But primitive

[1] F. W. Fitzsimons, *The Natural History of South Africa: Mammals*, vol. i, p. 58.

[2] L. Büchner, *op. cit.*, pp. 198 sq.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 190.

[4] *Loc. cit.*

[5] C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, vol. i, pp. 41, 75.

human social solidarity has not risen as a systematic, classificatory, organising act; it has arisen from the operation of the instincts which have created it. It is those instincts and those sentiments which constitute the 'actual facts' and the immediate data, not any ocular perception of physiological relations.

The operation of the primary social sentiments is very much the same in primitive human societies as that of the corresponding instincts in animal groups. There is, as we saw, an emphatic and general consensus of testimony to the intensity of maternal and parental instincts in uncultured societies; but the operation of those instincts is not marked by any corresponding tendency to individualisation. In advanced societies the instinctive sentiment is supplemented by the intellectual conception of the individual relationship and of the fact that the child is the mother's 'own,' her flesh and blood. In primitive society the solidarity of sentiment in the clan-group is much more intense than in any more advanced social group.[1] The instincts of the mother and also the parental instincts of the men operate with almost equal strength in regard to the children of the collective group as in regard to their individual offspring. Among the Patagonians the whole clan and not the 'family' alone, is ruled by its indulgence to the whims of a child, quite irrespectively of individual relationships.[2] When the Jesuit Father Le Jeune asked an Iroquois Indian how he could be so fond of children of whose parentage he admittedly could not be sure, considering the constant interchange of wives, the Indian looked at him contemptuously and replied: "Thou hast no sense. You Frenchmen love only your own children; we love all the children of the tribe."[3] The children, said a Canadian Indian to a more recent enquirer "belong to all the people, and we care for them; they are bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh. We are all father and mother to them. The white people are savages; they do not love their children. People have to be paid for loving orphan children."[4] In typical primitive matrilocal and matriarchal groups, the women are not separated and scattered in different households; sisters, half-sisters, female cousins, form one closely bound, solidary group. In the care and rearing, and even in the nursing of children, the closest cooperation takes place; the maternal instincts operate, as it were, collectively, the children are not so much the exclusive objects of those instincts in the individual mother, as the common children of the female group. Among the tribes of the

[1] See below, vol. ii, pp. 491 sqq.
[2] See above, p. 127.
[3] Le Jeune, in *Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, vol. vi, p. 254.
[4] J. Maclean, *Canadian Savage Folk*, p. 64.

Orinoco "the wives attend without distinction to their own children and to those of their rivals." [1] Among the Andamanese, a child is petted and nursed "not only by his own father and mother, but by everyone in the village; a woman with a nursed child will often give suck to the children of other women." [2] In Indonesia, likewise, it is usual for sisters and female relatives to assist in the suckling of a child when the mother is occupied.[3] Among the negroes of the Ivory Coast it is not usual for each mother in a polygamous family to look after her own children, but one of the wives undertakes that duty and acts collectively for the time being for all the others; "she looks after all the children equally, those of the other wives as well as her own." [4] In Australia the several wives of a man assume the care of the infants by turns and attend to them irrespectively of whether they are their own children or not.[5] "A very common, and indeed almost universal custom," says Dr. Siebert, "is that a child should be suckled not only by its mother, but also by its grandmother and likewise by other near female relatives." [6]

That spontaneous operation of the natural instincts in primitive mothers towards the common children of the group has frequently become erected into principles of group-loyalty and has given rise to usages which would otherwise appear strange. Among certain tribes of Chitral "it is customary for every infant to be suckled in turn by every nursing mother of the clan; consequently there is a constant interchange of infants going on among the mothers, for the purpose of strengthening tribal unity." [7] Throughout the Hindu Kush the interchange of children and the practice of adoption are an established institution. "The custom of foster-relationship is maintained among all the ruling families, and its ties seem more stringent than those of blood kinship. On the occasion of a son or daughter being born, the child is assigned to a foster-mother in whose house it is brought up, so that frequently the father does not see his children till they are six or seven years old, and the

[1] A. von Humboldt, *Personal Narrative of Travels to the Equinoctial Regions of the New Continent*, vol. ii, p. 454.

[2] A. R. Brown, *The Andaman Islanders*, p. 76.

[3] M. Bartels, "Die spät Lactation," *Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie*, 1896, pp. 268 sq.

[4] F.-J. Clozel and R. Villamur, *Les coutumes indigènes de la Côte d'Ivoire*, p. 100.

[5] H. Koeler, "Einige Notizen über die Eingebornen an der Ostküste des St. Vincent Golfs, Süd Australien," *Monatsberichte über die Verhandlungen der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin*, N.F., i, p. 51.

[6] O. Siebert, "Sagen und Sitte der Dieri und Nachbarstämme in Zentral-Australien," *Globus*, xcvii, p. 49.

[7] J. Biddulph, *Tribes of the Hindoo Koosh*, p. 83.

whole family of the nurse place themselves at the disposal of the foster-child with whom, for the rest of their lives their fortunes are unalterably bound up. Whatever are a man's misfortune or crime in after life his good and bad fortune are equally shared. Should exile be his lot, his foster kindred accompany him. The foster-relationship is regarded as so close that marriage between foster-relations would be looked upon as incestuous." If a man is suspected of adultery, any further misconduct on his part with the woman is insured against by obliging him to put his lips to her breast. "She thenceforth is regarded as his foster-mother, and no other relation but that of mother and son can exist between them. So sacred is the tie thus established esteemed that it has never been known to be broken, and the most jealous husband ceases to suspect even though a confession of previous guilt may have been made." The custom is said to be falling into disuse, "but it was extremely common not many years ago."[1] The same customs are found in India proper, and among the purest Aryan race. "The institution of fosterage," says Sir Alfred Lyall, "flourishes among communities so distinctive of the primitive Aryan type as the Rajputs." The family of relatives so established "has recognised hereditary claims of 'kinship by the milk.'"[2] That form of kinship is, indeed, regarded by the Rajputs as constituting true motherhood: "The Rajput mother," writes Colonel Tod, "claims her full share in the glory of her son, who imbibes at the maternal fount his first rudiments of chivalry; and the importance of this parental instruction cannot be better illustrated than in the ever-recurring simile, 'Make thy mother's milk resplendent.'"[3] Since a Rajput is usually nursed, not by his 'actual' mother, but by a foster-mother, the terms 'mother' and 'parentage' must here be understood in a 'classificatory' sense. In the Ajmere district it is said that no Rajput becomes a hero unless suckled by a woman of the Gujar clan.[4] Those notions and the practice of adoption by women are

[1] J. Biddulph, *op. cit.*, pp. 82 sq., 77.

[2] A. C. Lyall, *Asiatic Studies, Religious and Social*, First Series, p. 257.

[3] J. Tod, *Annals and Antiquities of Rajast'han*, vol. i, pp. 443 sq. The ordinary practice of juridic adoption is very prevalent among the Hindus. The form of the institution which is intended to secure an heir is, of course, quite different from the primitive customs above referred to, but is nevertheless in all probability evolved from them. "Among Hindus the adoption of a son by two who have no male issue is a regular institution, and there is a whole complicated law pertaining to it. A son being considered absolutely necessary not merely for the perpetuation of lineage, but also to perform the funeral ceremonies of his father. The adopted boy gets completely severed from his natural family, and is for almost all purposes regarded as having been actually born in the new one" (R. Vénkata Sutra Rau, *Karmala's Letters to her Husband*, p. 162).

[4] Bhimbhái Kirpáram, "Gujarát Population," *Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency*, vol. ix, Part i, p. 495.

evidently derived from the customs of communal motherhood as practised in Chitral. Similar usages are prevalent in the more primitive parts of Indonesia. Thus among the Dayaks the practice of adoption is so widespread, says one writer, that "I know men who have dozens of adopted children and adopted fathers."[1] "When a couple has arranged to adopt a child," say Drs. Hose and MacDougall, "both man and wife observe for some weeks before the ceremony all the prohibitions usually observed during the latter months of pregnancy. Many of these prohibitions may be described in general terms by saying that they imply abstention from every action that may suggest difficulty or delay in delivery; e.g., the hand must not be thrust into a narrow hole to pull anything out of it, no fixing of things with wooden pegs may be done, there must be no lingering on the threshold or entry on leaving a room. When the appointed day arrives, the woman sits in her room propped up and with a cloth round her, in the attitude commonly adopted during delivery. The child is pushed forward from behind between the woman's legs, and, if it is a young child, it is put to the breast and encouraged to suck. . . . It is very difficult to obtain admission that a particular child has been adopted and is not the actual offspring of the parents; and this seems to be due not so much to any desire to conceal the facts as to the completeness of the adoption, the parents coming to regard the child as so entirely their own that it is difficult to find words which will express the difference between the adopted child and the offspring. This is especially the case if the woman has actually suckled the child."[2] In northern Celebes, among the primitive Alfurs of Minahassa, the practice is so general that it is almost impossible to discover who are a person's actual parents.[3]

Similar usages are universal in Polynesia. In Raratonga it is obligatory in old families that every child should be suckled by several mothers.[4] It was usual for a child not to remain with its mother, but to be adopted in some other family. "The adopted members are numerous in every family, and are not distinguished from the rest. The child adopted is sometimes given in charge of a foster-mother as soon as born; at other times

[1] A. Hardeland, *Dajasch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, p. 6.

[2] C. Hose and W. MacDougall, *The Pagan Tribes of Borneo*, vol. i, pp. 78 sq.

[3] S. J. Hickson, *A Naturalist in North Celebes*, p. 282; A. F. P. Graafland, *De Minahassa*, vol. i, pp. 322 sq.; G. A. Wilken, *De verspreide geschriften*, vol. i, p. 307; vol. ii, pp. 375 sq.; De Clerg, "Over eenige maatschappelijke instelligen der inlandsche Christenen in de Minahassa," *Tijdschrift van Nederlands Indië*, i, p. 213 n.; P. N. Wilken, "Bijdragen tot de kennis van de zeden en gewoonten der Alfoeren in de Minahassa," *Mededeelingen van wege het Nederlandsche Zenderlinggenootschap*, vii, pp. 288 sq.

[4] C. E. Meinicke, *Die Inseln des Stillen Oceans*, vol. ii, p. 149.

the child is left with the parents till weaned. This system of adoption is so old and constant that mothers part with their babies apparently without a pang." The original intention of the practice "seems not now to be understood."[1] "It is common in the Tonga Islands for women to be what they call mothers to children or grown-up young persons who are not their offspring, for the purpose of providing them, or seeing that they are provided with, all the conveniences of life. This is often done although their natural mothers be living and residing near the spot."[2] The custom is, or was, the same throughout Polynesia. Thus in Hawaii "the bonds of the family are extremely loose. Often, as soon as the child was born it was handed over to some relatives, who brought it up; consequently it had not the least affection for its natural parents."[3] "A common practice existed in Hawaii," says another writer, "of giving away any children at their birth. It was, and still is, very much the custom to do so. Children so made over have at least as much, and very often more, love for their adopted than for their natural parents. They regard the real authors of their being in much the same light as uncles and aunts, and as if to assist an indefiniteness of feeling in this respect, their real and their adopted parents go by the same title as uncles and aunts, and it does not require a near connection to make an uncle or aunt. A great many wise things might be said about a custom which breaks up what has been considered the nucleus of all government, to wit, the relationship between parents and offspring."[4] Similarly in Samoa, "parents may have in their family adopted children and their own real children elsewhere. The existence of this custom has been a source of great practical difficulty to those who become converted from heathenism. No sooner are their eyes opened to see their parental responsibility and that they must give account at the judgment-seat for the manner in which they have trained up their children, than they wish to collect their offspring from the families into which they have been adopted. But then the parents who have adopted them will not give them up, and often the children are unwilling to leave their adopted parents and go among strangers, for, alas! such to them are their real parents."[5] In Nukahiva the first concern of a young woman when she becomes

[1] F. J. Moss, "The Maori Polity in the Island of Raratonga," *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, iii, p. 23.

[2] W. Mariner, *An Account of the Natives of the Tonga Islands*, vol. ii, pp. 96 sq.

[3] J. Remy, *Ka Moolelo Hawai: Histoire de l'archipel Hawaien*, p. xlii.

[4] M. Hopkins, *Hawaii: The Past, Present and Future of the Island-Kingdom*, p. 365.

[5] G. Turner, *Nineteen Years in Polynesia*, p. 179 sq.

aware of her pregnancy is to find a suitable foster-mother to adopt her child.[1] The same usages were observed in Tahiti.[2] A great French writer thus refers to those customs: "An ancient usage of the Polynesian race requires that the children should seldom remain with their actual mother. Adoptive mothers, adoptive fathers, are common there, and the family is recruited at haphazard. That traditional change of children is one of the eccentricities of Polynesian customs."[3] The 'eccentricity' is, however, found also in Melanesia. In the Banks Islands Group, in Motlav, when a child is born all the women assemble in the house and a ceremony is performed in which they stand in a circle and the child is handed round, each woman holding it for a time. The suckling of the child is undertaken by one or more of the women, and the only woman who is not permitted by custom to perform that function is its actual mother.[4] In Australia, among the natives of Yorke's Peninsula, it is customary for people to adopt other people's children, and "the foster-children are treated as their own."[5] In the Gilbert Islands the persons who pass for a man or a woman's parents are never the real parents, for it is an invariable rule that every child is adopted at at birth by foster-parents. Arrangements are made by the mother to procure parents for her child as soon as she discovers that she is pregnant. The foster-parents look after the young mother during her confinement, after which they transfer their care to her child. The latter is named not after its mother or father, but after its adoptive father or its adoptive mother according as it is a boy or a girl. The child "remains with its parents until the end of the period of suckling only, and is then transferred to its adoptive parents." Very poor people have sometimes difficulty in finding adoptive parents for their children, and may suffer the mortification of having to bring up their own children.[6] In the Pelew Islands "the custom of adopting children, especially boys, is so general and the adopted children are so completely assimilated to actual offspring that, when they grow up, they are entirely unconscious of their relationship to their real family."[7] Similar customs are found in Western Africa. Thus among the Abron of the Ivory Coast it is a widespread usage

[1] T. Waitz and G. Gerland, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, vol. vi, p. 135.

[2] J. Wilson, *A Missionary Voyage to the South Pacific Ocean*, p. 354.

[3] Pierre Loti, *Le mariage de Loti*, p. 5.

[4] W. H. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society*, vol. ii, pp. 137, 139.

[5] T. M. Sutton, "The Adjahdurah Tribe of Aborigines on Yorke's Peninsula: some of their Early Customs and Traditions," *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society of Australasia: South Australian Branch*, ii, p. 17.

[6] R. Parkinson, "Beiträge zur Ethnologie der Gilbert Insulaner," *Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, ii, pp. 33 sqq.

[7] K. Semper, *Die Palau-Inseln in Stillen Ocean*, p. 117.

that, if there are numerous children in a family, several of them are given to relatives, usually the father's brothers and sisters, the boys being handed over to their uncles and the girls to their aunts. " The children so given become in a sense own children to their adoptive fathers and mothers, and their actual father no longer has any power over them. They enjoy the same rights as the legitimate children of their adoptive parents."[1] Among the Nupe of Northern Nigeria, the first child is generally taken from its mother at birth, and suckled by another woman. Subsequent children are taken over by relatives as soon as they are weaned, " divorcing them so entirely from their own parents that the only connection left is inheritance." They are distributed among uncles and aunts. " They call them ' father ' and ' mother,' and when grown up would visit them and give them money before going to their true parents. The foster-parents would equally go to their foster-children for support in their old age, and only to their own children in the last resort." [2] So again, " the practice of adopting children is very prevalent among the Felatah," although the adoptive parents may have sons and daughters of their own. Major Denham describes, the unconsolable grief of a Felatah gentleman over the death of a foster-son who was quite unrelated to him, and expresses admiration for the natural kindness of heart manifested.[3] Among the Filane it is obligatory that all male children should go to live with their mother's brother, and they remain there until their marriage.[4] Among the Aleuts the custom of adopting children was very common. Parents were always willing to give up their children to any relative or even to strangers, to be brought up. The adopted children were in every respect on the same footing as the natural children of their adoptive parents.[5] Since this was done for no apparent advantage, and since the intensity of parental and filial affection among the Aleuts has frequently been emphasised, we must conclude that those sentiments were collective in their operation. The Haidas of the Queen Charlotte Islands are very strict in the observance of their matriarchal rules of succession ; a child takes the totem of its mother, and a man's property passes to his sister's child. But sometimes a father is

[1] F.-J. Clozel and R. Villamur, *Les coutumes indigènes de la Côte d'Ivoire*, p. 204.

[2] O. Temple, *Notes on the Tribes, Provinces, Emirates and States of the Northern Provinces of Nigeria*, pp. 327 sq.

[3] D. Denham, Capt. Clapperton and Dr. Oudney, *Travels and Discoveries in North and Central Africa*, vol. iv, p. 131.

[4] O. Temple, *Notes on the Tribes, Provinces, Emirates and States of the Northern Provinces of Nigeria*, p. 402. Cf. L. Tauxier, *Le Noir du Soudan*, p. 619.

[5] Weniaminoff, quoted by I. Petroff, " Report on the Resources, etc., of Alaska," *Tenth Census of the United States*, vol. vii, p. 159.

particularly anxious to hand his property to his son. In that case the child is given to his sister to suckle, and it is considered that he thereby becomes a member of the latter's clan, not merely by a juridic fiction, but in all reality. "The child is spoken of as belonging to the aunt." [1] Among the Cheyennes a woman was not permitted to suckle her own child until it had first been put to the breast of some of her clan-sisters.[2] Among the Minuanas of Paraguay, "the father and mother look after their children so long only as these are at the breast; the children are then handed over to some married relative, either an uncle, cousin, or brother, and they are no longer received in the home of their actual parents, or treated by these as their children. The latter, accordingly, do not recognise them as their parents, nor do they assume mourning at their death." [3] Similarly among the Bororo, as soon as the children have been weaned they enter the 'bahito' or men's house, and "only occasionally visit their parents." [4]

"Where in the world," exclaims Dr. Westermarck somewhat impatiently, "has a society been found in which it is the custom for infants to be taken away from their mothers when they are weaned, or for mothers to desert their infants?" [5] The foregoing examples may perhaps supply an answer to Dr. Westermarck's enquiry, which is all the more remarkable since the usage is found among some of the people of Morocco, a country about which he has written books and concerning which he claims special knowledge. Among the Kuntahs, a nomadic Moorish tribe of the Saharah, "brothers exchange their children, for they say it would be shameful to bring up one's own children. . . . We have found a similar custom among the Fulbeh (that is to say, the Filane), but here the sentiment is more intense and more general. Accordingly, children are never brought up in their own family unless it is impossible to do otherwise." [6] The usage appears to be a very ancient one, for King Masinissa was, we are told, in the habit of bringing up all the children of his various sons and daughters, and, no doubt, also those of his nieces and nephews, and kept them until they were three years old.[7]

[1] G. M. Dawson, "On the Haida Indians of the Queen Charlotte Islands," *Geological Survey of Canada: Report of Explorations and Surveys*, 1878–79, p. 134.

[2] G. B. Grinell, "Cheyenne Woman Customs," *The American Anthropologist*, iv, p. 16.

[3] F. de Azara, *Voyages dans l'Amérique méridionale*, vol. ii, p. 33; cf. pp. 34 sq.

[4] V. Frič and P. Radin, "Contributions to the Study of the Bororo Indians," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxvi, p. 388.

[5] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. i, p. 268.

[6] L. Tauxier, *Le Noir du Soudan*, p. 638.

[7] Athenaeus, xiii. 16.

Similar usages are found even in Europe. In Albania it is customary to exchange children, and it is considered that a boy's father is not the proper person to bring him up. The mother suckles the child for about a year and a half; the father then hands him over to his brother, if he has a married brother, and the latter will in turn hand over his own children to his brother.[1] Among the Ossetes likewise, every boy is sent away to a foster-parent as soon as he is weaned, and he does not see his mother again until he is seven years old.[2] Those 'eccentricities,' as Loti termed them, appear such only when the primitive clan-group has become broken up; to whatever other purposes the custom may have become adapted, it is in that group the normal manifestation of biological instincts. Traces of that primitive collective character of motherhood survived apparently in patriarchal Rome in the custom which so puzzled Plutarch that a woman, in her prayers to the Great Mother, should mention her sisters' children before her own.[3] In the Ladrones Islands the relation between maternal aunt and nephews is said to be closer than that between mother and children.[4] Among the Kaffirs of South Africa it is positively a matter of the greatest difficulty to discover, either by observation or enquiry, which is a boy's actual mother. "I could never ascertain from any of my Kaffirs," says Delagorgue, "which was his real mother."[5]

Collective clan-relationship thus appears to be more primitive than the family-system of relationship, and the terms by which kinship between individuals is denoted in primitive society is not an extension of the meaning they bear in regard to the relation between members of a family, but the latter are, on the contrary, adaptations of the primitive terms of clan-relationship to the family-group. For these there are no names in the primitive clan, as there is no name for the family. They can only be indicated by explanatory phrases. Of the people of the Gold Coast a missionary remarks that "if you would know of anyone who is his father and who is his mother you must put the question to him in these terms: 'Who is the father that begot you? Who is the mother that bore you?' If you ask him simply, 'What is

[1] J. G. von Hahn, *Albanische Studien*, p. 150.

[2] P. Fuchs, "Ethnologische Beschreibung der Ossetes," *Das Ausland*, 1876, p. 166.

[3] Plutarch, *Quaestiones Romanae*, xiv. The custom appears to have puzzled others besides Plutarch. Bachofen gives a most roundabout interpretation of it (*Das Mutterrecht*, p. 32), and Dr. Warde Fowler simply says that he cannot account for it.

[4] T. Waitz and G. Gerland, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, vol. v, p. 107.

[5] A. Delegorgue, *Voyage dans l'Afrique australe*, vol. i, p. 154.

the name of your father? What is the name of your mother?' it may be that he will give you successively four or five fathers and as many mothers without including the authors of his being in the number. Those whom he will give you as his fathers will be his uncles and his old male cousins who live in the same house with him, and his mothers will similarly be his aunts and old female cousins." [1]

The bonds of sentiment and common interests which constitute the forces that bind the members of the family are identical with those which in primitive society bind together the clan-group, though the former are in general weaker and more variable; the economic collectivism usual among members of the family is far more pronounced among members of the primitive clan. When, therefore, we are dealing in one instance with a family-group and in another with a clan-group, we have not to do with two forms of association having different purposes and functions, but with two equivalent and analogous human groups, the one more archaic, the other of later origin, but both functionally similar. The one is not a social and the other a reproductive association; both are equally reproductive groups. Whatever functions the primitive clan may have, the aspect and function of it which is foremost in the primitive mind is the sexual and reproductive aspect. To the Australian,[2] to the Melanesian,[3] to the North American Indian,[4] the primary purpose of clan-divisions is to indicate which individuals

[1] Le Père Gallaud, "A la Côte d'Or," *Les Missions Catholiques*, xxxv, p. 284; Sir J. G. Frazer's translation, *Totemism and Exogamy*, vol. ii, pp. 575 sq. Dr. Westermarck curiously adduces several examples of the use of defining and circumlocutory expressions to distinguish relations in the family sense of the notion, such as 'tur natuk,' my own child, instead of 'natuk'; 'tur tamina,' my real father, instead of 'tamina,' in Melanesia, and so forth, in refutation of the fact that terms of family-relationship do not exist in primitive clan society, a fact which, he declares, "has no weight" (E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. i, pp. 271 sqq.). But it would seem obvious that the expressions which he adduces testify, and that very strongly, to the very reverse of what he intends those examples to indicate. If a determining word or phrase is necessary to designate family-relationship by means of clan-relationship terms, it is fairly manifest that the latter are the more primitive and that the need to indicate the former did not arise until later.

[2] J. Dawson, *The Australian Aborigines*, p. 27; S. Gason, "The Manners and Customs of the Dieyeri Tribe of Australian Aborigines," in J. D. Woods, *The Native Tribes of South Australia*, pp. 260 sq.

[3] R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians*, p. 21.

[4] L. H. Morgan, *The League of the Iroquois*, pp. 79 sqq.; Id., *Ancient Society*, p. 180; G. H. Loskiel, *History of the Mission of the United Brethren*, vol. i, pp. 49 sq.; W. W. Warren, "History of the Ojibways," *Collections of the Minnesota Historical Society*, vol. v, p. 42.

may and which may not intermarry, and to express the concrete application of the rules prohibiting incest and regulating marriage.

Primitive Marriage Relationship.

Those rules constitute the earliest regulations imposed upon sexual relations, the most primitive institution of marriage regulations as opposed to unregulated promiscuity. But the object of those regulations is entirely different from that which we regard as the main purpose of laws of marriage and of principles of sexual morality, namely, to safeguard claims to individual sexual possession. In their origin marriage regulations had no reference to such individual relations, but to relations between groups. The terms denoting marriage relationships in the clan, or 'classificatory,' system, are similar in their collective character to those denoting consanguinity; that is to say, all the women of a similar age in the corresponding marriage group are called by a man 'wives,' and all the men are called by a woman 'husbands.' The use of the term 'wife' for all the women of the corresponding marriage group might, it has been suggested, be interpreted as 'potential' wife and not as actual wife, and as the term 'mother' need not mean actual mother, the term 'wife' need not mean actual wife. The relation between mother and son may be quite easily and naturally generalised in clan organisation by the similarity of the sentimental and functional relation between all the mother's tribal sisters and their offspring. But the relation of marriage between one man and one or more women cannot be generalised and extended in the same manner to all the women of the group if the corresponding functional and sentimental relations between them are excluded. While the use of the term 'mother' for all the actual mother's tribal sisters corresponds to an actual functional and sentimental relation, the use of the term 'wife' for all the wife's tribal sisters would not. The use of the one term would be accurate in relation to function and sentiment, the use of the other would be purely artificial and conventional. The actual relation represented by so important an institution as individual marriage would, in primitive clan-nomenclature, have no specific term to denote it. All terms of consanguineous relationship, such as 'mother,' 'father,' 'brother,' 'son,' 'uncle,' and so forth, are susceptible of being used in a sentimental, conventional, or even ceremonial manner to denote deference, good will, or fraternal feeling; but the terms 'wife' and 'husband' cannot be, and are not so used without implying the right of sexual access, which is of the essence of their meaning.

Such collective sex relations are, in fact, found to exist in conjunction with the nomenclature that implies them; a

wife's sisters and a husband's brothers (in the clan or in the family sense) are not only called 'wives' and 'husbands,' but act and are treated as such. In the following chapters existing instances of those usages will be examined. In most, though not in all, they are associated with some concomitant form of individual marriage, that is, with the closer association and more continuous cohabitation of one man with one or more women. But that individual association does not necessarily exclude collective sex relations. Under the term 'marriage' two distinct orders of relations are included which, though commonly combined in one and the same association, are not by any means invariably or necessarily so combined. Marriage is both a sexual and an economic association. But while the economic relation implies the continuous association which constitutes individual marriage as ordinarily understood, the sexual relation alone does not. The two aspects of the association are quite independent of one another, and just as sexual relations may exist without economic marriage, so also economic marriage may exist without exclusive sexual rights. It is upon the economic and not upon the sexual aspect of the relation that individual marriage rests, for it is of the essence of that economic relation, more especially as regards the contribution of the woman, that it should be an individual relation. The man may contribute the products of his hunting and his service as a warrior, to a whole group; but the economic value of a woman to primitive man lies in her more or less personal and individual service. To obtain that personal service is, in fact, the chief motive of individual marriage in most primitive communities. In accordance with the division of labour between the sexes, a man requires a woman to work for him, as a woman requires a man to provide animal food and to protect her. The foundations of individual marriage, as of the biological mating instinct, are economic and not purely sexual. The combination of exclusive individual sexual claims with economic cooperation, which appears so obvious to us, is, as the facts of ethnology show, not so obvious to primitive humanity. Claims to exclusive sexual possessions have developed, and developed somewhat tardily, in relation to the consolidation of the economic association between sexual partners, and jealousy throughout the more uncultured races has no reference to exclusive sexual possession, but precisely to the economic loss resulting from the dissolution of the association by desertion or abduction.[1] Individual economic association certainly tends to lead to exclusive sexual association, but it does not necessarily imply it.

In those societies which have preserved their primitive

[1] See below, vol. ii, pp. 100 sqq.

organisation in clans or intermarrying groups; recognised freedom of access between any male of the one group and any female of the other is, in fact, the rule rather than the exception. That recognised licence of access varies in every degree. It may be more or less limited by the claims of individual marriage; but even where the latter are most fully established and jealously enforced, a clear distinction is drawn between sexual relations with members of the husband's group and with individuals not belonging to that group. Penalties for the infringement of individual sexual rights, that is, for adultery, are almost invariably much less severe in the case of an individual who is a member of the husband's group than when the offender is not a member of that group.[1] In the former case there may be no penalty at all, while offences on the part of strangers against marital claims are subject to vengeance, punishment or compensation. In numerous instances the temporary loan or exchange of wives takes place between members of the same marriage-group.[2] Where this is the case the individual association

[1] E.g., F.-J. Clozel and R. Villamur, *Les Coutumes indigènes de la Côte d'Ivoire*, pp. 102 sq.; M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, p. 106.

[2] F. Boas, "The Central Eskimo," *Sixth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 579; J. Murdoch, "Ethnological Results of the Point Barrow Expedition," *Ninth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, pp. 412 sq.; L. M. Turner, "Ethnology of the Ungava District," *Eleventh Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 689; W. E. Parry, *Journal of a Second Voyage for the Discovery of a North-West Passage*, pp. 528 sq.; F. Nansen, *Eskimo Life*, p. 169; K. Rasmussen, *Peoples of the Polar North*, pp. 164 sq.; E. W. Hawkes, *The Labrador Eskimo*, p. 116; H. Egede, *A Description of Greenland*, p. 140; F. Boas, "The Eskimo of Baffin Land and Hudson Bay," *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*, xv, p. 158; A. L. Kroeber, "The Eskimo of Smith Sound," *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*, xv, p. 302; E. Petitot, *Dictionnaire de la langue Déné-Dindjé*, p. xxii; A. G. Morice, "The Great Déné Race," *Anthropos*, ii, p. 37; S. Hearne, *A Journey from Prince of Wales's Fort to the Northern Ocean*, p. 129; F. Sagard Théodat, *Le grand voyage du pays des Hurons*, p. 115; F. X. de Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, vol. vi, p. 38; A. Henry, *Travels and Adventures*, pp. 241 (Crees), 314 (Chippeways); A. Mackenzie, *Voyage from Montreal to the Frozen Ocean*, p. xcvi (Crees); J. Mooney, in *Nineteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 456; J. Dunn. *The Oregon Territory*, p. 70 (Crees); M. Lescarbot, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, vol. iii, p. 718; F. X. de Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, vol. vi, pp. 181, 184 (Natchez); *Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, xlviii, p. 143; F. L. de Gomara, *Primera y segunda parte de la historia general de las Indias*, p. 199 (Darien); A. de Ulloa, "Voyage to South America," in Pinkerton, *Voyages and Travels*, vol. xiv, p. 521 (Quito); F. S. Gilii, *Saggio, di storia americana*, vol. ii, p. 128 (Orinoco); A. Simson, "Notes on the Zaparos," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, vii, p. 505; Id., *Travels in the Wilds of Ecuador*, p. 173; C. Markham, "List of the Tribes of the Amazon," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxiv, p. 40; J. Orton, *The Andes and the Amazon*, p. 172 (Jibaros); F. R. do Prado, "Historia dos Indios Cavalleiros, ou da nação Guaycuru" *Revista Trimensal*, i, p. 201;

is mainly economic and does not extend to exclusive individual sexual claims, and the sex relations correspond to what is implied in the terms of clan-relationship and in the collective contract between intermarrying groups. Such a contract can never have reference to other than sexual relations, for economic association between the sexes involves individual association.

Every degree of transition is, in fact, found from complete

W. Curtis Farabee, *Indian Tribes of Eastern Peru* (*Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology*, vol. x), pp. 16, 59; J. Campbell, *Travels in South Africa*, vol. i, p. 30 (Bushmen); J. Merolla da Sorrento, "A Voyage to the Congo," in Pinkerton, *Collection of Voyages and Travels*, vol. xvi, p. 299 (Angola); J. H. Weeks, "Anthropological Notes on the Bangala of the Upper Congo River," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxxix, p. 442; A. B. Ellis, *The Tshi-speaking peoples of the Gold Coast*, p. 286; Id., *The Ewe-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast*, pp. 201 sq.; Duff Macdonald, *Africana*, vol. i, pp. 119, 173; W. E. H. Barrett, "Notes on the Customs and Beliefs of the Giriama, etc., British East Africa," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xli, p. 42; F. S. Joelson, *The Tanganyika Territory*, p. 120; J. Roscoe, "The Bahima," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxvii, p. 105; H. H. Johnston, *The Kilimanjaro Expedition*, pp. 430, 433; A. H. Post, *Afrikanische Jurisprudenz*, vol. i, p. 472; A. C. Hollis, "Notes on the History and Customs of the People of Taveta, East Africa," *Journal of the African Society*, i, p. 117; Id., *The Masai*, p. 261 sqq.; Id., *The Nandi*, p. 76 sq.; S. R. Steinmetz, *Rechtsverhältnisse*, p. 38 (Banaka); J. Hecquard, *Voyage à la côte occidentale et dans l'intérieur de l'Afrique*, p. 174 (Mandingo); A. Poupon. "Étude ethnographique des Baya de la circonscription du M'Bimou" *L'Anthropologie*, xxvi, p. 126; T. A. Barns, *The Wonderland of the Congo*, p. 205 (Babali); E. T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal*, p. 28 (Arayo); G. H. von Langsdorf, *Voyages and Travels*, vol. ii, p. 47; G. W. Steller, *Beschreibung von dem Lande Kamtschatka*, p. 347; R. V. Russell, *Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, vol. ii, p. 412 (Chamar); J. Guppy, *The Solomon Islands*, p. 43; R. Parkinson, *Dreissig Jahre in der Südsee*, p. 267 (New Ireland, New Hanover); C. E. Fox, "Social Organisation in San Cristoval," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlix, pp. 109, 118; T. Waitz, *Anthropologie*, vol. vi, pp. 130, 131, 622; A. Grimble, "From Birth to Death in the Gilbert Islands," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, li, p. 33; F. W. Christian, *The Caroline Islands*, p. 74; F. Cortes, "History of the Province of Mindanao," in E. Blair and Robertson, *The Philippine Islands*, vol. xl, p. 164; A. von Chamisso, *Reise um die Welt*, vol. ii, p. 209 (Caroline Islands), 243 (Marshall Islands); J. Remy, *Ka Mooolelo Hawaii*, p. xli; L. Bougainville, *A Voyage Round the World*, p. 257 (Tahiti); J. D. E. Schmeltz, "Ethnological Notes on the Australian Aborigines," *Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, xvi, p. 12; W. H. Willshire, *The Aborigines of Central Australia*, p. 36; W. T. Wyndham, "The Aborigines of Australia," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales*, xxiii, p. 36; E. W. Roth, *North Queensland Ethnography, Bulletin No.* 8, pp. 6-9; A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, pp. 170, 195, 216 sq., 224; E. Eylmann, *Die Eingeborenen der Kolonie Südaustralien*, p. 153; A. L. P. Cameron, "Notes on some Tribes of New South Wales," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xiv, p. 353.

freedom of access between the members of groups associated in intermarriage and individual marriage with exclusive sexual claims. There is, on the other hand, every reason to believe that the latter and the consequent regulations as regards individual relations are of later origin than collective contracts between groups. The imperative necessity which imposed such contracts in the earliest phases of human society did not call in the same manner for the regulation of individual relations between the members of the associated groups. In the self-contained and economically self-sufficient group of brothers and sisters, sexual partners need never separate from their own group, and the economic motive for their association is absent. In the majority of primitive societies such association is, as has been seen, much looser than in individual patriarchal marriage, and in some there is no cohabitation between the sexual associates; and we shall see that even where association takes place it is commonly so loose and so transient as to be scarcely distinguishable from the casual coming together of the sexes. Even where restrictions are most completely absent the relations between the sexes are never, properly speaking, promiscuous. The prohibition of incest, which is far wider in its scope in the most primitive than in the most advanced societies, not only excludes relations within the group to which an individual belongs, but necessitates a collective agreement with some other group. Sexual relations are therefore regulated by established institutions.

It is well to observe that if we view, as we are liable to do, that earlier form of marriage institution in the light of existing standards of sexual morality, and regard it as a condition approaching promiscuity, we are not only admitting a bias which is irrelevant and opposed to scientific judgment, but are led to form an estimate which is in fact inaccurate and misleading. It has always been customary with both savage and civilised peoples to speak of marriage usages differing from those established amongst themselves as ' barbarous,' ' immoral,' and similar to the promiscuity of beasts. The Singhalese who were polyandrous and polygynous spoke with disgust of the wild Veddahs, who had only one wife, as being in their marriage usages " like monkeys." [1] In South-East Africa the coast natives, among whom there are clear indications that marriage of cousins formerly prevailed, but who have now given up the custom, speak of the marriages of the inland tribes, among whom

[1] J. Bailey, " The Wild Tribes of the Veddahs of Ceylon," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society*, ii, p. 294. It need scarcely be pointed out that the remark cannot be used as a basis for the natural history of monkeys, but is equivalent to our attribution of lubricity to pigs or of abnormal ignorance to asses.

the custom still obtains, as being no better than the promiscuous intercourse of dogs.[1] The Awemba of Northern Rhodesia express their utter disgust at the practice of their neighbours, the Winamwanga, of inheriting their father's wives. The Winamwanga, on the other hand, are moved to moral indignation by the shameless custom of the Awemba of marrying their cousins.[2] The Chinese regard the marriages of matriarchal aboriginal tribes as no better than the intercourse of beasts.[3] The Greeks and the Romans spoke of all marriage usages differing from the patriarchal customs current amongst themselves at the time as promiscuity. The Jews looked upon the marriages of Christians as wholly invalid, and it was held that if a Jew had intercourse with the wife of a Christian he did not by so doing commit adultery, for Christians can scarcely be said to have any proper marriage.[4] Early missionaries described almost every form of marriage found among savage populations as shameless promiscuity. Some modern writers have employed the same language. But nothing could differ more from promiscuity than the elaborate sexual organisation of primitive society, and this is more particularly true of those organisations which come nearest to unmodified group-marriage. Promiscuity means properly the absence of sexual regulations and the unchecked operation of instincts; the sexual regulations of the Australian or Melanesian natives are beyond comparison more complex and elaborate than our own. As a matter of fact, if we seek in primitive societies for the nearest approach to a state of promiscuity, in which the operation of instincts is unchecked by juridic regulations, we shall find such conditions not where organised group-relations obtain, but in societies whose marriage customs are, according to current nomenclature, labelled 'monogamous,' such as some forest tribes of Brazil and Malaya.[5] Where sexual relations are founded upon those between intermarrying groups, they are governed by rules which modern civilised man would regard as an intolerable interference with his liberty. The savage lives in such societies in the midst of females the great majority of whom are inaccessible to him under penalty of death. Speaking of the New Hebrides, Mr. Speiser remarks that "a man may be surrounded with marriageable girls, and yet may be unable to find a wife, for he cannot marry any of them."[6] Among the Zayeins of Upper Burma the principles of group intermarriage, in

[1] G. McCall Theal, *Records of South-Eastern Africa*, vol. vii, pp. 431 sq.
[2] C. Gouldsbery and H. Sheane, *The Great Plateau of Northern Rhodesia*, p. 173.
[3] J. H. Gray, *China*, vol ii, p. 393.
[4] J. A. Eisenmenger, *Endeckles Judenthum*, vol. i, p. 433.
[5] See below, vol. ii, pp. 48, 79, 82 sq., 87, 270 sq.
[6] F. Speiser, *Two Years with the Natives of the Western Pacific*, p. 234.

a combined clan and family form to be sure, may, as we saw, lead to a tyranny so intolerable that they are scarcely able to submit to it patiently.[1] One cause which has beyond doubt led everywhere to the modification and decay of pure group-marriage organisations is their extreme inconvenience and vexatious restrictions.

[1] See above, pp. 577 sq.

CHAPTER XI

GROUP-MARRIAGE AND SEXUAL COMMUNISM

Sororal Polygyny.

IT is a widespread principle in uncultured societies that when a man marries a woman he thereby acquires marital rights over all her sisters. Thus in Australia, on the Pennefeather and Tully Rivers in Queensland, a man is understood to have the same sexual rights over all his wife's sisters as over his wife, whether they happen to be married to other men or not.[1] Among the Kurnai of South-East Australia, when a man obtains a wife from another tribe by eloping with her, her parents, after their anger has blown over and the matter has been amicably settled, hand over her sister also to their son-in-law.[2] Among the tribes of Gippsland, the men cannot be made to understand the distinction between a wife and a sister-in-law—the latter, they insist, are just as much their wives as the former.[3] In Western Australia, "where there are several sisters of a family, they are all regarded as the wives of the man who marries the eldest of them."[4] In Melanesia, it is likewise a general usage that when a man takes one woman as his individual partner, he thereby becomes the husband of all her actual sisters.[5] So also in the western islands of Torres Straits, before the conversion of the natives to

[1] W. E. Roth, "North Queensland Ethnography, Bulletin No. 10," *Records of the Australian Museum*, vii, p. 3.

[2] L. Fison and A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, pp. 202 sq.

[3] J. Bulmer, "Some Account of the Aborigines of the Lower Murray, Wimmera, Gippsland, and Maneroon," *Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society of Australasia* (*Victoria Branch*), Part i, vol. v, p. 24.

[4] A. R. Brown, "Three Tribes of Western Australia," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxxvi, p. 184.

[5] W. H. R. Rivers, *History of Melanesian Society*, vol. i, p. 49 (Banks Islands); G. Serbelov, "The Social Position of Men and Women among the Natives of East Malekula, New Hebrides," *The American Anthropologist*, N.S., xv, p. 244; W. Gunn, *The Gospel in Futuna*, p. 279; R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians*, p. 244.

Christianity, a man's wives were all sisters or cousins,[1] and even at the present day a man, there is little doubt, normally has marital relations with all his wife's sisters.[2] The traditional tales of the natives of northern New Guinea represent a man as being married as a matter of course to all the sisters of his wife.[3] Like the rule of cross-cousin marriage, the principle is a translation in terms of family-relationship of the sexual claim of a man to all the women of the group with which his own group has entered into a marriage agreement.

Among the North American tribes it was an almost universal rule that when a man married a woman he thereby acquired marital rights over her sisters. For example, among the Ojibwa "it was usual for them, when an Indian married one of several sisters, to consider himself as wedded to all; and it became incumbent upon him to take them all as wives."[4] Among the Pawnees "a man," says Murray, "having married the elder sister has a right to marry all the younger ones as they successively attain puberty. Nor is this at all unusual; on the contrary it is a common practice."[5] "It is a custom," says a missionary, "that when a savage asks a girl in marriage and gets her to wife, not only she, but all her sisters belong to him and are regarded as his wives."[6] Among the Natchez, when a man marries a woman, "if she has many sisters he marries them all, so that nothing is more common than to see four or five sisters, the wives of a single husband"[7] Similarly, among the tribes of California "the common custom is when a man marries that he takes the whole of the sisters for wives."[8] The custom "prevailed from the earliest ages among all the Dacota family as well as among the Algonkin and other tribes of the Great Lakes."[9] Morgan found it in operation in forty different tribes,[10] and it has been reported of practically every tribe of the North American continent.[11]

[1] W. H. R. Rivers, in *Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits*, vol. v, pp. 244 sq.

[2] Id., *History of Melanesian Society*, vol. ii, p. 134.

[3] R. Neuhauss, *Deutsch Neu-Guinea*, vol. i, p. 150.

[4] W. Keating, *Narrative of an Expedition to the Source of the St. Peter's River*, vol. i, p. 111.

[5] C. A. Murray, *Travels in North America*, vol. i, pp. 256 sq.

[6] *Annales de l'Association de la Propagation de la Foi*, v, (1829), p. 56.

[7] *Mémoire sur la Louisiane ou le Mississipi* (Luxembourg, 1752), p. 137.

[8] A. Forbes, *California*, p. 190.

[9] J. Gregg, *Commerce of the Prairies*, p. 303.

[10] L. H. Morgan, *Ancient Society*, p. 432.

[11] N. Perrot, *Mémoire sur les coutumes*, etc., *des sauvages*, p. 28; Le Jeune, in *Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, vol. xvi, pp. 204–6; J. F. Lafitau, *Moeurs des sauvages amériquains*, vol. i, p. 560; F. X. de Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, vol. v, p. 419; La Potherie, *Histoire de l'Amérique Septentrionale*, vol. ii, p. 31; H. R. Schoolcraft, *Indian Tribes*,

The usage appears to have been equally general in Central and South America. Thus among the natives of New Granada it was customary for a man to marry all his wife's sisters.[1] Among the Caribs, "very often the same man will take to wife three or four sisters, who will be his cousins-german or his nieces."[2] In British Guiana and among the tribes of the Orinoco a man commonly had three sisters living with him as his wives.[3] Among the Arau-

vol. v, pp. 654 sq.; L. Hennepin, *Voyage dans l'Amérique septentrionale*, p. 219; J. Carver, *Travels through the Interior Parts of North America*, p. 367; G. B. Grinell, *Blackfoot Lodge Tales*, pp. 217 sq.; W. Matthews, *Ethnography of the Hidatsa Indians*, p. 53; J. O. Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," *Third Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 261; E. James, *Account of an Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains*, vol. i, pp. 115 sq., 209; Maximilian zu Wied, *Reise in das Innere Nord Amerikas*, vol. ii, p. 130; P. Jones, *History of the Ojebway Indians*, p. 81; L. R. Masson, *Les Bourgeois de la Compagnie du Nord-Ouest*, vol. ii, p. 24; J. Gregg, *op. cit.*, p. 248; J. G. Bourke, "Notes on the Gentile Organization of the Apaches of Arizona," *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, iii, p. 118; A. L. Kroeber, "The Arapaho," *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*, xviii, Part i, p. 14; S. Hearne, *Journey from the Prince of Wales's Fort to the Northern Ocean*, p. 130; B. R. Ross, "The Eastern Tinneh," *Smithsonian Report*, 1866, p. 310; W. H. Dall, *Alaska and its Resources*, p. 138; J. Teit, "Thompson Indians of British Columbia," *Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. i, p. 326; C. Hill Tout, "Report on the Ethnology of the Stlatlumh of British Columbia," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxv, p. 131; J. F. G. de La Pérouse, *Voyage autour du monde*, vol. ii, p. 303; T. F. Cronise, *The Natural Wealth of California*, p. 24; R. E. Dixon, "The Northern Maidu," *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*, xvii, Part iii, pp. 239, 241; J. Baegert, "An Account of the Aboriginal Inhabitants of the Californian Peninsula," *Smithsonian Report*, 1863–64, p. 368; Ph. S. Sparkman, "The Culture of the Luiseño Indians," *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology*, viii, p. 214; H. H. Bancroft, *The Native Races of the Pacific States*, vol. i, p. 278 n. (Spokan); M. Lewis and W. Clarke, *Travels to the Source of the Missouri*, p. 307; F. Boas, "Second General Report on the Indians of British Columbia," *Report of the Sixtieth Meeting of the British Association*, 1890, p. 24; J. Mooney, "Myths of the Cherokee," *Nineteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 491; R. I. Dodge, *Our Wild Indians*, pp. 201 sq.; G. B. Grinell, *The Story of the Indian*, p. 46; H. A. Boller, *Among the Indians*, p. 195; J. Morse, *A Report to the Secretary of War of the United States on Indian Affairs*, p. 135; G. A. Dorsey, "Social Organisation of the Skidi Pawnees," *Congrès international des Américanistes, XVe Session* (Québec, 1906), vol. ii, p. 73; J. R. Swanton, "Indian Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley and Adjacent Coast of the Gulf of Mexico," *Bureau of Ethnology, Bulletin No.* 43, p. 95; Bossu, *Travels through that part of America formerly called Louisiana*, vol. i, p. 128.

[1] L. Fernandez de Piedrahita, *Historia general de las conquistas del nuevo Reyno de Granada*, p. 16; J. Suarez de Cepeda, "Relación de la ciudad de la Trinidad y desta de La Palma," in G. Latorre, *Relaciones geograficas de Indias*, p. 107.

[2] J. B. Labat, *Nouveau voyage aux Isles de l'Amérique*, vol. ii, pp. 77 sq.

[3] R. Schomburgk, *Reise in Britisch-Guiana*, vol. ii, p. 318; F. S. Gilii, *Saggio di storia americana*, vol. ii, p. 250.

canians, " when an Indian is able to obtain several sisters together as wives, they prefer it to marrying women who are not related to one another, because this accords with their laws." [1] Among the tribes of the Amazon and Rio Negro a man commonly married all the sisters of a family.[2] Among the Canebo of the Upper Amazon " a man must marry all the sisters of the family as soon as they are old enough " ; and the same obligation is imposed upon the Jivaros.[3] Among the Guaranis, the men " often marry several sisters." [4] So also among all the tribes of the Gran Chaco " a man has frequently two or more sisters as wives at the same time." [5] The Chriguanos commonly marry two sisters.[3] Among the Fuegians it was customary for a man to marry several sisters.[6]

Among the Guanches of the Canary Islands it was customary for a man to marry several sisters.[7] The practice is very common in Africa, more especially among the more primitive races and in those whose social organisation has undergone least modification. Among the Bushmen of the Kalahari a man usually marries several sisters or female cousins, that is, tribal sisters.[8] The custom is an old-established principle among all the Kaffirs of South Africa ; [9] and is very regularly observed by the Zulus.[10] Among the eastern South African tribes of Mozambique a man has a claim to his wife's sisters as they reach maturity ; [11] and among the natives of Portuguese East Africa a man had a recognised right over all his wife's sisters, though the practice is said to be falling into disuse at the present

[1] T. Guevara, " Folklore Araucano," *Anales de la Universidad de Chile*, cxxvii, p. 515.

[2] " Noticias geographicas da Capitania do Rio Negro no grande Amazona," *Revista Trimensal de historia e geographia*, x, p. 486.

[3] W. Curtis Farabee, *Indian Tribes of Eastern Peru* (*Papers of the Peabody Museum*, vol. x), pp. 101 sq., 118.

[4] P. Hernandez, *Misiones del Paraguay. Organización social de las doctrinas Guaranies de la Compañia de Jesús*, vol. i, p. 85. Cf. N. de Techo, " History of Paraguay and Adjacent Provinces," in Churchill, *A Collection of Voyages and Travels*, vol. iv, p. 772.

[5] G. Pelleschi, *Eight Months in the Gran Chaco of the Argentine Republic*, p. 67 ; Id., *Los Indios Matacos y su Lengua*, p. 80.

[6] C. W. Furlong, " The Vanishing People of the Land of Fire," *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, cxx, p. 221 ; A. Cojazzi, *Los Indios del Archipelago Fueguino*, p. 16 ; C. R. Gallardo, *Los Onas*, pp. 214, 217 ; Ph. Hahn, " La mère et l'enfant chez les Fuégiens du Sud (Yaghans)," *Bulletin de la Société d'Anthropologie*, Série iii, iii, p. 805.

[7] A. de Espinosa, *Del origen y milagros de N.S. de Candelaria*, p. 35.

[8] S. Passarge, *Die Buschmänner der Kalahari*, p. 106.

[9] J. A. Maclean, *A Compendium of Kaffir Laws and Customs*, pp. 61, 112, 159.

[10] J. Shooter, *The Kafirs of Natal and the Zulu Country*, p. 46 ; F. Speckmann, *Die Hermannsburger Mission in Afrika*, p. 135.

[11] H. A. Junod, *The Life of a South African Tribe*, vol. i, pp. 251 sq.

day.[1] Similarly, among the Herero of western South Africa a man cannot marry a younger sister without marrying her elder sister also.[2] Sororal polygyny is observed as a matter of course by the tribes of the Upper Congo. Among the Ba-Congo " a man who has bought a woman has thereby a right to all her marriageable sisters in turn. To what extent a man would exercise the right it is difficult to say, but in theory he could go on as long as there remained an eligible girl in the family." [3] Sororal polygyny has been reported among the Bangala,[4] and the Wabemba.[5] In East Africa, among the Basoga, the bride is accompanied to her husband's home by a sister, who joins the household as a secondary wife.[6] Among the Bagesu of Uganda it is usual for a man to marry all his wife's sisters,[7] and the same is the practice of the Banyoro.[8] Among the tribes of Kavirondo the younger sisters of a man's wife join her as they become of age.[9] The same usages are observed by the tribes of northern Nigeria,[10] and of the French Sudan.[11]

The practice of sororal polygyny is usual among the more primitive races of Siberia, such as the Chukchi,[12] the Kamchadals,[13] the Ostyak.[14] It is an old-established custom among both the eastern Mongols [15] and the western Mongols, or Kalmuks.[16] Jinghis Khan married two sisters, and the practice was taken for granted among

[1] M. Monteiro Lopes, " Usages and Customs of the Natives of Sena," *Journal of the African Society*, vi, p. 365.

[2] E. Dannert, *Zum Rechte der Herero*, p. 38. Cf. H. Schinz, *Deutsch-Süd-West-Afrika*, pp. 172 sq.

[3] G. C. Claridge, *The Wild Tribes of Central Africa*, p. 83.

[4] A. Huterau, *Notes sur la vie familiale et juridique de quelques populations du Congo Belge*, p. 68 ; J. H. Weeks, *Among Congo Cannibals*, p. 130.

[5] C. Delhaise, *Notes ethnologiques sur quelques populations du Tanganika*, pp. 18 sq.

[6] J. Roscoe, *The Northern Bantu*, p. 282 ; G. A. S. Northcote, " The Nilotic Kavirondo," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxxvii, p. 62.

[7] J. Roscoe, *The Northern Bantu*, pp. 173 sq.

[8] *Emin Pasha in Central Africa*, p. 86. Cf. J. Roscoe, *The Bakitara, or Banyoro*, p. 280.

[9] C. W. Hobley, *Eastern Uganda*, p. 17 ; H. H. Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate*, vol. ii, p. 747 ; G. A. S. Northcote, " The Nilotic Kavirondo," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxxvii, p. 61.

[10] O. Temple, *Notes on the Tribes, Provinces, Emirates and States of the Northern Provinces of Nigeria*, pp. 153, 169.

[11] L. Tauxier, *Le Noir du Soudan*, pp. 95, 139.

[12] W. Bogoras, *The Chukchee*, p. 598.

[13] G. W. Steller, *Beschreibung von dem Lande Kamtschatka*, p. 347.

[14] P. S. Pallas, *Reise durch verschiedene Provinzen des Russischen Reichs*, vol. iii, p. 51.

[15] L. Dubeux and V. Valmont, *Tartarie*, p. 226.

[16] A. C. Borheck, *Erdbeschreibung von Asien*, vol. i, pp. 105 sq. ; B. Bergmann, *Nomadische Streifereien unter den Kalmuken*, vol. iii, p. 146.

his warriors and khans.[1] The same usage was observed in ancient times by the Chinese. We read of the famous emperor Yao bestowing both his daughters on the Chinese prince Shuenn, and accompanying them himself with great formality on their journey to their appointed bridegroom, bidding them to "fulfil all their duties with respect and diligence in the home of their husband."[2] In a Chinese novel the hero is rewarded for his exemplary virtue by his protector bestowing upon him the hands of both his daughters.[3] The same usage obtained among the ancient Japanese; "to wed two or more sisters at the same time was a recognised practice."[4] We find the same practice in Tibet.[5] Among the primitive Moï of Indo-China it is usual to take the first wife's sisters as co-wives;[6] and the same usage is observed in Cambodia.[7] It is likewise the custom in Siam.[8] Among the Malays of the Patani States the most common form of polygyny is the simultaneous marriage of several sisters.[9] The custom prevails among the tribes of Upper Burma[10] and of Manipur.[11] It is observed by the Garos of Assam.[12] Sororal polygyny was in vogue among the ancient Indo-Aryans; one of the most illustrious of the Rishis is reported to have married no less than ten sisters at the same time.[13] The practice is common in the Panjab.[14] We find it among the tribes of the Rajmahal Hills,[15] and among the Gonds,[16] and it prevails among several other native tribes of Central India.[17] It is likewise

[1] Abul Ghazi, *History of the Tartars*, pp. 14 sq., 100, 157.

[2] *Shu-King*, i. 1. 12, ed. S. Couvreur, pp. 11 sq.

[3] *Iu-Kiao-Li, ou les deux cousines*, translated by J. P. Abel Rémusat.

[4] B. Hall Chamberlain, "Ko-Ji-Ki, or Records of Ancient Manners," *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, x, *Supplement*, p. xxxviii.

[5] See below, p. 649.

[6] J. Canivey, "Notice sur les moeurs et coutumes des Moï," *Revue d'Ethnographie et de Sociologie*, vi, p. 5.

[7] J. Moura, *Le royaume du Cambodge*, vol. i, pp. 426 sqq.

[8] Turpin, *History of Siam*, in Pinkerton, *Voyages and Travels*, vol. ix, p. 585.

[9] N. Annandale and H. C. Robinson, *Fasciculi Malayenses*, vol. ii, p. 73.

[10] J. G. Scott and J. P. Hardiman, *Gazetteer of Upper Burma and the Shan States*, vol. i, pp. 405, 407.

[11] C. A. Soppitt, *A Short Account of the Kuki-Lushai Tribes of the North-East Frontier*, pp. 15 sq.

[12] A. Playfair, *The Garos*, p. 69.

[13] E. Balfour, *Cyclopaedia of India and Eastern and Southern Asia*, vol. iv, p. 621.

[14] Pandit Harikishen Kaul, in *Census of India*, 1911, vol. xiv, "Panjab," Part i, pp. 289 sq.

[15] T. Shaw, "On the Inhabitants of the Hills near Rájamahall," *Asiatick Researches*, iv, pp. 59 sq.

[16] R. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India* vol. iii, p. 72.

[17] *Ibid.*, vol. ii, pp. 26 sq. (Ahirs); vol. iii, pp. 286 sq. (Kachis), 393 (Telis 559 (Korkus).

prevalent in Mysore and Southern India.[1] We know from the account of the marriage of Jacob that it was a recognised usage among the ancient Jews.[2]

In Ceram in a polygynous family the wives are almost invariably sisters;[3] and in Central Celebes a man cannot marry a younger sister unless he first marries the elder.[4] In the Philippine Islands a man usually took as wives all the sisters of a family.[5] The same practice is common among the Negritos of Zambales.[6] In the Marshall Islands "when a man marries a woman he is regarded as married to all her sisters."[7] The same view obtains in the Gilbert Islands,[8] and among the Mortlock Islanders.[9] In the Kingsmill or Line Islands, "if a woman has sisters, then the sisters become the wives of her husband on her own marriage, and no other man can ever take them as wives." According to the same authority, if the husband does not find it convenient to take charge of all the sisters, there is no alternative for the latter than to contract casual alliances; they become, in fact, what we should call prostitutes.[10]

In New Zealand it was common for a man when he married a woman to take her sisters also.[11] When the sailor Rutherford, who was adopted in a Maori tribe, was requested to select a wife,

[1] H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnological Survey of Mysore*, vol. ii, p. 7, vol. ix, p. 3, vol. xiii, p. 5, vol. xv, p. 13, vol. xvi, p. 2, vol. xxi, pp. 4, 7, vol. xxx, p. 6; E. Thurston, *Tribes and Castes of Southern India*, vol. v, p. 55.

[2] *Genesis*, xxix. 21–30.

[3] M. C. Schaadee, "Heirats- und andere Gebräuche bei den Mansela und Nusawele Alfuren in der Intertheilung Wahaai der Insel Seram," *Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, xxii, p. 135.

[4] A. C. Kruijt, "Eenige ethnografische aanterkeningen omtrent de Toboengkoe en de Tomori," *Mededeelingen van wege het Nederlandsche Zendelinggenootschap*, xliv, p. 234.

[5] A. de Morga, *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas*, in E. H. Blair and J. A. Robertson, *The Philippine Islands, 1493–1898*, vol. xvi, p. 129.

[6] W. Allan Reed, *The Negritos of Zambales*, p. 61.

[7] F. Hartzer, *Les îles blanches de la Mer de Sud*, p. 14. Cf. Jung, "Aufzeichnungen über die Rechtsanschauungen der Eingeborenen von Nauru," *Mitteilungen aus den Deutschen Schutzgebieten*, x, p. 66.

[8] A. Krâmer, *Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa*, p. 334.

[9] J. Kubary, "Die Bewohner der Mortlock-Inseln," *Mitteilungen der geographischen Gesellschaft in Hamburg*, 1878–79, p. 37.

[10] Tutuila, "The Line Islanders," *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, i, p. 267. According to another account, however, the sisters might marry, but their suitors had to obtain the permission of the eldest sister's husband (H. S. Cooper, *The Coral Islands of the Pacific*, p. 315). The two accounts probably represent phases in the development of the usage.

[11] M. J. Dumont d'Urville, *Voyages de la corvette l'Astrolabe*, vol. ii, pp. 436 sq.; J. Savage, *Some Account of New Zealand*, p. 44; E. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, p. 298; E. Best, "Maori Marriage Customs," *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute*, xxxvi, pp. 29, 63.

the father of the young woman called her sister, and he "advised me," says Rutherford, "to take them both."[1] In Samoa "it was a common practice in the old days for a woman to take her sister or sisters with her, and these became practically the concubines of her husband." It does not appear, however, to be quite correct to call them 'concubines' for each younger sister brought her dowry with her in the same manner as her elder sister.[2] If a sister was not available, the wife brought with her a cousin or some other near relative.[3] Even long after the conversion of the natives to Christianity it was considered that the husband of the elder sister had the disposal of the younger sisters, and intending suitors applied to him and not to her parents.[4] Similarly, in the Hervey Islands a bride was followed to her husband's home by all her sisters, who became his co-wives.[5] In the Marquesas a man had marital rights over all his wife's sisters, whether these married other men or not.[6]

The same causes which tend to limit every kind of polygamy restrict sororal polygyny in practice; it is sometimes a severe strain on a man's resources to marry a whole family. That difficulty is, however, often relieved by the fact that, since in primitive society girls usually marry at puberty, the younger sisters are not marriageable at the time of their elder sisters' marriage; and by that time the man's circumstances may have improved so as to enable him to maintain a larger family. From those usages follows the rule which is observed in most parts of the world, that it is unlawful for a younger sister to be married before her elder sister. That rule, on which Laban insisted when he gave his daughters to Jacob, namely that "it must not be done so in our country, to give the younger sister before the first-born," is a matter of fundamental morality, not only in most of the lower phases of culture, but in societies so highly civilised as that of China, and it has left traces at the present day even in England and in Scotland.[7]

If the husband does not wish, or cannot afford, to exercise his claim on his wife's sisters, he allows them to marry other men,[8]

[1] G. L. Craik, *The New Zealanders*, pp. 196 sq.

[2] G. Brown, *Melanesians and Polynesians*, p. 123. Cf. J. B. Stair, *Old Samoa*, p. 175; S. Ella, "Samoa," *Report of the Fourth Meeting of the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science*, p. 628.

[3] G. Kurze, "Die Samoanern in den heidnische Zeit," *Mitteilungen der geographischen Gesellschaft (für Thuringen) zu Iena*, xix, p. 6.

[4] H. S. Cooper, *The Coral Islands of the Pacific*, p. 315.

[5] W. W. Gill, *The South Pacific and New Guinea*, p. 14.

[6] L. Tautain, "Étude sur le mariage chez les Polynésiens (Mao'i) des îles Marquises," *L'Anthropologie*, vi, p. 644.

[7] J. G. Frazer, *Folk-lore in the Old Testament*, vol. ii, pp. 288 sq.

[8] E. James, *Account of an Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains*, vol. i, pp. 115 sq.; W. Matthews, *Ethnography of the Hidatsa*

but in order to do so his consent is necessary ; [1] when a bride-price is due it is sometimes to him and not to the girl's relatives that it is paid.[2] An additional sister is given as a matter of course if the first sister proves to be barren ; the younger sister either replacing her, or joining her in her husband's household.[3] The woman whom a man has married may be exchanged for another sister for no other reason than incompatibility of temper, or simply because the man wishes it.[4] Of the Indians of the Oregon, for example, it is remarked that " the parents do not seem to object to a man's turning off one sister and taking a younger one," that prerogative being " a custom handed down from time immemorial." [5] In Australia, however, among the Gournditch-mara, if a man has repudiated his wife he loses his claim to her sisters, being regarded as having divorced the whole family.[6] Among the Tartars, if the wife dies before the payment of the bride-price is completed, the sum already paid goes towards the acquisition of her sister ; but if there is no sister to take the wife's place the whole of the deposit is lost.[7] In other instances the husband or bridegroom may demand a refund of the bride-price, should the family refuse to supply the widower with another wife.[8] A deceased wife's sister is supplied to the widower without extra

Indians, p. 53 ; L. H. Morgan, *Ancient Society*, p. 432 ; H. H. Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate*, vol. ii, p. 747.

[1] J. Teit, " The Thompson Indians of British Columbia," *Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. i, pp. 591 sq. ; C. W. Hobley, *Eastern Uganda*, p. 17 ; J. Moura, *Le Royaume du Cambodge*, vol. i, p. 428 ; W. Crooke, *The Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh*, vol. iv, p. 224 ; R. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, vol. iii, p. 80 ; H. S. Cooper, *The Coral Islands of the Pacific*, p. 315.

[2] C. G. Seligman, *The Melanesians of British New Guinea*, p. 736.

[3] R. B. Dixon, " The Shasta," *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*, v, pp. 463 sq. ; G. McCall Theal, *Records of South-East Africa*, vol. vii, p. 433 ; J. Roscoe, *The Northern Bantu*, p. 282 ; L. Decle, *Three Years in Savage Africa*, p. 158 ; G. A. S. Northcote, " The Nilotic Kavirondo," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxvii, p. 62 ; A. Kruyt " De Timoereezen," *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch Indië*, lxxix, p. 362 ; E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, vol. iv, p. 147 ; H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnological Survey of Mysore*, vol. xxx, p. 6.

[4] J. F. Cunningham, *Uganda and its Peoples*, p. 226 (Bakongo); W. Matthews, *Ethnography of the Hidatsa Indians*, p. 53 ; *Emin Pasha in Central Africa*, p. 209 (Monbuttu).

[5] H. R. Schoolcraft, *Indian Tribes*, vol. v, p. 655.

[6] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 250.

[7] J. G. Georgi, *Description de toutes les nations de l'Empire de Russie*, vol. ii, p. 191.

[8] F. Warneck, " Das Eherecht bei den Toba-Batak," *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, liii, p. 535 ; C. J. Temminck, *Coup d'oeil général sur les possessions néerlandaises*, vol. ii, p. 55 ; C. Keysser, in R. Neuhauss, *Deutsch Neu-Guinea*, vol. iii, p. 87.

payment,[1] or at a reduced rate.[2] Among the Kalmuks the right to marry a deceased wife's sister is regarded as a claim which a man is entitled to enforce. Should the father be unwilling to yield the younger sister to the widower, the latter calls on him, places bread and salt on the table, whereupon the father is held bound to give up the younger sister.[3] Among the Kirghis failure to hand over the deceased wife's sister is an offence punishable by law.[4] So strong is the claim than among the Flat-heads and other Oregon tribes, if the deceased wife's sister is already married to another man, she is obliged to leave him and marry the widower.[5] Among the Wabemba of the Congo, if a man's wife dies, and all her sisters are married, the husband of one of them must allow his wife to cohabit for one or two nights with the widower. Unless this is done the latter cannot marry another woman.[6] The same rule is observed by the Baholoholo; so essential is the observance accounted that if the surviving sister be a mere infant, the widower goes through the form of imitating the sexual act and pretending to have connection with the infant, although he does not marry her.[7] In the last instances the usage of sororal succession has become a mere ritual. We shall see that similar ritual survivals abound in relation to the corresponding custom of fraternal succession, or the levirate. The observance of the ritual derives its obligatory or beneficial character from its formal conformity with established custom; for to comply with an established custom is always lucky, and to omit its observance unlucky. With the Wabemba, when the sister happens to be an infant she is nevertheless handed over to the widower, but a slave-girl is sent with her to act as a substitute until the girl grows to nubile age.[8] Similarly among the Assiniboins if, when a man's wife dies, her sister is still immature, she is kept for him until she attains puberty.[9] The same rule as to age must, however, be observed in marrying a deceased wife's sister as when

[1] R. I. Dodge, *Our Wild Indians*, p. 202; C. G. Seligman, *The Melanesians of British New Guinea*, p. 738; Fama Mademba, "Die Sansandig-Staaten," in S. R. Steinmetz, *Rechtsverhältnisse von eingeborenen Völkern in Afrika und Ozeanien*, p. 69; F. Warneck, *loc. cit.*; C. J. Temminck, *loc. cit.*

[2] L. Tauxier, *Le Noir du Soudan*, pp. 95, 139; P. S. Pallas, *Reise durch verschiedene Provinzen der russischen Reichs*, vol. iii, p. 51.

[3] A. C. Borheck, *Erdbeschreibung von Asien*, vol. i, pp. 105 sq.

[4] L. Koslow, "Das Gewonheitsrecht der Kirghisen," *Russische Revue*, xxi, p. 463.

[5] H. R. Schoolcraft, *Indian Tribes*, vol. v, pp. 654 sq.

[6] C. Gouldsbury and H. Sheane, *The Great Plateau of Northern Rhodesia*, pp. 171 sq.

[7] R. Schmitz, *Les Baholoholo*, pp. 225 sq.

[8] C. Gouldsbury and H. Sheane, *loc. cit.*

[9] R. H. Lowie, "The Assiniboine," *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History*, iv, Part i, p. 41.

marrying her during the wife's lifetime. Thus among the Kaikari of central India, a man may marry his deceased wife's younger sister, but may not marry her elder sister.[1]

Marriage with a deceased wife's sister is sometimes regarded in the light of a moral obligation rather than as a claim or privilege. Thus the Iroquois widower who failed to do so was subjected to such abuse on the part of the insulted lady that he seldom failed to comply.[2] Among the Shuswap of British Columbia the widower was actually kept a prisoner by the deceased wife's family until the period of mourning was over, and was released from his imprisonment on condition only that he married the deceased lady's sister.[3] On the island of Engano the widower who failed to marry his deceased wife's sister was punished with a heavy fine.[4] The abnormal notion that it is reprehensible to marry one's deceased wife's sister is a rare anthropological curiosity which appears to be found only among the natives of New Britain, some Chinese tribes, and some natives of Ashanti.[5]

The rule that when a man's wife dies he marries her sister, which is often the only survival of sororal polygyny, is thus clearly an attenuated relic of the widespread claim of a man to all the sistersof a family when he marries one of them, and it would be difficult to find any two social facts the connection between which is so manifest and so fully exhibited by every possible transition and similarity in the mode of their observance. Nevertheless, in accordance with an even more general rule, those people who observe the rule of marrying their deceased wife's sister, but who have given up simultaneous sororal polygyny,[6] do not admit that they at present

[1] R. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, vol. iii, p. 298.

[2] F. X. de Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, vol. v, p. 419.

[3] F. Boas, "Second General Report on the Indians of British Columbia," *Report of the Sixtieth Meeting of the British Association* (Leeds, 1890), p. 91.

[4] J. Winkler, "Bericht über die zweite Untersuchungsreise nach der Insel Engano," *Tijdschrift voor Indische taal-, land- en volkenkunde*, l, p. 152.

[5] E. Lunet de Lajonquière, *Ethnographie du Tonquin septentrional*, p. 293 (Pa-teng); G. Zündel, 'Land und Volk der Eweer auf der Sclavenkuste in Westafrika," *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin*, xii, p. 390. Dr. Keating says that among the Pottowatomies the marriage of a deceased wife's sister, though not forbidden, "was always looked upon as an improper connection" (W. H. Keating, *Narrative of an Expedition to the Source of St. Peter's River*, vol. i, p. 111). But this is so radically opposed to the customs of all North American tribes that we are justified in doubting the accuracy of the statement.

[6] E.g. J. Roscoe, "Worship of the Dead as practised by some African Tribes," *Harvard African Studies*, vol. i, p. 35; J. A. Dorsey, "Siouan Sociology," *Fifteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 244 (Biloxi); R. B. Dixon, *The Chimariko Indians and Language* (*University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology*, vol. v, No. 5),

practise the former custom because they once practised the latter, and that their present usage is derived from one which they now condemn, but justify their practice by independent considerations of sentiment or expediency. Thus the natives of the Hervey Islands, who until quite lately practised as a matter of course sororal polygyny, are all at the present day good Christians and their heathen customs have entirely ceased; but "a woman feels herself to be deeply injured if her brother-in-law does not, on the death of his wife, ask her to become a mother to his children."[1] Similarly, some Omaha Indians, among whom sororal polygyny was a time-honoured practice, but who now conform to Christian usages, are reported to submit that marriage of a deceased wife's sister is expedient because "the children bereft of their own mother . . . would come under the care of her close kindred, and not fall into the hands of a stranger," or that the usage "shows a respect for the dead."[2] In like manner writers on anthropological subjects to whom the application of the theory of evolution to the human race is repugnant, have no hesitation in declaring that they cannot "find any reason for the assumption that the custom of marrying a deceased wife's sister is derived from the custom of marrying her other sister in her lifetime."[3]

The peoples who practise sororal polygyny and the missionaries and other writers who interpret their customs have likewise good reasons to offer for the origin and observance of the usage. The favourite explanation given by travellers and missionaries who report the custom as a peculiarity of the peoples they are describing is that it is desirable in a polygynous family that the wives should be sisters, because sisters are more likely to live together in harmony. The wives of an American Indian are said to live together "in the greatest harmony."[4] If, however, a man marries into two different families, "the wives," it is alleged, "do not harmonise well together, and give the husband much inquietude."[5] But there is an overwhelming mass of testimony to the perfect harmony obtaining between wives in polygynous families, whether the wives be sisters or not.[6] Where polygyny

p. 301; R. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, vol. iv, p. 520 (Sumars).

[1] W. W. Gill, *The South Pacific and New Guinea*, p. 14.

[2] A. C. Fletcher and F. La Flesche, "The Omaha Tribe," *Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology*, p. 313, cited by E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. iii, p. 96.

[3] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. iii, p. 263.

[4] J. Carver, *Travels through the Interior Parts of North America*, p. 367.

[5] E. James, *Account of an Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains*, vol. i, p. 119.

[6] See below, vol. ii, pp. 257 sqq.

obtains, the women are the most persistent advocates of the practice, and additional wives are in most instances acquired at the desire of a man's wife or wives, and are very commonly selected by them.[1] There is nothing to indicate that the wives in a polygynous family are more prone to quarrel among themselves than other persons who live together, or that wives who are sisters are less liable to disagree than those who are not. In contradiction to the assumption of several writers, La Potherie asserts that sisters among the North American Indians are often particularly quarrelsome, and that their disputes are sometimes so lively that they attack one another with knives.[2] The value of the psychological suppositions as to the greater harmony between wives who are sisters offered by uncultured peoples when pressed to account for their customs, is pointedly illustrated by the opinion of the Ostyak on the subject. Although it is their immemorial custom to marry several sisters, and they say that the observance of the usage brings luck,[3] they nevertheless state that the arrangement is unsatisfactory and that they would prefer to marry women who are unrelated, "because experience shows that sisters are particularly liable to disagree in such marriages."[4]

The practice of sororal polygyny, like every other traditional custom, presents, there can be no doubt, many advantages that could be adduced in its defence or serve as an inducement for its observance; but usages and customs do not generally owe their origin to the careful 'a priori' weighing of fine points of psychology. It may be doubted whether Melanesian savages are much concerned about the amicable nature of the relations between their wives, about respect for their deceased wives, or proper qualifications in the nurses of their children. None of those alleged beneficial effects of the practice is applicable to ethnological facts as we find them; they do not account for a man having to marry his wife's sisters against his will, or for his collecting the bride-price when they marry other men, or for his having to wait, with a slave-girl as a substitute, when those sisters are still infants in arms, or for his having a recognised right of access to them whether he marries them or not. With peoples in the lowest stage of social organisation the practice of sororal polygyny and of sororal succession is, like that of cross-cousin marriage, the automatic effect of the principles which constitute the foundation of their social organisation, namely, the rule of marriage between intermarrying groups. Like the principle

[1] See below, vol. ii, pp. 261 sqq.

[2] La Potherie, *Histoire de l'Amérique Septentrionale*, vol. i; p. 31.

[3] M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, p. 126, after Pallas.

[4] M. A. Castrén, *Ethnographische Vorlesungen über die altaischer Völker*, p. 119.

of cross-cousin marriage, that of sororal polygyny in its narrower sense is a translation in terms of family relationship of the wider conceptions of clan-relationship. In the one case the cross-cousins and the sisters are what we, in accordance with the family system, call 'actual,' or 'own' cousins, and 'own' sisters; in the other they are cousins and sisters in the tribal sense, and according to the system of relationship obtaining in more primitive societies. If relationship be reckoned from the point of view of the clan-group, the term 'wife' includes all the women of the corresponding marriage-group, and all those women are 'sisters'; that a man's wives should be sisters is not a right or claim, or a matter of policy, but a consequence of primitive organisation to which there exists no alternative. According to the clear and oft-quoted description of Dr. Codrington, "speaking generally, it may be said that to a Melanesian man all women, of his own generation at least, are either sisters or wives; to the Melanesian woman all men are either brothers or husbands. . . . . It must not be understood that a Melanesian regards all women who are not of his own division as in fact his wives, or conceives himself to have rights which he may exercise in regard to those women of them who are unmarried; but the women may be his wives by marriage, and those who cannot be so stand in a widely different relation to him; and it may be added that all women who may become wives by marriage and are not yet appropriated, are to a certain extent looked upon by those who may be their husbands as open to more or less legitimate intercourse. In fact, appropriation of particular women to their husbands, though established by every sanction of native custom, has by no means so strong a hold in native society, nor in all probability so deep a foundation in the history of the people, as the severance of either sex by divisions which most strictly limit the intercourse of men and women to those of the section or sections to which they do not themselves belong."[1] Translated into terms of the relationship set up by the smaller family-group, those principles imply that a man has a right to all the women of the group into which he marries. The true reason for the principle of sororal polygyny in its various forms is very clearly stated by the Omaha woman who, according to the Rev. J. Owen Dorsey, says to her husband: "I wish you to marry my brother's daughter, as she and I are one flesh." Instead of 'brother's daughter,' she may say her sister or her aunt.[2]

The converse or complementary aspect of the rule that when a man contracts a marriage with a family he marries all the marriage-

[1] R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians*, pp. 22 sq.

[2] J. O. Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," *Third Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 261.

able females of that family is the principle that when a woman contracts a marriage with another family she marries all the marriageable males of that family. The simultaneous observance of the two rules constitutes a marriage between the two groups or families irrespectively of the relations between the several individuals composing them. The one-sided observance of sororal polygyny and perhaps also of fraternal polyandry are, however, at the present day much more common than the combination of the two practices as complete group-marriage. The reason of this is, on consideration, plain. The combination of the two practices is, as we have already noted, an unstable arrangement; for unless the groups to which the men and the women respectively belong be supposed to be broken up and a new grouping of men and women substituted for the original groups, the arrangement can only operate in an unmodified form where sexual relations do not entail permanent cohabitation. As soon as marriage involves not only sexual relations, but also economic interdependence and association, such an arrangement becomes almost impracticable in an unmodified form; for no economic association can take place between a man and a woman or group of women unless the labour of those women is in some degree specially allotted to the man, unless, therefore, he has an individual right to their labour. Unmodified group-marriage is, thus, a practicable arrangement so long only as sexual relations remain completely independent of economic relations between the associates; and directly such economic factors enter into that relation the organisation must of necessity break up into one or the other of its constituent aspects, into sororal polygyny or fraternal polyandry. But the whole development of individualism, of individual property, and of personal economic interests has taken place mainly in the hands of the men and not of the women, and in human societies as they exist at the present day the economic advantages are generally in favour of the men. Since it is those very factors which constitute the chief difficulty in the practical operation of unmodified group-marriage, it is naturally to be expected that when that organisation breaks up, it will do so in the form of sororal polygyny rather than in that of fraternal polyandry. And in fact fraternal polyandry, although scarcely less widespread in its distribution than sororal polygyny, is found to be considerably less common.

Not only is it less common, but pure fraternal polyandry is, in point of fact, even more rare than it is generally supposed and currently stated to be. For if those customs which are usually described as fraternal polyandry be more closely enquired into, it will be found in a large proportion of instances that, in addition to the rule of fraternal polyandry, that of sororal polygyny is either actually observed also or that there are strong indications that it

was until lately observed. In other words, although primitive group-marriage customs frequently assume the modified form of sororal polygyny without polyandry, when fraternal polyandry survives, the converse aspect of the collective relation survives also; and most instances of fraternal polygamous marriage are in reality examples of complete group-marriage and not of its decay in the form of fraternal polyandry. Accordingly, instead of reviewing separately reported instances of fraternal polyandry and of group-marriage, we shall consider together those survivals of primitive marriage institutions.

Collective Marriage among the Peoples of Northern Asia.

We will begin our survey in that region which includes the north-eastern portion of Asia and the adjoining northern portion of the American continent, and which constitutes a cultural and ethnical link between the old world and its civilisations and the new world of America which has remained comparatively isolated in its development.

The Gilyak are a palaeo-Asiatic race inhabiting the region of the lower Amur river, immediately north of Manchuria, and the northern parts of the adjacent island of Sakhalin. Our information concerning their customs illustrates the confusion to which I have just referred. An old Japanese traveller mentions incidentally that Gilyak women have several husbands.[1] The more recent account of an able French traveller gives us more specific details. Brothers have their wives to some extent in common; when an elder brother is absent on a journey his younger brother enjoys marital rights over his wife, although the converse does not hold. " Villages are inhabited as a rule by members of the same family; every Gilyak comes into the world with so many fathers and so many mothers that it is somewhat difficult to understand their system of relationship."[2] Another traveller reports that their sexual relations are indiscriminate, and that the circumstance is accounted for by the tradition that " in earlier times cousins (' rus-er ') had the juridic right of collective use of cousins and even of the sisters of cousins."[3] Such information has, however, been greatly amplified by the extensive investigations, including a census, conducted among the Gilyak by Dr. Leo Y. Sternberg, the distinguished director of the Peter the Great Museum of Anthropology of the former Imperial

[1] Mama Rinso, " To-tato ki ko, d. i., Reise nach der ostlichen Tartarei," *Nippon, Archief voor de beschrijving van Japan*, vol. vii, p. 169. Cf. E. G. Ravenstein, *The Russians on the Amur*, p. 391.

[2] P. Labbé, *Un bagne russe, l'île de Sakhaline*, pp. 170 sq., 167.

[3] C. H. Hawes, *In the Uttermost East*, p. 263.

Russian Academy of Science. The Gilyak are strictly organised into exogamic intermarrying classes, and every member, male and female, of one class marries into the corresponding marriage class to which he or she is allotted from birth. Those classes correspond exactly to the degrees of relationship, and the terms used to denote these indicate at the same time the norms of their marriage regulations. Thus the woman whom a man is bound to marry is his cross-cousin; on the other hand all other cousins, the daughters of a father's brother or of a mother's sister, are strictly barred even in the remotest degree, and are called 'yoch,' which implies that they are absolutely tabu and inviolable. The name given by a man to the women whom he may marry is 'angej,' and the name given by a woman to the men whom she may marry is 'pu.' Individual marriage takes place, that is, a woman becomes the particular economic associate of a man. But the economic husband possesses no exclusive sexual rights over the woman: "all people who are in the relation of 'angej' and 'pu' have really the right of sexual intercourse, not only before, but also after, individual marriage." When her husband is absent a wife is free to receive any man who is 'pu' to her; his brothers (actual and tribal) living in the same village or neighbourhood do customarily use that right, and every man who is 'pu' to a woman has the right to claim his privilege. Sometimes a man from a distant part, hearing that an 'angej' of his is living in a certain village will come to claim the right. In one respect the rules of group-marriage are different in the two principal divisions of the Gilyak nation; for among the western Gilyak of the interior all tribal brothers have marital rights over the wives of each other indifferently. Among the eastern Gilyak, on the other hand, the younger brothers have a claim to the wives of all their elder brothers, but the elder brothers have no right to the wives of the younger brothers. The terms of relationship are modified in accordance with those distinctions in the two divisions, the wives of younger brothers being 'yoch,' that is, forbidden, to the elder brothers. Dr. Sternberg sees in that rule of the eastern Gilyak, the significance of which will be perceived later on, a step from unmodified group-marriage towards the establishment of patriarchal rights.[1]

The Yakut, the great Turki nation of which the Manchus are a branch, are divided into totemic clans. When the Russians first came upon them polygyny was general;[2] the nature of that polygyny is clearly indicated by the fact that at the present day the sisters of the bride, as well as the bride herself, must carefully

[1] Leo Y. Sternberg, "The Turano-Ganowanian System and the Nations of North-East Asia," *International Congress of Americanists, Proceedings of the Eighteenth Session, London*, 1912, pp. 323 sqq.

[2] M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, p. 112.

abstain from ever showing their faces, or even their hair to the bridegroom or any of his brothers or cousins.[1] They have been for the last hundred years members of the Orthodox Russian Church,[2] but their former organisation still survives in a curiously modified form, for it is the established custom " that two brothers of one side marry two sisters of another." [3] The same terms are employed to denote a man's own children or his brother's.[4] Betrothals take place in infancy.[5]

Among the Kamchadals it appears that the favourite marriage is between cousins, that is, presumably cross-cousins.[6] Sororal polygyny was the recognised usage; when a man took a second wife she was his first wife's sister, or failing a sister her first-cousin, or tribal sister.[7] A man frequently had two or three wives, either living in the same household or in separate dwellings.[8] We are further told that it was customary between 'friends,' which expression usually means tribal brothers, to exchange wives, and the levirate rule was observed.[9] In spite. therefore, of the imperfect and fragmentary character of our information, it seems fairly clear that their marital relations conformed to the principles of sororal and fraternal group-marriage.

The Tungus are, numerically, by far the most important race of northern Asia, extending from the borders of China in the east over the whole northern portion of the continent to the Ob river in the north-west. The organisation of the Ochi tribe has been carefully investigated by Dr. Sternberg. Among them marriage is regulated by a classificatory system of relationship with wide age-grades, so that not only do those who stand in the relation of cross-cousins belong to reciprocal marrying classes, but also those who stand in the relation of uncle and niece, the daughter of a man's

[1] M. A, Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, p. 113.

[2] J. Stadling, *Through Siberia*, p. 96.

[3] W. L. Sieroszewski, 12 *lat w kraju Jakutow* (" Twelve Years in the Land of the Yakut ") (Warsaw, 1900), translated and abridged by W. G. Sumner, *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxi, p. 89.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 90; M. A. Czaplicka, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

[5] M. A. Czaplicka, *op. cit.*, p. 108; I. W. Shklovsky, *In Far North-East Siberia*, p. 41.

[6] H. Krasheninnikof, *The History of Kamtschatka and the Kuriski Islands*, p. 215.

[7] G. W. Steller, *Beschreibung von dem Lande Kamtchatka*, p. 346.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 347. Those customs refer to the time when the Kamchadals first came into contact with the Russians. It is particularly noticed that in a remarkably short time after that contact with Europeans their customs changed completely (W. Coxe, *Account of the Russian Discoveries between Asia and America*, p. 262). It is well to bear that observation in mind when considering the social customs of primitive tribes as they are found at the present day.

[9] *Loc. cit.*

sister belonging to the class into which he is by birth married. Among the Tungus complete group-marriage relations obtain, for not only is sororal polygyny observed, but every man has marital rights over the wives of his elder brothers. Further, owing to the inclusiveness of their classificatory system, he has also marital rights over the wives of the younger brothers of his father.[1]

A Russian traveller among the natives of the extreme north-east of the Asiatic continent, the Chukchi, mentions that, " among other customs, they have the usage of contracting so-called ' exchange-marriages.' Two or more men enter into an agreement whereby they have mutual rights to each other's wives. This right is exercised whenever the contracting parties come together, as for instance on the occasion of a visit. Even unmarried men or widowers can enter into an ' exchange-marriage,' which thus assumes the form of a veritable polyandry."[2] We have, concerning the Chukchi, the elaborate monograph of Mr. Wlademar Bogoras, sumptuously published in the series of publications of the ' Jesup North Pacific Expedition.' The Chukchi are commonly betrothed in infancy to their first-cousins, that being the prescriptive marriage alliance. They moreover observe sororal polygyny; if a man desires or can afford to maintain several wives he has a right during her life-time as well as after her death to the sisters of his first wife. Further, not only have the Chukchi the common custom of exchanging wives, but Mr. Bogoras describes a regular system by which a number of men will solemnly bind themselves to mutual rights over their respective wives. Practically every Chukcha, we are told, belongs to such a marrying group. At first sight it would appear as if this group-marriage organisation were an artificial one, that is to say, one formed by a pact into which the members deliberately enter by an individual contract, and not group-marriage in what we are led to regard as its typical and original form as a mutual relation arising from an established collective contract between the two groups. But the matter wears a different complexion when we are informed that " second and third cousins are almost invariably united by ties of group-marriage," and that it is indeed exceptional for any but cousins to belong to a group exercising those reciprocal marital rights. It is well to note, as a corrective to the ideas by which it is customary to judge those marriage organisations, that in this instance we have clear testi-

[1] Leo Y. Sternberg, " The Turano-Ganowanian System and the Nations of North-East Asia," *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Congress of Americanists*, p. 327.

[2] D. Nikolski, " Über die Tscuktschen des kolymsker Bezirk," *Moskauer Arbeiten* (Moscow, 1900), reviewed by L. Stieda, in *Archiv für Anthropologie*, xxvii, p. 506.

mony that licentiousness has nothing to do with the institution. The Chukchi are indeed described as a sensual race, but their group-marriage organisation is not taken advantage of for licentious purposes. In fact, they are careful not to form such an alliance if possible with dwellers in the same village, and they in general avoid exercising the rights conferred on them by the compact. It is, as in all instances where deliberate exchange of wives takes place with a friend or a guest, as a bond of brotherhood that the relation is regarded. A man will thus seek to bind himself to those of his relatives who dwell in other villages, and when he visits those villages his tribal cousin will yield to him his bed, presently returning the visit in order to make the obligation mutual; sometimes cousins will exchange wives for several months, for years, or permanently. So seriously is the arrangement regarded that children of the same marriage group are regarded as brothers and sisters; they are not allowed to marry among themselves, such a union being looked upon as incestuous.[1] It appears, then, that although the group-marriage of the Chukchi is to a certain extent artificial and depends upon an individual compact, it nevertheless corresponds to, and is a direct derivative of, established marriage rights between two marrying classes or groups, modified by the necessities imposed by the isolated and scattered condition of those groups, who live in small communities ranging over wide areas.

That conclusion is confirmed the more we enquire into such reported instances of polyandrous arrangements. Passing to the bridge of islands which connects the Asiatic with the American continent across the Bering Sea, the majority of the reports which we have concerning the Aleuts are of the same character as those which are current concerning the Chukchi or the Gilyak, and represent them as given to loose polyandrous unions by 'agreement' or from expediency. Thus Count Langsdorf says that a woman sometimes "lives with two husbands, who agree among themselves upon the conditions on which they are to share her."[2] Father Veniaminoff, after stating that polygyny was usual among the Aleuts, adds that "in addition the custom of polyandry is practised, a woman having the right to take, besides her principal husband, one who has the title of 'helper,' or 'partner' (in Russian, 'polovinschtschik'). Those supplementary husbands enjoyed all marital rights, and were under the obligation of contributing towards the upkeep of the household. The women living

[1] W. Bogoras, *The Chukchee* (*Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. vii), pp. 602–605.

[2] G. H. von Langsdorf, *Voyages and Travels in Various Parts of the World*, vol. ii, p. 47.

in such double marriages were in no wise regarded as immoral, but on the contrary were rather honoured for their industry in caring for two men besides their children." [1] Three men sometimes lived together in one household with one woman "without suspicion of jealousy." [2] Those multiple marriage arrangements were sometimes extended so as to include Russian settlers as accepted members in the partnership.[3] All this might easily appear mere licentious depravity and laxity on the part of those savages, who were in the Stone Age when first visited by Europeans. Admiral Wrangell remarks that only a few years after the arrival of the Russians they had become Russianised, and had so entirely lost their native traditional customs, that it was quite useless to enquire what these really were.[4] At the present day they have become as completely Americanised, and the appearance of many Aleutian villages and of their inhabitants differs little from that of a western township in the United States. To see the natives sitting on the verandahs of their wooden cottages, the mother, maybe with her blouse-sleeves tucked up doing the week's washing, or putting the finishing touches to her children's toilet before they go to Sunday-school, one would consider those people to be no nearer to a primitive social state than the European immigrants in the little colonies. In those circumstances we should scarcely be entitled to hope that any investigation could bring to light more definite particulars concerning their social organisation. Yet such an investigation has been successfully carried out under the auspices of the Russian Geographical Society by the well-known ethnologist, Mr. Wlademar Jochelson. To his intense surprise he found not only that in former times it was an established rule for younger brothers to have access to the wives of their elder brother, but that even at the present day among these Europeanised natives "the institution is preserved among cousins, and—what is most remarkable—not as a facultative institution, but as an obligatory one. To participate in group marriage is the duty of cousins." [5]

[1] F. Lowe, "Wenjaminow über die Aleutischen Inseln und deren Bewohner," *Archiv für wissenschaftliche Kunde von Russland*, ii, p. 477; Cf. I. Petroff, "Report on the Population, etc., of Alaska," *Tenth Census of the United States*, vol. viii, p. 158.

[2] W. Coxe, *Account of the Russian Discoveries between Asia and America*, p. 300.

[3] G. A. Erman, "Ethnographische Wahrnehmungen und Erfahrungen an den Kusten des Berings-Meere," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, iii, p. 163.

[4] F. P. Wrangell, *Statistische und ethnographische Nachrichten über die russische Besitzungen an de Nordwestküste von Amerika*, p. 117.

[5] W. Jochelson, cited from a personal communication by L. Y. Sternberg, "The Turano-Ganowanian System and the Nations of North-East Asia," *International Congress of Americanists, Proceedings of the Eighteenth Session*, p. 332.

Sexual Hospitality.

It will be well to pause here for a moment and consider how it is that participation in group-marriage, which we are in the habit of regarding as a form of licentious disorder, should be regarded not only in the light of a right and a privilege, but actually as a moral obligation. The reason is in reality quite clear and simple. Community of wives being originally part of the relation of tribal brotherhood, it was naturally regarded as an essential token of that relation—that is, a man could not be truly a tribal brother unless that reciprocal access to wives existed. To primitive man all men are either tribal brothers or strangers, and the latter term is equivalent in primitive society to 'enemy'; there is no middle status between those two opposite relations. If a man, not being by birth a tribal brother, is admitted into the community, if he is found to be well-disposed, if he is regarded with good will or affection or admiration—if, in short, he is not an enemy—he must needs be a tribal brother. Hence the sacredness of hospitality in all primitive sentiment; a man who has been admitted to the relation of guest is necessarily to be regarded and treated as a tribal brother. If a man has touched the tent-rope of an Arab's tent his life must be defended against all enemies, and to tell an Arab that he has neglected his guest is the greatest of insults.[1] The hospitality of savages knows no bounds; if they are on the verge of starvation they will give the little that they have to the stranger who has been admitted to their midst. The guest who is not by birth a tribal brother must be made one, since he is not an enemy. The first thought of the savage when a stranger to whom he feels himself attracted is in his company, is to take the necessary steps to make him a tribal brother. When a young American naval officer won the good graces of Seri women, their first anxiety was to paint on his face the tribal marks.[2] The blood-bond is insisted on whenever a traveller makes a stay in an African, American or Polynesian tribe; an exchange of blood must be effected so as to make the man who is not treated as a stranger or enemy a tribal brother. In Australia, if a member of a strange tribe refuses to drink the blood of his hosts, it is forcibly poured down his throat.[3] Among the Koryak the guest is obliged to undergo a somewhat strange rite of brotherhood with his host's wife before he can avail himself of her hospitality.[4] It follows

[1] J. L. Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins and Wahábys*, vol. i, p. 180.

[2] W. J. McGee, "The Seri Indians," *Seventeenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 277.

[3] W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 461 sq.

[4] J. Georgi, *Description de toutes les nations de l'Empire de Russie*, vol. iii, p. 98. Before receiving him, a Koryak woman "lache son urine

that the participation of the guest in his host's wife is a necessary token of his friendship, a 'friend' being necessarily a tribal brother. The practice, very inaptly called 'hospitality prostitution,' is not a matter of misguided benevolence, but a necessary pledge that the guest is a friend and not an enemy. For the guest to refuse is equivalent to repudiating the assumed brotherhood, and is thus tantamount to a declaration of war. The sedentary Koryak, for example, "look upon it as the truest mark of friendship, when they entertain a friend, to put him to bed with their wife or daughter; and a refusal of this civility they consider as the greatest affront, and are capable of even murdering a man for such contempt. That happened to several Cossacks before they were acquainted with the customs of the people."[1] The same thing is reported of the Chukchi.[2] In Madagascar a missionary closely escaped being murdered because he refused the proffered hospitality.[3] I have heard of similar perils incurred by missionaries in New Zealand, in the early days, from the same cause. Even the very free sexual hospitality of the natives of Tahiti was, M. Lesson remarks, regarded in the light of a ceremony partaking of a religious character.[4] The custom is very general in all primitive societies.[5]

en présence de l'étranger et lui en offre une jatte pour s'en rincer la bouche." Among Eskimo and allied races the bladder is regarded as the seat of the soul. Cf. below, vol. ii, p. 484.

[1] H. Krashininnikoff, *The History of Kamtchatka*, p. 224.

[2] W. Bogoras, *The Chukchee*, p. 607.

[3] Personal communication. Cf. A. van Gennep, *Tabou et totémisme à Madagascar*, p. 158.

[4] P. Lesson, *Voyage autour du Monde entrepris par ordre du Gouvernement sur la corvette La Coquille*, vol. i, p. 421.

[5] W. E. Parry, *Journal of a Second Voyage for the Discovery of a North-West Passage*, pp. 528 sq.; F. Boas, "The Central Eskimo," *Sixth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 579; K. Rasmussen, *The People of the Polar North*, pp. 64 sq.; F. Nansen, *Eskimo Life*, p. 169; E. Petitot, *Autour du Grand Lac des Esclaves*, p. 137; A. Mackenzie, *Voyages from Montreal to the Frozen Ocean*, p. xcvi; *Relations des Jésuites*, 1642, p. 42; M. Lescarbot, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, vol. iii, p. 718; F. X. Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, vol. vi, pp. 38, 181, 184; A. Henry, *Travels and Adventures*, pp. 241, 314; M. Lewis and W. Clarke, *History of an Expedition to the Sources of the Missouri*, vol. i, p. 161; J. Carter, *Travels through the Interior of North America*, p. 369; J. D. Hunter, *Memoirs of a Captivity among the Indians*, p. 229; E. James, *Account of an Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains*, vol. i, p. 233; J. Bradbury, *Travels in the Interior of North America*, p. 177; Bossu, *Travels through the Part of North America formerly called Louisiana*, vol. i, p. 231; H. Trumbull, *History of the Indian Wars*, p. 168; G. Gibbs, *Tribes of Western Washington and North-West Oregon*, p. 199; G. M. Sproat, *Scenes and Studies of Savage Life*, p. 95; H. H. Bancroft, *Native Races of the Pacific States*, vol. i, p. 514; S. Powers, *Tribes of California*, p. 153; E. D. Neill, "Memoirs of the Sioux," *Macalister College Contributions: Department of History, Literature and Political Science*, No. 5, p. 229; F. de Herrera, *General History of the Indies*, vol. i,

From the manner in which it is regarded we may be as certain as we can be of any inference in social anthropology that wherever it is observed clan-brotherhood is, or was formerly,

p. 217; F. L. de Gomara, *Historia general de las Indias*, p. 206 (Nicaragua); A. Vespucci, "Quattuor navigationes," in M. Fernandez de Navarrete, *Colección de los viages y descubrimientos*, vol. iii, pp. 219 sq.; W. Curtis Farabee, *Indian Tribes of Eastern Peru* (*Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology*, vol. x), p. 59; J. de Lery, *Histoire d'un voyage faict en terre de Brésil*, p. 303; J. de Silva Guimares, "Sobre os usos, costumes e linguagen dos Appiacas," *Revista Trimensal de Historia e Geographia*, vi, p. 307; P. Hernandez, *Organización social de las doctrinas Guaranies*, vol. i, p. 84; J. B. Debret, *Voyage pittoresque et historique au Brésil*, vol. i, p. xii; W. Chandless, "Ascent of the River Purus," *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, xxxvi, p. 101 (Manetenerys); F. Krause, *In den Wildnissen Brasiliens*, p. 327; F. de Castelnau, *Expédition dans les parties centrales de l'Amérique du Sud*, vol. i, p. 446; C. Teschauer, "Die Caigang oder Coroados-Indianer in Brasilienischen Staat Rio Grande do Sul," *Anthropos*, ix, p. 22; G. A. Erman, *Travels in Siberia*, vol. ii, p. 530; W. Bogoras, *The Chukchee*, p. 607; W. Jochelson, *The Yukaghir*, pp. 62, 64; M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, p. 107 (Tungus); H. Krashininnikoff, *The History of Kamtchatka*, p. 530; M. Buch, "Die Wotjaken," *Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae*, xii, p. 48; J. Kohler, "Studien über Frauengemeinschaft, Frauenraub und Frauenkauf," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*, v, p. 306; C. H. Desgodins, *Le Thibet*, p. 244; F. Grenard, *Tibet*, p. 260; O. Roero, *Ricordi dei viaggi al Cashemir, Piccolo e Medio Thibet, e Turkestan*, vol. i, pp. 273 sq.; M. Veliukoff, "The Belors and their Country," *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, xxxvi, p. 272; J. Biddulph, *Tribes of the Hindoo Koosh*, p. 77; J. P. Ferrier, *Caravan Journeys and Wanderings in Persia, Afghanistan, Turkestan and Beloochistan*, pp. 232 sq.; *Census of India*, 1911, vol. i, p. 248, vol. iv, pp. 105, 107, vol. xiv, p. 294; C. Pridham, *An Historical, Political and Statistical Account of Ceylon*, vol. i, p. 250; G. McCall Theal, *Records of South-Eastern Africa*, vol. vii, p. 434; L. Alberti, *De Kaffers aan Zuidkust van Afrika* p. 124; G. Capus, "Kafirs Siahpouches," *Bulletin de la Société d' Anthropologie*, 4e Serie i, p. 265; A. H. Post, *Afrikanische Jurisprudenz*, vol. i, p. 468; *Annales du Musée du Congo*, Ser. iii, vol. i, p. 206 (Bateke); C. Overbergh, *Les Bangala*, p. 223; F. S. Joelson, *The Tanganyika Territory*, p. 120; A. de Serpa Pinto, *Comment j'ai traversé l'Afrique*, vol. i, p. 389; G. A. Farini, *Huit mois au Kalahari*, pp. 190 sq.; A. C. Hollis, *The Nandi*, p. 77; H. H. Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate*, pp. 689, 882; J. Roscoe, *Twenty-five Years in East Africa*, pp. 203, 257; Id., *The Northern Bantu*, p. 121; Id., *The Banyankole*, p. 123; Id., *The Bagesu and other Tribes of the Uganda Protectorate*, p. 197; Von Oertzen, "Die Banaka und Bapuku," in S. R. Steinmetz, *Rechtsverhältnisse von eingeborenen Völker in Afrika und Ozeanien*, p. 38; J. M. Hildebrandt, "Ethnographische Notizen über Wakamba und ihre Nachbaren," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, x, p. 400; W. E. H. Barrett, 'Notes on the Customs and Beliefs of the Wa-Giriamas, etc., of British East Africa," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xli, p. 31; C. W. Hobley, *Ethnology of the A-Kamba and other East African Tribes*, p. 64; G. Lindblom, *The Akamba*, p. 81; A. I. Bennett, "Ethnological Notes on the Fangs," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxix, p. 79; G. Bruel, *L'Afrique équatoriale française*, p. 191; A. B. Ellis, *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples*, p. 182;

considered to imply sexual communism, for it is by assimilation to a clan-brother that the guest is treated as he is. All hospitality, which among primitive peoples organised in clans is so liberal and ungrudging as to excite the admiration of Europeans, has its foundation in the assimilation of the guest to a clan-brother. The practice of sexual hospitality has naturally tended to become modified and limited, in the same way as sexual communism has

K. Endemann, "Mitteilungen über die Sotho-Neger," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, vi, p. 40; H. Hecquard, *Voyage aur la côte et dans l'intérieur de l'Afrique occidentale*, p. 21; R. W. Felkin, "Notes on the Waganda Tribe of Central Africa," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, xiii, pp. 716 sq.; W. Munzinger, *Ostafrikanische Studien*, p. 524; A. and G. Grandidier, *Histoire physique, naturelle et politique de Madagascar*, vol. iv, pp. 143 sq.; H. Low, *Sarawak*, p. 197; P. A. M. Hinlopen and P. Severijn, "Verslag van een ondersoek de Poggi-Eilande," *Tijdschrift voor taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch Indië*, iii, p. 328; J. A. Moerenhout, *Voyages aux îles du Grand Océan*, vol. ii, p. 64; O. Finsch, "Über die Bewohner von Ponapé," *Zeitschrift für Ethnolgie*, xii, p. 317; C. E. Meinicke, *Die Inseln des Stilles Ozeans*, vol. ii, p. 305; J. J. Jarves, *History of the Hawaiian Islands*, p. 42; S. S. Hill, *Travels in the Sandwich and Society Islands*, p. 64; M. Hopkins, *Hawaii: the Past, Present and Future of the Island-Kingdom*, p. 355; E. H. Lamont, *Wild Life among the Pacific Islanders*, p. 42; T. West, *Ten Years in South Central Polynesia*, pp. 260, 270; L. de Freycinet, *Voyage autour du monde*, vol. ii, part i, pp. 587 sqq. (Hawaii); P. Lesson, *Voyage autour du monde*, vol. i, p. 421; F. Walpole, *Four Years in the Pacific*, vol. ii, p. 401; L. A. de Bougainville, *Voyage autour du monde*, vol. ii, p. 44; J. Cook, *Voyages* (ed. Anderson), p. 267 (Tahiti); D. Porter, *Journal of a Cruise into the Pacific Ocean*, p. 59 (Nukahiva); La Pérouse, *Voyage*, vol. ii, pp. 97, 105 sq.; M. S. Dumont D'Urville, *Voyage la Corvette L'Astrolabe*, vol. ii, p. 433 (New Zealand); W. Brown, *New Zealand and its Aborigines*, p. 35; F. L. Gray, "Easter Island," in Hastings's *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. v, p. 131; H. R. Codrington, *The Melanesians*, p. 246; H. B. Guppy, *The Solomon Islands*, p. 43; A. Hagen and A. Pineau, "Les Nouvelles Hébrides," *Revue d'Ethnographie*, vii, p. 331; H. Moseley, "On the Inhabitants of the Admiralty Islands," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, vi, p. 413; T. Williams, *Fiji and the Fijians*, vol. i, p. 147; A. Liston-Blyth, "Notes on Native Customs of the Baniara District (N. E. D.), Papua," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, liii, p. 468; A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, pp. 232 sqq.; R. Brough Smyth, *The Aborigines of Victoria*, vol. ii, p. 301; E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race*, vol. i, p. 110; J. D. Woods, *The Province of South Australia*, p. 398; W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 63, 106 sq.; C. Wilhelmi, "Manners and Customs of the Australian Natives, in particular of the Port Lincoln District," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Victoria*, v, p. 180; C. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition*, vol. i, p. 226; W. H. Willshire, *The Aborigines of Central Australia*, p. 36; A. L. P. Cameron, "Notes on some Tribes of New South Wales," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xiv, p. 353; W. E. Roth, *Ethnological Studies among the North-West-Central Queensland Aborigines*, p. 182; G. Krefft, *On the Manners and Customs of the Aborigines of the Lower Murray and Darling*, p. 76; G. F. Angas, *Savage Life and Scenes*

become modified and limited, with the development of individual marriage and its growing claims. All manner of transitional and attenuated modifications of the custom are accordingly found. Thus, the Missouri Indians were, like many North American tribes, so averse to any intercourse with members of another tribe, that they never offered their wives or daughters to strangers, not even to their close neighbours, the Mandans. Nevertheless, they regarded themselves as being under the obligation of offering sexual hospitality to a guest, and accordingly provided him with a captive from some other tribe.[1] It may safely be concluded that this practice was a compromise between their strongly endogamic tribal principles and their equally strong conviction that a clan-brother, or a guest who was treated as a clan-brother, was entitled to access to his fellow-clansman's or host's women. Among the Krumir Berbers a stranger visiting the tribe is received and lodged by one of the tribesmen, and is invited to spend the night in his tent in the company of his host's wife. The host leaves the tent, but he mounts guard outside it, armed with his gun, and should he hear the slightest suspicious movement on the part of his guest, he would have no hesitation in instantly shooting him.[2] So-called 'hospitality prostitution' has here dwindled down to an empty ceremonial which preserves the form of the social tradition, while safeguarding more advanced sentiments by abolishing the reality of the usage. Among the Arabs the cult of hospitality amounts to an article of religious faith, and, as is usually the case, is associated with an equally fervent devotion to the sentiment of clan-brotherhood and solidarity, which may be said to be the dominating passion of the Arab. At the same time the Arabs are at the present day, and have long been, intensely patriarchal in their conceptions, while passionately devoted to their women, and in the fullest sense of the term jealous of them and of their honour. From the importance of the conceptions of hospitality and clan-brotherhood among them we should, however, be disposed to infer, on comparative grounds, that at some former time hospitality amongst them included sexual hospitality, and that therefore sexual communism among clan-brothers was also at some former period a custom of their forefathers. In this instance we are able to check the inference,

in Australia and New Zealand, vol. i, p. 93; C. Meredith, in *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Tasmania*, 1873, p. 28.

[1] C. Mackenzie, "The Missouri Indians," in L. R. Masson, *Les Bourgeois de la Compagnie du Nord-Ouest*, vol. i, p. 360.

[2] L. Bertholon, "Les formes de la famille chez les premiers habitants de l'Afrique du nord d'après les écrivains de l'antiquité et les coutumes modernes," *Archives de l'anthropologie criminelle et de psychologie normale et pathologique*, viii, p. 609.

and we have evidence that it is, in fact, entirely justified. The learned Arab jurist, 'Ata ibn-Abi Rabah, states that the custom of offering one's wife to a guest was of old a universally sanctioned and recognised custom of the Arabs.[1] Among several Arab tribes the custom survived in historical times, and, indeed, has survived among some down to the present, or quite recent, times. The Asir tribe, up to the time of the Wahhabites, lent their wives to their guest, and so also did the Dhahaban.[2] Among the Merekedes, a tribe of the Yemen, " custom requires that the stranger should pass the night with his host's wife, whatever may be her age or condition. Should he render himself agreeable to the lady, he is honourably and hospitably treated; if not, the lower part of his 'abba,' or cloak, is cut off and he is driven away in disgrace." [3] Thus among a people whose notions of the exclusive nature of individual marriage are in general at the present day even more severe and more strict than our own, whose more civilised representatives veil their women and confine them to the sacred privacy of the harîm, clan-organisation entailed the same conceptions and usages as among the primitive savages of North America or of Australia.

It will, I think, be apparent from the above facts why it is that the Aleuts regard the ancient observance of community of wives between cousins as a moral duty and obligation. Neglect of it would be a dissolution and repudiation of the sacred bonds of clan-kinship. When a Chukcha claims his privilege from a tribal cousin, the latter makes a point of ceremoniously returning the visit, not on the principle that he is entitled to reciprocity, but because it would be as offensive not to return the token of brotherhood as to withhold his hand when another proffered his in friendship. When a Nayar of Travancore became converted to Christianity he refused to cohabit any longer with his brother's wife; the brother was mortally offended, and expressed his indignation at the unbrotherly conduct of the convert.[4] Among the Eskimo of Davis Strait and Cumberland Sound the rite of reciprocal exchange of wives between tribal brothers is, as with the Aleuts, " commanded by religious law." [5]

[1] I. Goldziher, review of W. Robertson Smith's " Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia," *Literatur-Blatt für orientalische Philologie*, iii, p. 21. Cf. J. Wellhausen, *Reste des arabischen Heidentums*, p. 462.

[2] W. Robertson Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, p. 116.

[3] J. L. Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins and Wahábys*, vol. i, pp. 179 sq. Cf. Id., *Travels in Arabia*, Appendix ii.

[4] E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, p. 119.

[5] F. Boas, " The Central Eskimo," *Sixth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 579.

Collective Sexual Relations in America.

There can be little doubt that the practice of exchanging wives temporarily, which is universal with all sections of the Eskimo race,[1] is the survival of an organisation of tribal sexual communism which, together with all clan and tribal organisation, has become disintegrated through the dispersion of small communities in the icy habitat to which the race has been driven. Among the Eskimo of the Kadiak tribe the rules which were found by Mr. Jochelson among the Aleuts have been observed by M. Dawydoff.[2] Among the Eskimo of Bering Straits "it is a custom," says Mr. E. W. Nelson, "for two men living in different villages to agree to become bond-fellows, or brothers by adoption. Having made the arrangement, when one of them goes to the other's village he is received as the bond-brother's guest, and is given the use of his host's bed with his wife during his stay. When the visit is returned the same favour is extended to the other, consequently neither family knows who is the father of the children." The children of each family call one another brother.[3] Among the Eskimo of Baffin Land and Hudson Bay polygyny is combined with polyandry.[4] In Repulse Bay "it is a usual thing among friends to exchange wives for a week or two about every two months," and Dr. Murdoch was informed that "at certain times there is a general exchange of wives throughout the village, each woman passing from man to man till she has been through the hands of all."[5] In northern Greenland, as Dr. Bessels delicately puts it, "somewhat communistic tendencies seriously interfere with the sanctity of marriage."[6]

The most important race of the extreme north-western region of the American continent is the nation of the Tlinkit, or as the Russians called them, the Kolosh. They are divided into a number of totemic clans, which are grouped into two large divisions or exogamic marriage-classes, and a man is strictly forbidden to marry

[1] See above, p. 609 n[3].

[2] L. Y. Sternberg, "The Turano-Ganowanian System and the Natives of North-East Asia," *International Congress of Americanists, Proceedings of the Eighteenth Session*, London, 1912, p. 332. Cf. H. J. Holmberg, "Ethnographische Skizzen über die Völker des russischen Amerika," *Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae*, iv, p. 399.

[3] E. W. Nelson, "The Eskimo about Bering Strait," *Eighteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 292.

[4] F. Boas, "The Eskimo of Baffin Land and Hudson Bay," *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*, p. 115.

[5] J. Murdoch, "Ethnological Results of the Point Barrow Expedition, *Ninth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, pp. 412 sq.

[6] E. Bessels, "The Northernmost Inhabitants of the Earth," *The American Naturalist*, xviii, p. 873.

in his own division, and must take his wives from the opposite marriage class. It would appear further that it is most usual for members of one clan to draw their wives from one particular clan only, for we are told that as a rule the wives are cousins of their husbands,[1] which means that a man marries into the same clan or family from which his father, his grandfather, and all his forbears have been in the habit of taking their wives. Polygamy is very general and extensive, and a man of distinction may have as many as forty wives.[2] In addition the Tlinkit are polyandrous. Their usages in this respect are interesting as illustrating once more the deceptive manner in which such an organisation is apt to be reported. Some writers state that their customs allow "great looseness in sexual relations."[3] Count Langsdorf, on the contrary, says that their decent and orderly behaviour in this respect and the modesty of their women stand in striking contrast with the manners of neighbouring races.[4] The reason of this is, as usual, that the men are "very jealous"—that is to say, they are not disposed to allow the women any liberties. Girls are given in marriage as soon as they attain puberty. Adultery is very severely punished, the guilty parties, if discovered, being, we are told, usually killed on the spot, unless, indeed, the man is able to soothe the husband's feelings by the offer of an adequate monetary compensation. But the notable feature in the organisation of the Tlinkit lies in what constitutes 'adultery.' It is a serious offence only if the seducer belongs to a clan other than the husband's; if he be a 'relative' (by which term we are presumably to understand a 'clan-brother') there is no offence and no punishment. The lover is, on the contrary, invited to continue his relations with the woman quite freely, subject to the reasonable proviso that he shall contribute his share towards the maintenance of the household.[5] It is, in fact, customary for a woman to have several co-husbands, who exercise their rights during one another's frequent absences, and cooperate in the upkeep of the common home. The 'secondary husbands,' as they have been called, "are invariably either brothers or cousins of the principal husband."[6]

[1] W. H. Dall, *Alaska and its Resources*, p. 416.

[2] H. J. Holmberg, "Ethnographische Skizzen über die Völker des russischen Amerika," *Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae*, iv, p. 313.

[3] J H. Swanton, "Social Condition, Beliefs and Linguistic Relationship of the Tlingit Indians," *Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology*, p. 423.

[4] G. H. von Langsdorf, *Voyages and Travels*, pp. 413 sq.

[5] H. J. Holmberg, *op. cit.*, p. 316; T. Lüttke, **Путешествіе вокругъ свѣта**, vol. i, p. 161.

[6] W. H. Dall, *Alaska and its Resources*, p. 416; H. J. Holmberg, *loc. cit.*; I. Petroff, "Report on the Population, Industries and Resources of Alaska," *Tenth Census of the United States*, vol. viii, p. 158.

The rules governing the sexual organisation of the Tlinkit would seem, from those facts, to be fairly clear. The Russian bishop, Father Veniaminoff, to whom we owe our most valuable information concerning the populations of that region in their original state, thinks it, however, necessary to go to Sicily for a parallel to the customs of the natives, and many ethnological writers have used the hint, and affect to term these arrangements 'cicisbeism.' It does not appear that the customs of the Tlinkit bear any resemblance to the practices of eighteenth-century Italian society, of which the relations between Nelson and Sir William and Lady Hamilton are a famous instance. Putting our information together it would seem that among the Tlinkit sexual relations with the wife of a clan-brother, or, what is the same thing, with a woman of the clan with which his was intermarried, did not constitute adultery, but that a man might always share such a woman with her individual husband; in other words, a man had the right of access to any woman of the corresponding marriage class, independently of any individual economic ties which she might have contracted, and could, in fact, become a co-partner in that economic marriage. Such rules resemble far more closely the scheme of what Mr. Fison described as group-marriage than any dissolute habits of eighteenth-century society in Sicily or elsewhere. It is to be noted that the marriages of the Tlinkit were commonly matrilocal;[1] the households to which the various husbands contributed were therefore those of the women.

Still farther south, among the Salish Indians of British Columbia, "it was customary for a man to marry all his wife's sisters." As among most other American tribes, "the levirate prevailed among them, a man's widow or widows going to his surviving brother." Further, we are told that during the lifetime of the oldest brother his wives and his younger brothers "stood in the relation of 'skalpa' and 'kalapa' to one another. There is no equivalent in English for these terms."[2] From what we have already seen of the relations between a man's wives and his brothers among kindred tribes, we may, I think, form a fairly accurate idea of the meaning of those special terms applied to that relationship.

Making due allowance for variations of statement and the great difficulty attending such observations, it would appear that from Manchuria on the Asiatic side to British Columbia on the American side, the principles which govern collective sexual relations are substantially identical among all tribes, and that with the large majority reciprocal sexual rights between all the males and all the

[1] H. J. Holmberg, *op. cit.*, p. 315.

[2] C. Hill Tout, "Report on the Ethnology of the Stlatlumh of British Columbia," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxv, p. 133.

females of two intermarrying groups are recognised and used at the present day, or were so until quite recent times.

The general prevalence of those customs among the peoples of the ruder northern regions of eastern Asia and western America suggests that they may also have obtained among the American tribes, who, there is every reason to believe, originally passed over from Asia and southward from those northern regions. That presumption is strongly confirmed by several social characteristics common to all North American peoples. In the first place, the nomenclature of clan-relationship amongst them is that which is called ' classificatory,' and which corresponds to the relations established by such a sexual organisation. The principle and practice of sororal polygyny is, as we have seen, universally observed among North American Indians. In conjunction with it levirate marriage is, as with the Alaskan and other tribes, a right and an obligation.[1] Taken together, those facts are, to anyone who admits the principle of evolution in social phenomena, in themselves conclusive evidence of a former sexual organisation in which relations were collective between members of intermarrying groups. Not only did the wives pass, after the death of their economic associate, to his brother, but the practice of exchange of wives between clan-brothers was so general that sexual communism may be said to have, in fact, existed between the brothers of one group and the sisters of another. Among the Menomini Indians, between sisters-in-law and brothers-in-law on both sides, sexual relations were permissible and lawful.[2] Indeed, in many tribes even at the present day, according to a medical man thoroughly familiar with their conduct, " communism as to sexual relations seems to prevail." [3] Among the Natchez, when a man married a woman, " if she has many sisters he marries them all, so that nothing is more common than to see four or five sisters the wives of a single husband." [4] It appears, on the other hand, that they were not, after all, confined in their sexual relations to a single husband, for we are further informed that " jealousy has so little place in their hearts that many find no difficulty in lending their wives to their friends." [5] As ' their friends ' obviously

[1] See below, p. 767 n[3].

[2] A Skinner, " Social Life and Ceremonial Bundles of the Menomini Indians," *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History*, xiii, p. 20.

[3] A. F. Currier, " A Study relative to the Functions of the Reproductive Apparatus in American Indian Women," *Transactions of the American Gynecological Society*, xvi, p. 275.

[4] *Mémoire sur la Louisiane ou le Mississipi* (Luxembourg, 1752), p. 137.

[5] *Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, vol. lxviii, p. 143. Cf. X. L. de Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, vol. vi, p. 181.

includes their brothers, the marriage arrangements of the Natchez must have been scarcely distinguishable from fraternal-sororal group-marriages. Among the more secluded tribes of the Déné, the northern branch of the great Athapascan group, which includes the Navahos and the Apaches, those collective relations were even more definite. As of other American tribes, we are told that sororal polygyny, the levirate, and the exchange of wives were usual; but among the Sekanais "polyandry was in honour conjointly with polygyny."[1] "Brothers," in fact, "cohabit with one another's women openly."[2] Among the Beaver Indians "one woman is common to two brothers, and often to three."[3] Among the most primitive representatives of the Amerind race, the Seri Indians, it is practically certain that both sororal polygyny and fraternal polyandry are, or were till recent times, in force. Marriage with a woman gives a husband marital rights over all her sisters. At the present time the number of the women greatly exceeds that of the men, owing to constant losses from warfare; but Dr. McGee is of opinion that when the tribe was more flourishing the right of blood-relatives to one another's sexual mates was mutual, if, indeed, it is not so at the present day. At any rate "among other privileges bestowed on the bride during the probationary period are those of receiving the most intimate attentions from the clan-fellows of the bridegroom."[4] Zuñi traditions make distinct reference to fraternal polyandry as an accepted custom;[5] and from the traditional tales of the Fox Indians we learn that among them also it was customary for brothers to share their elder brother's wives.[6] Those customs obtained among the Iroquois themselves. After referring to the practice of sororal polygyny amongst them, Father Charlevoix adds that among the Tsonnontouan—that is to say, the Senecas, the most important and by far the most numerous of the confederated Iroquois nations—"there was a far greater disorder, namely, plurality of husbands."[7] The information is confirmed by Father Lafitau, who adds that this 'disorder' was regarded as a perfectly regular form

[1] A. G. Morice, "The Western Dénés, their Manners and Customs," *Proceedings of the Canadian Institute, Toronto*, 3rd Ser., vii, p. 123. Cf. Id., "The Great Déné Race," *Anthropos*, ii, p. 33.

[2] G. Keith, in L. R. Masson, *Les Bourgeois de la Compagnie du Nord-Ouest*, vol. ii, p. 69. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 115.

[3] W. F. Wentzel, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 86.

[4] W. J. McGee, "The Seri Indians," *Seventeenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, pp. 279, 281.

[5] F. H. Cushing, *Zuñi Folk Tales*, p. 127.

[6] W. Jones, *Fox Texts* (*Publications of the American Ethnological Society*, vol. i), pp. 213, 305, 313.

[7] X. L. de Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, vol. v, p. 419.

of marriage, and was, in fact, quite 'in order.'[1] There is thus ample evidence to confirm the presumption that the marriage customs of the North American Indians, at the time when they first became known to us, were, like the breaking down of their clan exogamy, the result of the decay of clan organisation under the influence of individual economic marriage; and that the rules of sororal polygyny and of the levirate were, like the terms of kinship nomenclature, survivals of a collective sexual organisation.

Similar principles would appear to have been widely current in South America. Thus of the natives of New Granada or Colombia we are told that " brothers-in-law may marry sisters-in-law, and two or three brothers will marry two or three sisters jointly, and they regard this manner of contracting marriages as lawful."[2] Of the tribes of Brazil with which the Spaniards first came in contact, Herrera gives the following account: " They observed no law or rule in matrimony, but took as many wives as they would and they as many husbands, quitting one another at pleasure without reckoning any wrong done to either part. There was no such thing as jealousy among them, all living as best pleased them without taking offence at one another." Contrary to generally accepted notions of the evils inseparable from a departure from European standards of morality, those Indians, he says, " multiplied very much," and Herrera adds the even more remarkable information that the men " were very modest in conversing with the women."[3] Of the Moxos Indians it is reported that, "according to the ancient custom of their nation, the women belong without distinction to all their relatives." Among their neighbours, the Itonamas, the men willingly lend their wives to one another, and the women abandon themselves to all their relatives. The parents designate at birth the children who shall intermarry.[4] Polyandrous marriages are reported from the Paraguayan Chaco;[5] and among the Zaparos of Ecuador polyandry is usual, and two men may have five wives between them.[6] Baron von Humboldt

[1] F. M. Lafitau, *Moeurs des sauvages amériquains*, vol. i, p. 555. Lafitau also states that the polyandrous marriages of the Senecas were monogynous; but rules of monogyny are so entirely unknown among the North American Indians that one is justified in doubting the accuracy of the latter statement. Monogamy has several times been alleged of the Senecas, but we shall see that the allegation is expressly contradicted on the best authority, and is wholly untenable (see below, vol. ii, p. 277, n 2).

[2] J. Suarez de Cepeda, " Relación de la ciudad de la Trinidad y desta de La Palma," in G. Latorre, *Relaciones geograficas de Indias*, p. 107.

[3] A. de Herrera, *The General History of the West Indies*, vol. i, pp. 216 sq.

[4] A. D. d'Orbigny, *Voyage dans l'Amérique méridionale*, vol. iii, p. 95; Id., *L'homme américain*, vol. ii, p. 240.

[5] W. B. Grubb, *An Unknown People in an Unknown Land*, pp. 215 sq.

[6] A. Simson, *Travels in the Wilds of Ecuador*, pp. 173, 178.

found that among the Avanos and among the Maypures of the Orinoco brothers had often but one wife between them.[1] In Guiana at the present day polyandry is common, and is practised openly.[2] A missionary endeavouring to persuade a Guiana Indian to give up polygyny, tried to convince him of the wickedness of the practice by asking him what he would think of a woman having several husbands. But the force of the argument was entirely lost upon the Indian, who replied that both customs were equally honoured in his tribe, and that both were practised.[3] Among the western Fuegians, according to the testimony of the missionaries who are settled amongst them, polyandry is very prevalent; it is quite common for several husbands to share the same wife.[4]

Collective Marriage in Tibet.

Returning to the Asiatic side, we will pass over for the present the Mongol and Turkic populations of the Central Asiatic plains, and come at once to a region where the group organisation of marriage is notorious—namely, the region of Tibet. Instead of 'notorious' I was about to write 'well known,' but the term would be inappropriate; for although Tibetan polyandry has been mentioned in almost every reference to that country, and the institution was used by J. F. MacLennan as the type of fraternal polyandry, the marriage organisation of Tibet is far from being currently known, and is, in fact, generally misconceived and erroneously described.[5] In spite, therefore, of the considerable

[1] A. von Humboldt, *Personal Narrative of Travels to the Equinoxial Regions of the New Continent*, vol. v, p. 549. Cf. J. Chaffanjon, *L'Orénoque et le Caura*, pp. 283 sq. (Maquiritares).

[2] H. Coudreau, *Chez nos Indiens*, p. 132.

[3] W. H. Brett, *The Indian Tribes of Guiana*, p. 177.

[4] J. M. Beauvoir, *Los Shelknam, indigenos de la Tierra del Fuego*, p. 207.

[5] In his instructions to Mr. Bogle, Warren Hastings wrote with true scientific curiosity: "It is said that in Tibet it is very common for one lady to have several husbands. I should wish much to know if this practice obtains in all ranks of society, and whether those husbands who all have intercourse with one woman have not likewise other women that are their wives with whom likewise they hold an intercourse in common. We have instances in other countries where, though each man in a family had a wife that was properly his own, all the men in the family had likewise an intercourse with all the women in it. Perhaps this may be the case also in Tibet; and if we knew anything of the laws of succession in Tibet, or to whom the children of a wife with several husbands were understood to belong, one might be able to discover how the fact stood, though we had no direct information with regard to it" (C. R. Markham, *Narratives of the Mission of George Bogle to Tibet and of the Journey of Thomas Manning to Lhasa*, p. 13). Warren Hastings's envoy does not, however, seem to have shared the scientific mind of his principal, for, beyond a brief remark

number of references which are available on the subject, Mr. A. H. Savage Landor is justified in writing: "Very little

couched in the jocular tone which was regarded as befitting in dealing with sociological facts, he did nothing to satisfy the curiosity of the great Proconsul, and added little to our knowledge. "The elder brother," he says, "marries a woman, and she becomes the wife of the whole family. They club together in matrimony as merchants do in trade" (*op. cit.*, p. 123). Father Desgodins remarks that "in less than a month I have read in three different periodicals the observation that no traveller who has written about Tibet has spoken of their matrimony and of the ceremonies which accompany it" (*Les Missions Catholiques*, 1881, pp. 298 sq.). Nevertheless Father Desgodins's own account, which consists mainly in invectives and denunciations of "ce devergondage de moeurs," is itself the worst that we possess (C. H. Desgodins, *Le Thibet d'après la correspondance des Missionaires*, Paris, 1885, p. 244). Vexed at not having been permitted to enter Tibet proper, that zealous teacher of the Gospel expresses the following pious opinion: "Je suis persuadé qu'il faudra en venir à faire parler la voix toute puissante de MM. Krupp et Chassepot. Alors Thibétains et Chinois obéiront et ce sera bientôt fini" (*Les Missions Catholiques*, 1886, No. 888). It should be added that the majority of missionaries are far from showing that spirit of the mediaeval Inquisition, and are foremost in doing ample justice to the character of the Tibetans. As is the case in all parts of the world, missionaries commonly show a spirit of scientific detachment and an ability to set aside prejudices which does honour to them and to science. It would be well if the same could be said of all professed scientists and ethnologists. Statements such as Father Desgodins's that the marriage customs of Tibet are the "cause d'une stérilité générale," and of I know not what other evils, are more frequently met with in professed scientific treatises than in the accounts of missionaries. The Moravian missionaries went so far as to defend Tibetan polyandry "as good for the heathen of so sterile a country" (A. Wilson, *The Abode of Snow*, p. 235). Captain Turner affirms that "the influence of this custom on the manners of the people, as far as I could trace, has not been unfavourable" (S. Turner, *Account of an Embassy to the Court of the Teshoo Lama, in Tibet*, p. 350); and Mr. Wilson "noticed no particular evidence of its evil effects" (A. Wilson, *The Abode of Snow*, p. 229). "There is no sense," he justly remarks, "in charging it with evils which we see existing everywhere. . . . Its lesson will be lost if it be viewed otherwise than in the cold white light of reason" (*ibid.*, p. 230). Statements to the effect that the evil effects of polyandrous marriages are visible in the respective physical development of Tibetan women and of those of monogamic countries (C. A. Sherring, *Western Tibet and the British Borderland*, p. 88) are flagrantly contradicted by the fact that the Chinese actually set down the practice to the enormous physical and mental superiority of the Tibetan women as compared with the chaste and recluse women of China (*Wei-Tsang Thu-Chi*, quoted in C. Puini, *Il Tibet secondo la Relazione del Viaggio del P. Ippolito Desideri*, p. 141; and A. Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 229, n. Cf. F. Grénard, *Tibet, the Country and its Inhabitants*, p. 261.). Bogle says that the conditions of Tibetan life "have evidently a very favourable effect upon the women, who are certainly more delicate and joyous than their neighbours" (C. R. Markham, *op. cit.*, p. 75). Among the evil results ascribed to polyandry, it has been affirmed that the usage is the cause of leprosy. Unfortunately for so interesting an aetiological theory, the disease is almost unknown in Tibet (Ahmad Shah, *Four Years in Tibet*, p. 54).

has hitherto transpired as to the actual form of these marital customs." [1]

Mr. Savage Landor himself, who had, to his cost, exceptional opportunities of obtaining first-hand information on the subject, gives us the most definite statement in regard to that organisation. "A Tibetan girl on marrying," he says, "does not enter into a nuptial tie with an individual, but with all his family, in the following somewhat complicated manner: If an eldest son marries an eldest sister all the sisters of the bride become his wives. Should he, however, begin by marrying the second sister, then only the sisters from the second down will be his property. If the third, all from the third, and so on. At the same time when the bridegroom has brothers they are all regarded as their brother's wife's husbands, and they one and all cohabit with her as well as with her sisters, if she has any." [2] Tibetan marriage is, therefore, not simple polyandry, but is, in fact, a complete group-marriage in principle and in practice, all the males of one group becoming united, by virtue of the marriage contract, to all the females of another, and reciprocally.

The polygyny which goes with Tibetan polyandry has been overlooked by most writers. There can, however, be no question as to the accuracy of Landor's account. All reports agree as to the existence of polygyny as well as of polyandry in Tibetan-speaking countries; and it is easy to see how, on the current assumption that the two must needs be quite different, and even opposite, forms of marriage customs, the mistake has occurred of describing group-marriage in Tibet sometimes as polyandry and sometimes as polygyny. In such group-marriage between two families it is evident that every possible combination, as regards the numbers of husbands and of wives, may occur. Thus one writer describes how in the district of Kunawar "in one house there may be three brothers with one wife; in the next three brothers with four wives, all alike in common; in the next house there may be a man with three wives to himself; in the next a man with only one wife." [3] Those various combinations have been described as 'polyandry,' 'polygamy,' and even as 'monogamy;' but the designations refer to one and the same form of institution based upon the principle of group-marriage. Dr. Stulpnagel is quite puzzled by finding "the two practices existing in one and the same family." [4] In the province of Ladak it has also been noted that a group of brothers

[1] A. H. Savage Landor, *In the Forbidden Land*, vol. ii, p. 60.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 62.

[3] C. R. Stulpnagel, "Polyandry in the Himalaya," *The Indian Antiquary*, vii, p. 135.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 134.

cohabit with a group of sisters.[1] "Equal numbers of husbands and wives in one family," says Mr. Crosby, "are frequently seen."[2] Tibetan families are generally small,[3] and it may therefore not infrequently happen that "in a small family there is but one male."[4] The principle of the institution is, however, in such cases exactly the same as if there were twenty males and twenty females, and to describe such a household as monogamous, implying a recognition of the principle of monogamy, is an abuse of language. "The number of husbands is not, as far as I could learn," says Captain Turner, "defined and restricted within any limits." He saw one family in which "five brothers were then living together very happily with one female under the same connubial compact"; [5] and Mr. Wilson knew a family of six husbands, the third husband—Mr. Wilson did not meet the elder ones—being over thirty and the youngest quite a boy.[6] As in group-marriage in other countries, the men who have marital rights over the same women are not necessarily members of the same household, so that the number of men actually living in one house is not a criterion of the constitution of the sexual group. For reasons presently to be noted, limitation of the number of wives appears, on the whole, to be more common in the higher uplands, while plurality of wives is more prevalent in the lower valleys; [7] and in one and the same valley 'polyandry' is stated to obtain in the upper portion and 'polygyny' in the lower.[8] The latter has often been assumed to be identical with Hindu or Muslim polygamy, but it does not appear probable that two totally different systems of marriage are in force in contiguous portions of the same mountain valley; and it seems clear, in the light of present information, that the 'polygyny' of the lower valley is in reality part of the same organisation as the 'polyandry' of the upper, and identical with it in principle.

The rule of seniority which, Mr. Landor thinks, renders the arrangement 'complicated' is a common feature of group-marriage, either in its complete or in its residual form, as the marriage of a deceased wife's sister or a deceased brother's wife; and the value of Mr. Landor's testimony is enhanced by the circumstance that

[1] E. A. Gait, in *Census of India*, 1911, vol. i, part i, p. 240.

[2] Oscar Terry Crosby, *Tibet and Turkestan*, p. 152.

[3] W. W. Rockhill, *The Land of the Lamas*, p. 212.

[4] S. Turner, *Account of an Embassy to the Court of the Teshoo Lama in Tibet*, p. 349.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] A. Wilson, *The Abode of Snow*, p. 228.

[7] E. C. Baber, *Travels and Researches in Western China*, p. 97.

[8] C. F. Gordon Cumming, *In the Himalayas and in the Indian Plains*, pp. 405 sq.

he is apparently unaware that he is describing the characteristic features of group-marriage in their most schematic and typical form. It is important to understand the significance of that feature. It should first be mentioned, in order to complete the above account of it, that when an elder brother marries, none of the younger brothers is allowed to marry during his elder brother's lifetime unless he severs completely his connection with the family and leaves the household.[1] Similarly, the younger sisters, when their elder sister marries, are debarred from contracting any further alliance. If, as not infrequently happens, the husband has no brothers or they are unable or unwilling to support a number of wives, the younger sisters are condemned to celibacy so long as their older sister lives; the usual course for them is to retire to a convent, and the female lamaseries of Tibet are peopled with younger sisters who can neither be supported as wives by the husbands of their older sister nor contract any independent marriage on their own account.[2] It is not infrequently the practice for the younger brothers also to become monks. Every Tibetan family is supposed to furnish at least one monk.[3] In the province of Spiti, when the eldest brother marries, it is usual for the others to become monks.[4] If, however, the eldest brother dies, leaving a young widow, the next brother usually leaves the monastery, and "thereupon he is at once considered his brother's widow's husband; she cannot object, nor is any marriage ceremony necessary." So, again, if the elder brother has a family of daughters only, the younger brother gives up his religious vocation in order to endeavour to beget a son by his brother's wife.[5] It sometimes happens that the eldest brother does not marry; if in a family of several brothers the second one marries, only his younger brothers have a claim on the wife, while the elder brother has none, and is obliged to leave the household.[6] In Ladakh the younger brothers are forbidden to marry on any account or to leave the household and go abroad for their living.[7]

The rationale of those rules becomes manifest when the principles upon which the marriage organisation is based are

[1] F. Grenard, *Tibet, the Country and its Inhabitants*, pp. 253, 255.

[2] C. F. Gordon Cumming, *In the Himalayas and in the Indian Plains*, p. 406. Cf. A. Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 231.

[3] *The Imperial Gazetteer of India*, vol. xvi, p. 92; E. C. Baber, *Travels and Researches in the Interior of China*, p. 97.

[4] Sarat Chandra Das, "The Marriage Customs of Tibet," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, lxii, part iii, p. 9.

[5] A. H. Diack, *Gazetteer of the Kangra District*, Part ii, pp. 82 sq.

[6] H. H. Risley, *The People of India*, p. 202.

[7] *The Imperial Gazetteer of India*, vol. xvi, p. 91.

apprehended. When an elder brother or an elder sister marries he or she does so as the representative of the whole group of brothers and sisters to which they respectively belong, and their marriage is at the same time the marriage of all the other brothers and of all the other sisters. It is in his capacity of head and representative of the family that the elder brother concludes the marriage, and he acts in the same manner with regard to all other transactions, the family property being undivided and vested in him as trustee for all the others. "The Tibetans look upon the family as a group of such absolute unity that there can be only one individual of full age who is the first-born of each generation." The younger brothers, "as incompetent minors, can enter into no valid contract except through the medium of their elder; they have not the power of making a marriage on their own account, even as they have not that of inheriting from their fathers in equality of right with the elder."[1] An intelligent Tibetan official, on being questioned by Marquis Cortanze on the institution, explained it as follows: "The system of the patriarchal family is consecrated by our religion, the property of a father not being divided amongst his sons, but remaining the exclusive property of the first-born. He, however, is under the obligation of lodging, clothing, and feeding his brothers, as many as there are; nor are they permitted to leave the parental roof unless they become lamas."[2] So consistently is the principle that the family can have only one representative head observed that, when the elder brother marries, his father retires from the headship of the family, and the property is, but for a small allowance, made over to the eldest son.[3] Indeed, there is indubitable evidence that, on the marriage of the elder brother, not only his younger brothers as they grow up, but also the husband's father and his uncles, have recognised rights over the wife or wives.[4] It follows from those principles that a marriage contracted by any one of the

[1] F. Grenard, *Tibet, the Country and its Inhabitants*, p. 253.

[2] O. Roero dei Marchesi di Cortanze, *Ricordi dei viaggi al Cashemir, Piccolo e Medio Thibet e Turkestan*, vol. i, p. 275.

[3] I. Desideri, in C. Puini, *op. cit.*, p. 131; E. F. Knight, *Where Three Empires Meet*, p. 138; *The Imperial Gazetteer of India*, vol. xvi, p. 91.

[4] Sarat Chandra Das, *Journey to Lhasa and Central Tibet*, p. 252. "It is not unusual for a father or uncle to live with his son's or nephew's wife, and even in high life a father makes himself a partner in the marital rights over his son's wife." Mr. Rockhill, who edits Mr. Chandra Das's book, throws doubt, without giving reasons, on the statement, but it is borne out by several other testimonies, besides being in perfect harmony with the whole principle of Tibetan jurisprudence. Mr. Sherring came upon an instance in a high and respected official of his acquaintance, and the matter was openly acknowledged and regarded as perfectly regular and involving

younger brothers independently would be supererogatory, and would have no place in the institution; it would, in fact, according to Tibetan ideas, be an act of bigamy incompatible with the principles of Tibetan marriage. Similarly among the Brahmans of Travancore and Malabar, when an elder brother marries all the younger brothers are thereby debarred from contracting any regular marriage within their own castes, although they are permitted to enter into a marriage union with a woman of a lower caste, such a union being regarded as informal.[1] We have already seen that among the eastern Gilyak the elder brother has no right of cohabitation over his younger brothers' wives,[2] and we shall come upon other illustrations of the same principle. It is a rule in marriages concluded by the head of a group in the name of the whole group that, while the younger brothers have a claim to the wives of their elder brother, the latter has no reciprocal claim to any wives whom his younger brothers may independently marry. Such marriages are no part of the group-marriage, which is complete with the marriage of the elder brother; and being unions grafted, as it were, on to the original organisation, it follows that they are ignored, and that they do not confer on the elder brother any right to the wives thus acquired. The younger brothers, on the other hand, retain their rights to the elder brother's wives.

The same principle is similarly observed in that residue of fraternal polyandry which is known as the levirate—that is, the right to marry a deceased brother's wife. That right belongs to a younger brother as regards the widow of his elder brother, but there is no converse right of an elder brother to the widow of his younger brother. Even where, for economic or charitable reasons, the widow of a younger brother is received by an older brother into his home and supported, he does not sexually cohabit with her, while he invariably does so with the widow of an elder brother. Thus in Assam, among the Kacharis and the Kuki, a man marries the widow of his elder brother, but he is forbidden to marry the widow of a younger brother.[3] Among the Gonds "it is even the duty of a younger brother to take to

no blame whatever (C. A. Sherring, *Western Tibet and the British Borderland*, p. 305). The same thing is also reported by Desideri (*op. cit.*, pp. 132 sq.). Father Desgodins says that the husbands are the brothers 'et proches parents' (C. H. Desgodins, *Le Thibet*, etc., p. 244). Moreover, if a man marries a widow who has daughters, the daughters also become his wives (C. A. Sherring, *op. cit.*, p. 306).

[1] See below, pp. 689 sq.

[2] See above, p. 630.

[3] C. A. Soppitt, *A Short Account of the Kachcha Naga Tribe of the North Cachar Hills*, p. 8; Id., *A Short Account of the Kuki-Lushai Tribes on the North-East Frontier*, p. 16.

wife the widow of an elder. The converse is not, however, permitted."[1] The same rules obtain among several other tribes of the Central Provinces.[2] Among the Teli of Chattisgarth if a younger brother of her deceased husband is too young to marry, the widow is obliged to wait until he grows up.[3] Among the Koryak a widow is obliged to marry her deceased husband's younger brother, but is forbidden to marry his elder brother.[4] Among the Chukchi it is a duty to marry the widow of one's elder brother and also of one's uncle, but a man must on no account marry the widow of his younger brother or of his nephew.[5] Among the Zulus the levirate is observed by the younger brother of the deceased, but not by his elder brother.[6] Among the Thonga of Mozambique a man marries his elder brother's widow, but it would be scandalous for him to marry the widow of a younger brother, and while he enjoys considerable freedom with the wives of his elder brothers during their lifetime, he is obliged to observe the greatest reserve towards the wives of his younger brother and to avoid meeting them.[7]

By the application of the same principle it is considered wrong for a younger brother to marry before his elder brother. We have already seen that the same rule obtains as regards sisters, who originally were married as soon as they attained puberty. The same reason applies in primitive society to brothers, since marriage generally takes place as soon as a youth is capable of fulfilling the physiological and economic functions of a husband. But in later stages it is as representative of the whole group that he marries, and it is clearly opposed to that principle that a brother younger than him should marry before him. The persistence of those ideas in stages of society far beyond those in which group-marriage took place bears witness to the deep mark which the principles of that organisation have impressed on social tradition. In the 'Laws of Manu' it is laid down that "the elder brother who marries after the younger, the younger brother who marries before the elder, the female with whom such a marriage is contracted, he who gives her away, and the sacrificing priest as the fifth, shall

[1] J. Forsyth, *The Highlands of Central India*, p. 150.

[2] R. V. Russell, *Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, vol. ii, p. 27 (Ahirs), vol. iii, p. 395 (Kawars). p. 559 (Korkus).

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. iv, p. 548. The same obligation is imposed upon the widow of a Batak in Sumatra (J. B. Neumann, "Het Pane- en Bila-stroomgebied op het eiland Sumatra," *Tijdschrift van het Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig Genootschap*, 2e Serie, No. 3, pp. 487 sq.).

[4] W. Jochelson, *The Koryak*, p. 748.

[5] W. Bogoras, *The Chukchee*, p. 607.

[6] F. Speckmann, *Die Hermannsburger Mission in Afrika*, pp. 135 sq.

[7] H. A. Junod, *The Life of a South African Tribe*, vol. i, p. 248.

all go down to hell."[1] In China the same principle is observed, and should any infraction of it be committed, it is atoned for by carrying in the bridal procession a pair of trousers, representing the elder brother, and laying them on the chair of the bride.[2] In Celebes, among the Toradjas, a fine is imposed for a transgression of the rule.[3] Among the Bataks of Sumatra a younger brother is forbidden to marry before his elder brother.[4] Among the Kaffir a younger brother may not marry before his elder brother.[5] The same rule is observed in Europe among the southern Slavs,[6] and there are traces of it even in England.[7]

The Korkus, a Kolarian tribe of the Central Provinces of India, are extremely polygamous, it being not unusual for a man to have as many as twelve wives. They observe sororal polygyny and the levirate, a man having a right to his wife's younger sisters and to the widow of his deceased elder brother, but those rights are subject to certain instructive restrictions. A man may not marry his wife's younger sister if she is the widow of a member of the same sect or clan, and a man may not marry the widow of his elder brother if she is an elder sister of his wife.[8] The rule of seniority in the latter case is therefore even stronger than the levirate rule; in the former case the right to a younger sister is over-ruled by the claim of the levirate—that is, by the right of the deceased's own relatives to his widow.

We have seen that among the Gilyak the rule of seniority is observed by one section—namely, the eastern and more advanced part of the race—while it is ignored by the western and ruder tribes. Among the latter all the brothers have access indifferently to one another's wives, while among the former the elder brother has no claim to the wives of the younger brothers, if they have any. The latter arrangement, which is identical with the Tibetan, marks an advance towards a more definitely patriarchal type of group-marriage. In the more primitive type the group is represented by its members, and all are equal; in the more advanced type it is represented by the eldest member, who is its head by right of primogeniture.

[1] *The Laws of Manu*, iii, 172 (*Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxv, p. 108). Cf. *The Institutes of Vishnu* (*ibid.*, vol. vii, p. 177); *The Sacred Laws of the Aryas* (*ibid.*, vol. xiv, pp. 103, 217).

[2] H. L. D., "A Strange Marriage Custom," *The China Review*, i, p. 272.

[3] N. Adriani and A. C. Kruijt, *De Bare'e-sprekende Toradja's van Midden Celebes*, ii, p. 16.

[4] G. A. Wilken, *De verspreide Geschriften*, vol. i, pp. 450 sq.

[5] D. Kidd, *The Essential Kafir*, p. 211.

[6] F. Demelič, *Le Droit Coutumier des Slaves Méridionaux*, p. 52.

[7] J. G. Frazer, *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament*, vol. ii, pp. 289 sq.

[8] R. V. Russell, *Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, vol. iii, p. 559.

There is every reason to believe that group-marriage between families—that is, patriarchal families—is in every instance derived from an organisation in which the marrying groups were originally clans, or in later stages marrying classes, that relation being represented in the patriarchal form of society by the preference for the marriage of cross or 'machuna' cousins. In Tibet the trace of those marriage classes has, it would seem, even now not completely disappeared. Father Ippolitus Desideri, an Italian Jesuit who visited the country in the beginning of the eighteenth century, has left us the following interesting information: "Concerning the marriages of the Tibetans it should be known in the first place that they recognised two different kinds of kinship—kinsmen who are 'of the same bone' (Rus-pa-gschig), and kinsmen who are 'of the same flesh' (Sha-gschig). The first kind comprise all the individuals who are issued from the same stem, whether begotten in the direct line or belonging to side branches, however remote from the main stem, and through a very long series of generations. Those, on the other hand, are designated as kindred 'of the same flesh' who are allies by way of lawful matrimonies. The first kind of kinship is regarded by the Tibetans as very close and absolutely inviolable, and it constitutes an absolute impediment to matrimony; if persons 'of the same bone,' even though very remotely related, were convicted of having sexual relations, they would be accounted guilty of an execrable incest, and would accordingly be regarded as for ever infamous and abhorred of everyone. The second sort of kinship, although in the first or sometimes even in the second degree it is regarded as unfavourable to marriage, is nevertheless not avoided in forming matrimonial unions. Thus, for example, an uncle and a niece will not marry, but the union in matrimony of a male and a female cousin is extremely frequent."[1] Read in the light of our present knowledge, that account implies that Tibetan marriages are concluded between members of corresponding marrying classes, out of which the present-day 'families' have become differentiated, and that the proper wife for a young Tibetan is his cousin—that is, the daughter of his mother's brother or of his father's sister.[2] And this is confirmed by the fact that

[1] Carlo Puini, *Il Tibet secondo la relazione del viaggio del P. Ippolito Desideri* (1715–1721) (*Memorie della Società Geografica Italiana*, vol. x. p. 129.

[2] Mr. Rockhill remarks on the fact that, while the Tibetan language is very rich in terms of relationship, it has no word corresponding to 'cousin.' He mentions that the word used would be the same as for 'brothers' or 'sisters' (W. W. Rockhill, *The Land of the Lamas*, p. 213, n.). This must probably be understood to refer to cousins 'of the same bone,' who cannot marry, while cousins 'of the same flesh' may and must. Although, as will be seen, the prohibited degrees extend much farther than with us, one

no marriage can be concluded without the authority of the bride's maternal uncle, who, in normal circumstances, would be no other than the father of the bridegroom.[1] In the province of Sikkim the whole marriage transaction is negotiated between the respective maternal uncles of the parties.[2] It appears, indeed, that not long since it was his maternal uncle who was regularly responsible for a man's marriage. As late as the year 1880 a dispute arose between two tribes out of the claim of the maternal uncle of a young prince to select a bride for his nephew without consulting the boy's father. The latter, however, disputed the right, and claimed to have a say in the matter.[3]

As the above facts indicate, Tibetan society, although essentially patriarchal in its present organisation, is not far removed from a matriarchal phase. In former times part of the country at least was not only matriarchally organised, but was under a complete system of gynecocracy in the fullest sense of the term.[4] The high position occupied by Tibetan women, which stands in marked contrast with the status of women in China or in India, has already been noted.[5] Almost every report dwells upon the fact. "Comparatively with their southern neighbours," says Turner, "the women of Tibet enjoy an elevated station in society. To the privileges of unbounded liberty the wife adds the character of mistress of the family and companion of her husbands."[6] "This is a country," says Mr. Knight, "where women's rights are thoroughly understood and respected. The ladies of Ladakh labour under no legal disabilities, and, far from being treated as inferiors, are in a better position than the men."[7] "The freedom of the women is complete—in fact, it is the unfortunate male who at some future date will have to bestir himself in the matter of his rights."[8] "This pre-eminent position of women in Tibetan society," says Mr. Rockhill, "has been from of old one of the

writer, who shows a very thorough misunderstanding of the whole subject, asserts that the Tibetans marry within the prohibited degrees (C. R. Stulpnagel, in *The Indian Antiquary*, vii, p. 134). It is easy to see how their marriages with a cousin would be so interpreted by a person ignorant of the principles of their marriage system.

[1] F. Grenard, *Tibet : the Country and the People*, p. 262.

[2] Sarat Chandra Das, "The Marriage Customs of Tibet," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, lxii, pt. iii, p. 20.

[3] W. W. Rockhill, *op. cit.*, pp. 253 sq., n., citing an official report in the *Peking Gazette* of January 8, 1884.

[4] See below, vol. iii, pp. 23 sq.

[5] See above, p. 327.

[6] S. Turner, *An Account of an Embassy to the Court of the Teshoo Lama*, p. 350.

[7] E. F. Knight, *Where Three Empires Meet*, p. 139.

[8] Ahmad Shah, *Four Years in Tibet*, p. 52.

peculiarities of the race."[1] In spite of the fundamental importance of the undivided patriarchal household in the social organisation of Tibet at the present day, that patriarchal family has, by a strange paradox, no name; there are no family names in Tibet, and children are named after their mother and not after their father, whose name, indeed, must not even be mentioned.[2] Polyandrous Tibetan marriages are, in some districts, at the same time matrilocal. In Seresmundo, according to Bonvalot, a woman continues after marriage to dwell in her own house, and the men whom she accepts as husbands join her or visit her there.[3] So again in Lahul, where the same marriage customs prevail as in Tibet proper, a woman, if she be an heiress, remains in her own home after marriage.[4] The same thing is not unusual in Tibet.[5] If, as there seems every reason to believe, the organisation of Tibetan society was formerly matriarchal, kinship being counted and property descending in the female line, this would be originally the normal arrangement. The exogamic polyandrous marriages of the Tibetan clans would thus be identical with those which will presently be considered in regard to the Tamils of Southern India.

It is apparent that the marriage organisation of Tibet has undergone considerable modifications before assuming its present form. The changes which have taken place would appear to have been similar to those which, according to Dr. Sternberg, have marked the transition between the marriage institutions of the western and those of the eastern Gilyak. While with the former the members of a marriage-group have equal rights of access to one another's wives, among the latter an undivided patriarchal family of exactly the same type as that of Tibet has become established, and the marriage of the eldest brother stands for that of the whole group of brothers.[6]

Marriage is not regarded by the Tibetans as a sexual but as a social and economic relation, the two aspects being kept distinct. The sexual life of the Tibetans is for the most part unconnected with marriage, and is free from restrictions, both before and after marriage, except as regards the begetting of children. Marriage is regarded rather in the light of a sacrifice to the paramount interests of the family group than as a sexual organisation. Probably that is what Captain Turner realised when he wrote in somewhat whimsical terms that "marriage amongst them

[1] W. W. Rockhill, *op. cit.*, p. 213.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 213.
[3] G. Bonvalot, *Across Tibet*, vol. ii, pp. 124 sq.
[4] A. H. Diack, *Gazetteer of the Kangra District*, part iii, p. 14.
[5] Ahmad Shah, *Four Years in Tibet*, p. 53.
[6] See above, p. 630.

seems to be considered rather as an odium and a heavy burden, the weight and obloquy of which a whole family are disposed to lessen by sharing it among them." [1] As might be expected, the marriage arranged by the family for the elder brother has nothing to do with any personal choice or inclination on his part. "Conjugal union being a family affair is not a matter of personal inclination; the wishes of the young people interested are in no wise consulted. The marriage is usually arranged upon the birth of the children by the parents of the two parties." [2] Marquis Cortanze enquired from his informant, the governor of Leh, which of the brothers, on the conclusion of the marriage, had first access to the bride. The Tibetan official could not, however, see that the matter was of any importance. "As a rule, the eldest brother, no doubt," was his reply, "but the matter is of no moment whatever." [3] The question about which Warren Hastings was curious to obtain information—namely, to which of the fathers the children were supposed to belong—is likewise entirely irrelevant. "All interests," says Mr. Wilson, "are subordinate to those of the family. This supreme family feeling prevents any difficulty arising in connection with the children, who are regarded as scions of the house rather than of any particular member of it." [4]

Such being the fundamental principles governing the impartite fraternal household, it will be seen that the number of wives in it is of no essential importance. Although theoretically there does not appear to be any limit to that number, and all the sisters of a wife are deemed to be married to the same set of husbands, yet there is no doubt that in Tibetan marriage, as in most polyandrous organisations resting upon the same principles, monogyny is

[1] S. Turner, *Account of an Embassy to the Court of the Teshoo Lama*, p. 349.

[2] F. Grenard, *op. cit.*, p. 258. Cf. A. Wilson, *The Abode of Snow*, p. 233.

[3] O. Roero, *Ricordi dei Viaggi al Cashemir, Piccolo e Medio Thibet e Turkestan*, vol. i, p. 276.

[4] A. W. Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 231. Cf. F. Grenard, *op. cit.*, pp. 252 sq. Varying reports have been given by other writers. According to most all the children are accounted as the offspring of the eldest brother (Desideri, ap. C. Puini, *op. cit.*, p. 131; Ahmad Shah, *Four Years in Tibet*, p. 53; W. Moorcroft and G. Trebeck, *Travels in the Himalayas and the Panjab*, vol. i, pp. 321 sq.; E. Balfour, *Cyclopaedia of India and of Eastern and South Asia*, vol. iv, p. 620). According to other writers, the mother determines to which father the child belongs (Orazio Penna, *Breve notizia del regno di Tibet*, in *Journal Asiatique*, 2e Série, xiv, p. 143; G. Bogle, ap. C. S. Markham, *op. cit.*, p. 123; W. W. Rockhill, *op. cit.*, pp. 212 sq.). Mr. Savage Landor says that the children are assigned in rotation (*op. cit.*, vol. ii. p. 65), and others make the same statement (J. B. Du Halde, *Description de la Chine et de la Tartarie chinoise*, vol. iv, p. 572; C. B. G. A. Grosier, *A General Description of China*, vol. i, p. 322; C. R. Stulpnagel, *op. cit.*, p. 135). Those are probably attempts to satisfy Chinese and European enquiries on a question that, for Tibetans, does not arise.

usual. Marquis Cortanze's informant stated that "if there be two brothers with two wives, it is impossible for harmony to continue between them, much less if there be five or six women in the house." [1] Although such psychological generalisations should be regarded with distrust as explanations of customs, it appears probable that the paramount object of family unity is considered to be best attained by limiting fraternal sexual communism to one wife. The number of sisters or cousins that is received into a household is also related to economic conditions. Among the pastoral population of the uplands the men who are occupied in tending the herds of yak spend more than half their lives away from home.[2] There are no other duties for the women to attend to but the work of the household. Consequently one woman is enough, and there is no economic inducement to keep more. In the agricultural lowlands, on the other hand, different conditions obtain. The women, as everywhere, are the chief husbandmen. "In all the occupations of husbandry the heavy burden lies on the fair sex." [3] "Women, who all take their share in field work, are very valuable in the agricultural districts." [4] "In the valley-farms," says Baber, "the work is light and suitable for women, but the rough life and hard fare of a shepherd on pastures 13,000 feet or more above sea-level is too severe for the sex." [5] The reasons given by Baber are not in accordance with general experience, but the fact that agricultural work is women's work and herding is not is universal in earlier cultures. In those conditions the herdsman will prefer to dispense with more than one wife to attend to the house; the farmer will profit by having as many as possible. Accordingly in the agricultural districts polygyny as well as polyandry prevails in Tibetan group-marriage, and there are few nuns and female lamaseries; [6] in the higher pastoral districts, on the contrary,

[1] O. Roero, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 275.

[2] W. W. Rockhill, *The Land of the Lamas*, p. 211.

[3] G. Bogle, in C. S. Markham, *op. cit.*, p. 64. Cf. J. B. Fraser, *Journal of a Tour through Part of the Snowy Range of the Himālā Mountains*, p. 207, and A. Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 153: "During my stay there [at Spiti] most of the men were away trading in Chinese Tibet and Ladakh, and I could not but admire the wonderful industry of the women. There were some fields before my tent in which they worked literally day and night in order to lose no time in getting the grain cut and in preparing the ground for a second crop—one of buckwheat. Besides labouring at this the whole day, they returned to their fields after dinner in the evening and worked there with the aid of torches of resinous pine-wood until one or two in the morning."

[4] C. R. Stulpnagel, "Polyandry in the Himalayas," *The Indian Antiquary*, vii, p. 133.

[5] C. Baber, *Travels and Researches in the Interior of China*, p. 97.

[6] W. W. Rockhill, *The Land of the Lamas*, p. 212.

the younger sisters go to increase the population of the nunneries.[1] The paramount position of the woman as head of the household and symbol of its unity makes likewise for monogyny. The women are sometimes rather jealous of their rights. Thus Sir James Lyall, speaking of the Kangra district of the Panjab where the same usages obtain as in Tibet, says: "I remember a case which came before me in which one of the brothers living in polyandry much wished to separately marry a girl by whom he had had an illegitimate child; but the wife of the family objected strongly, claiming both brothers as husbands, and refusing to admit another woman into the household, and she eventually prevailed." [2]

The collective marriage, in which every Tibetan is a partner, while it places a restriction upon his social and economic arrangements, does not necessarily limit his sexual relations. In Tibet, as among all Mongol and Turkic populations, there is a recognised institution of individual marriages of very short duration, lasting months, weeks, or even days, which serves to compensate for the limitations imposed by group-marriage.[3] Further, in a wealthy family, more especially where trading has been taken up as the chief occupation, the younger brothers, while strictly debarred from bringing wives of their own into the family household, are generally at liberty to contract independently whatever marriages they please, as by

[1] It should be observed that the vows of Tibetan nuns (Ge-slong-ma) are not irrevocable. The nuns are free to give up religious life whenever they desire at the shortest notice, and they frequently avail themselves of the right. Sometimes a nun will only enter a lamasery for a few months or a year or two. A younger sister who has become a nun is therefore always available to join her elder sister should it be desired, or to take her place in case of death. I have nowhere come upon any statement on the point, but from the irrevocable character of the marriage contracted between two families, I think that there can be no doubt that, on the decease of a first wife, no other wife can be admitted into the same family unless she be a sister or cousin of the deceased. Further enquiries may perhaps throw light on the accuracy of my conjecture. Tibetan nuns enjoy much greater freedom than do the monks. They are not secluded; often they continue to live in the paternal home, only attending the lamasery for religious duties and functions. They are like all the rest of Tibetan women and men, except the lamas, extremely hard-working, and employ themselves in agricultural labour, cultivating either the fields of their parents and relatives or the land attached to the lamaseries. It is they, besides, who are generally called upon for any casual labour, which is done by order of the State; one's luggage, for instance, when travelling in Tibet, is generally carried by nuns. They maintain themselves and earn their living by their industry, and are thus in singular contrast with the monks, who are parasites on the community.

[2] J. B. Lyall, *Report of the Land Revenue Settlement of the Kangra District, Panjab*, p. 203.

[3] W. W. Rockhill, *The Land of the Lamas*, p. 212.

purchasing foreign wives and setting up polygamous households after the Mongol and Hindu fashion. In order to do so they must, however, sever their economic connection with the family household, either by surrendering their share entirely, or, if circumstances allow of it, by arranging to withdraw a proportional share of the common property, and giving up, of course, all claim to the usufruct of the remainder.[1] The marriage in such cases is a purely individual contract, and the other brothers or relatives have naturally no right as regards the wives thus individually acquired. Nevertheless, so strong is the established tradition of the normal group-marriage that the younger brother who thus secedes from the household does not lose his claim to the wives of the family to which he belongs by group-marriage, for the latter is indissoluble.[2] Such individual marriages can, it is clear, be contracted in wealthy families only where the property is large enough to bear subdivision, or where the individual can earn sufficient by his own industry to set up a separate household and purchase wives.[3]

It has been several times stated by the older writers that polyandry prevails in the poorer classes, and not among the well-to-do.[4] In the sense in which it is intended—that is, on the assumption that the supposed 'polyandry' is an economical means of acquiring a share in a wife adopted by people who cannot afford to acquire a whole wife—the statement is entirely false. There is, in fact, no real poverty in Tibet. "Almost everyone has either land and a house of his own, or land and a house in which he has a share, and which provide for his protection and subsistence. The people are hard-working in summer and in autumn, and they are poor in the sense of having small possessions and few luxuries, but they are not poor in the sense of presenting a very poor class at a loss to procure subsistence." [5] "The people

[1] F. Grenard, *op. cit.*, p. 256.

[2] *Ibid.* This liberty is, however, not permitted in the province of Ladakh (*The Imperial Gazetteer of India*, vol. xvi, p. 91).

[3] J. D. Cunningham, *History of the Sikhs*, p. 18.

[4] Father Georgi says: "Ab hoc turpitudinis genere alieni sunt viri nobiles et cives honesti" (A. A. Georgi, *Alphabetum Tibetanum*, Rome, 1762, p. 458). The Capucin Orazio della Penna states "this (polyandry) does not commonly happen among noble and well-to-do people"; it only takes place, according to him, "fra le persone non molto comode" (O. Penna, *Breve notizie del regno di Tibet*, in *Journal Asiatique*, 2e Serie, xiv, p. 177). General Sir Alexander Cunningham says that polyandry "prevails, of course, only among the poorer classes" (A. Cunningham, *Ladak*, p. 306). The remark appears, however, to have reference to the number of wives rather than to the number of husbands. "The rich," he adds, "generally have two or three wives, according to their circumstances."

[5] A. Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 235. Cf. C. R. Stulpnagel in *The Indian Antiquary*,

are generally well-to-do and happy," says the Rev. Ahmad Shah.[1] Polyandry can, therefore, not be imposed by the stress of a destitution which does not exist. Most travellers have occasion to make reference to high officials, headmen of villages and towns, nobles, governors of provinces, and even Dalai Lamas who are members of polyandrous families.[2] Captain Turner emphatically says: "Nor is this sort of compact confined to the lower ranks of the people alone; it is found also frequently in the most opulent families."[3] Wilson states: "My experience was that it prevailed among all classes."[4] Puini cautiously concludes: "I do not think that it can be affirmed in a general manner of all Tibetan provinces that polyandry is a custom practised by those who are driven to it by poverty."[5] It would appear, on the contrary, that the old and noble families, who are naturally the most conservative, and with whom the traditional institution of large undivided households containing as many as twenty or thirty members is regarded as a sanctified national custom, adhere most scrupulously to the time-honoured marriage institutions.[6] Dr. Stulpnagel, indeed, expressly states that in the districts of Kotgada, Bussahir, and Kulu, with which he was acquainted, "most of the cases of polyandry are found among the well-to-do."[7]

Contrary to what we are prone to assume, the polyandrous organisation of Tibetan marriage is not imposed upon the women, nor is any violence done to their inclinations. The claims of the brothers to the common wife or wives are never exercised without the express consent of the latter; should she refuse, her objections would be respected.[8] But in point of fact the women are the staunchest supporters of the system, and exclaim in astonishment and disgust on hearing that there are peculiar countries where a woman is allowed only one husband. "Don't you think we Tibetan women are better off?" asked one

vii, p. 134: "Poor the hill people undoubtedly are, but there are few who are destitute."

[1] Ahmad Shah, *Four Years in Tibet*, p. 52.

[2] C. R. Markham, *Narrative of the Mission of George Bogle to Tibet*, pp. 139, 181; O. Roero, *Ricordi dei Viaggi al Cashemir, Piccolo e Medio Thibet e Turkestan*, vol. i, p. 276; C. R. Stulpnagel, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

[3] S. Turner, *Account of an Embassy to the Court of the Teshoo Lama*, p. 349. Cf. W. W. Rockhill, *op. cit.*, pp. 212 sqq.; C. Bonvalot, *Across Thibet*, vol. ii, p. 126.

[4] A. Wilson, *The Abode of Snow*, p. 228.

[5] C. Puini, *Il Tibet*, p. 140.

[6] C. A. Sherring, *Western Tibet and the British Borderland*, p. 190; A. Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

[7] C. R. Stulpnagel, "Polyandryin the Himalayas," *The Indian Antiquary*, vii, p. 135.

[8] H. H. Risley, *The People of India*, p. 202.

lady on hearing of the strange custom. "In Tibet the housewife is the real lady of all the joint earnings and inheritance of all the brothers sprung from the same mother, who are all of the same flesh and blood. The brothers are but one, though their souls are several. In India a man marries several women who are strangers to each other," she added in disgust.[1] "The women of this country," says the Rev. Ahmad Shah, "have assured travellers that they sincerely pity their Western sisters who are compelled to own but one husband, and cannot realise how it is possible for any woman to become rich and be well provided for without enjoying the luxury of several husbands."[2] Indeed, it is the rule in some districts that a woman has the acknowledged right to have one or more additional husbands of her own choice besides the brothers to whom she is married. The additional husband selected by the woman who considers the latitude of her matrimonial arrangements insufficient, is admitted to the collective marriage-group on the same terms as the brothers or relatives.[3] The same right, as we shall presently see, is recognised by the Todas.

It is worth noting that as regards the degree of sexual promiscuity and of what, in terms of our ideas, is called immorality, these are far greater where the group-marriage organisation has been more or less sapped and broken up by individual marriage than where it is strictly preserved. In Tibet a group-marriage between two families generally means the cohabitation of two or three men with two or three women, in most cases of two men with one woman. The several husbands are, owing to the necessities of their occupations, usually absent from home for long periods. "It is not too much to say that more than half of the time of nearly every man in the country is spent away from his home."[4] In practice a woman therefore seldom cohabits with more than one man at a time.[5] Where, on the other hand, wealthy men break away from the tradition by individual marriage, they purchase as many wives and concubines as their means will allow, and often keep several households of wives in the various parts of the country where their trading or other occupations take them.[6] Orthodox group-marriage

[1] Sarat Chandra Das, *Journey to Lhasa*, p. 161.

[2] Ahmad Shah, *Four Years in Tibet*, p. 53.

[3] E. F. Knight, *Where Three Empires Meet*, pp. 138 sq.; F. Drew, *The Jummoo and Kasmir Territories*, pp. 250 sq.; K. E. von Ujfalvy, *Aus dem westlichen Himalaja*, p. 36; Ahmad Shah, *Four Years in Tibet*, pp. 52 sq. Cf. G. Bonvalot, *Across Thibet*, vol. ii, pp. 124 sq.

[4] W. W. Rockhill, *The Land of the Lamas*, pp. 211 sq.

[5] A. H. Savage Landor, *op. cit.*, p. 63; C. Horne, "Notes on Villages in the Himalayas, in Kumaon, Gharwâl and on the Sutlej," *The Indian Antiquary*, v, p. 164.

[6] W. W. Rockhill, *op. cit.*, p. 144; C. A. Sherring, *Western Tibet*, p. 190.

in Tibet is ceremoniously negotiated between the respective families through the intermediary of official 'go-betweens,' and it is reverentially solemnised, as among several North Asiatic races, by anointing the bride, in this instance with yak grease.[1] Among the Darma, Ryans, Chandans, and other south Himalayan tribes who have adopted individual marriage, this is arranged in places called 'rambangs,' which are a kind of club "where men and women spend the night singing lewd love songs and drinking and smoking. Married and unmarried men go there; also single women and married women up to the time that their first child is born. Girls start to go to the 'rambang' from the age of ten years, and practically never sleep at home after that age."[2] Tibetan group-marriage is indissoluble. Father Desideri is very emphatic on this point. "Absolutely and universally" he says "marriages between them are indissoluble until death doth part them."[3] Mr. Savage Landor states that divorce is possible, but that it is attended with so many difficulties and complications as to render it well-nigh impracticable.[4] It follows from the principle of group-marriage that it is not dissoluble; the contract is not made between individuals, but between the groups to which they belong; the former are mortal, but the groups are not. The same principle persists wherever the fundamental conceptions of group-marriage survive. Thus among the Yoruba, says Mr. S. Johnson, "women are never really married twice. They may be inherited as widows, or taken for a wife outside the late husband's family, but the marriage ceremony is never gone over again under any circumstances. Once married they are attached for ever to the house and family of the

[1] C. Puini, *op. cit.*, p. 144. Anointing the bride with the fat of reindeer is also the essential marriage rite among the Chuckchi (W. Bogoras, *The Chukchee*, pp. 595 sq.), and the Koryak (W. Jochelson, *The Koryak*, p. 746).

[2] C. A. Sherring, *Western Tibet*, p. 104; Id., "Notes on the Bhotias of Almora and British Garwhâl," *Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, vol. i, p. 105 sq.

[3] C. Puini, *op. cit.*, p. 132. Father Desideri says, however, that in his time the institution of divorce had been introduced through the authority of the Tartars, and could be negotiated through the intermediary of Chinese courts. But he also adds the interesting information that in all such cases of divorce the husband was an only son and had no brothers.

[4] A. H. Savage Landor, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 63. Should there, however, be no children and the eldest brother dies, it is then possible for the wife to sever her connection with the family. In order to do so she ties her finger by a thread to a finger of the body of the deceased brother, and breaks the thread, and she is then divorced from the corpse and the surviving brothers (*The Imperial Gazetteer of India*, vol. xvi, p. 92; E. F. Knight, *Where Three Empires Meet*, p. 139). It will be observed that the marriage contracted by the elder brother can only be dissolved by severing the connection with him, and that by so doing divorce for the other brothers is at the same time effected.

deceased husbands."[1] The easy dissolution of marriage is a feature which owes its introduction to individual marriage. In those parts of Western Tibet where the marriage customs of the plains have sapped the institution of group-marriage, "the form of divorce is simplicity itself; a man tells his wife to go and she leaves him."[2] Wives and concubines who are purchased after the lowland fashion can be changed and re-sold as often as a man pleases. When a man is tired of one "he sells her to his neighbour for something under cost price and purchases a new inmate for the zenana."[3] It is curious to note that those missionaries who have been more concerned with inveighing against the immorality of Tibetan customs than with endeavouring to understand them have unwittingly addressed their invectives against the very people who have departed from their ancestral customs of 'polyandry.' Similarly Dr. Westermarck takes occasion to remark that in its decay "polyandry is modified in directions tending towards monogamy,"[4] whereas in point of fact it is not towards monogamy, but on the contrary towards the highest degree of polygamy, that marriages which are originally 'poikilogynous,' if the term may be allowed, and often monogynous, do actually lead in Tibet. The Marquis Cortanze, who, like many other travellers, has been impressed by the high moral character of the Tibetans, remarks that "there does not exist in the whole province of Ladakh, including its capital Leh, a single Tibetan woman who is a prostitute," whereas the lowlands, where Tibetan customs have decayed, swarm with them, as does Kashmir.[5]

It appears superfluous to point out that no importance can be attached to the various theories and suppositions that have been put forward to 'explain the origin' of so-called polyandry in Tibet. It has, for instance, been frequently supposed and alleged that there is in Tibet a larger number of men than of women. Thus the Jesuits Desideri[6] and Du Halde[7] have explained the marriage institutions of Tibet by that supposition, and Dr. Wester-

[1] S. Johnson, *The History of the Yoruba*, p. 116.

[2] C. A. Sherring, *Western Tibet and the British Borderland*, p. 114.

[3] C. F. Gordon Cumming, *In the Himalayas and in the Indian Plains*, p. 405.

[4] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, p. 457. It appears difficult to reconcile this assertion with the same author's hypothesis that polyandry arose out of monogamy.

[5] O. Roero dei Marchesi di Cortanze, *Ricordi dei Viaggi al Cashemir, Piccolo e Medio Thibet e Turkestan*, vol. i, p. 277.

[6] I. Desideri, in C. Puini, *op. cit.*, p. 131. Father Desideri mentions this cause, however, as one "of secondary importance."

[7] Du Halde, *Description de la Chine*, vol. iv, p. 229.

marck, speaking of polyandry in general, has expressed the view that, "to whatever cause the practice may be attributed, the chief immediate cause is, no doubt, a numerical disproportion between the sexes." [1] There is in Tibet no trace of evidence to give colour to the supposition. Signor Puini, summing up very cautiously the information on the subject, remarks: "As regards the scarcity of women, it appears to me, in respect to Tibet, to be rather a motive imagined in order to explain the practice of polyandry than a fact corresponding to reality. The large number of those who give themselves up to monastic life and consequently to celibacy removes any excess of males which might be found among the Tibetan race.[2] The women who embrace a religious life are in far lesser number, and are chiefly those who have been unable to find a place in families. So that one may in truth estimate that in Tibet the numbers of the males are approximately equal to those of the females." [3] Mr. Rockhill also is of opinion that "the numbers of women and men are probably equal"; [4] and Sir Herbert Risley never heard polyandry assigned to a scarcity of women, and says that "there is no reason to believe that the proportion of the sexes in Sikkim and Tibet is not fairly equal." [5] But it would appear that even those estimates are too moderate. Sir A. Cunningham says that in Ladakh "it will be observed that the females outnumber the males," while, on the other hand, in Moslem districts, where Islamic polygyny obtains, "the reverse is the case." [6] This is confirmed by Messrs Moorcroft and Trebeck, who state: "The women of Ladakh, in consequence of their great proportional number, find it difficult to obtain subsistence." [7] In Lahul, where polyandry is "extensively practised," both the census of 1881 and that of 1891 show that the women outnumber the men in the large proportion of 108 to 100.[8]

[1] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage* (1911), p. 504; cf. p. 132. In his remodelled edition Dr. Westermarck avoids committing himself too explicitly, but still gives the hypothesis the most prominent place as an explanation of polygamy (*op. cit.*, ed. 1921, vol. iii, pp. 158 sqq.).

[2] In the province of Ladakh, which is now administratively a part of Kashmir, it is calculated that one-sixth of the population is in the monasteries (*The Imperial Gazetteer of India*, vol. xvi, p. 92). In Bhutan monks and nuns constitute about one-twelfth of the population (C. F. Koeppen, *Die Religion des Buddha*, vol. ii, p. 363).

[3] C. Puini, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

[4] W. W. Rockhill, *The Land of the Lamas*, p. 212.

[5] H. H. Risley, *The People of India*, p. 212.

[6] A. Cunningham, *Ladak*, p. 289.

[7] W. Moorcroft and G. Trebeck, *Travels in the Himalayan Provinces of Hindustan and the Panjab, in Ladakh and Kashmir*, vol. i, p. 322.

[8] A. H. Diack, *Gazetteer of the Kangra District*, Part iii, p. 10. A characteristic instance of the kind of evidence brought forward in support of preconceived theories is presented by the following passage of the Rev. W.

The survival of collective marriage in Tibetan-speaking countries does not appear to call for any other explanation than the persistence in a profoundly conservative and proverbially segregated society of its traditional organisation and institutions. In the same manner, the naturally and artificially segregated communities of Sparta retained in ancient Greece the social organisation and spirit of another age. The marriage institutions of Tibet have no connection with Lamaistic Buddhism, which was introduced at a comparatively late date,[1] whereas there is no tradition in Tibet of any origin of group-marriage, which is regarded as "indefinitely old."[2] Nor is Tibetan group-marriage a peculiar form of marriage existing side by side with other forms. "The regular, extensive, and solidified system of Tibetan polyandry"[3] is the legal, traditional and normal form of marriage institutions in the country, and any other form of marriage is an unrecognised and irregular deviation from that immemorial and fundamental organisation. It is observed "all over the country of the Tibetan-speaking people—that is to say, from China to the dependencies of Kashmir and Afghanistan. I found polyandry to exist commonly," continues Mr. Wilson, "from Taranda, in the Sutlej Valley, a few marches from Simla, up to Chinese Tibet, and from there to Suru, where it disappeared in the polygyny of the Mahommedan Kasmiris. But it is well known to exist, and to be an almost universal custom, all through Chinese Tibet, Ladakh, Little Tibet, and nearly all the Tibetan-speaking provinces. It is not confined to that region, however, and is probably the common marriage custom of at least thirty millions of respectable people."[4]

Rebsch, a missionary in Eastern Tibet. "It is a notorious fact," he asserts, "that for ages past the zenanas of the rich natives of the plains have been supplied with females from the hill regions, which, together with the cruel custom of female infanticide, has caused a disproportion between the sexes, and given rise to the monstrous evil of polyandry, a practice which obtains throughout the country" (quoted by Dr. C. R. Stulpnagel, *op. cit.*, p. 133). Both the above premises are opposed to facts. In Tibet girls are valued, respected and never sold to strangers, and there is not a single Tibetan prostitute either in Tibetan-speaking countries or anywhere else (O. Roero, *loc. cit.*). Female infanticide is never practised in Tibet (W. W. Rockhill, *op. cit.*, p. 214 n.).

[1] C. F. Koeppen, *Die Religion des Buddha*, vol. i, p. 476; cf. vol. ii, p. 322. Hence it is not surprising that lamas sometimes regard polyandry as "a sinful practice, solely attributable to the very lax morality of the people" (W. W. Rockhill, *The Land of the Lamas*, p. 213 n.). They would probably recommend younger brothers to avoid it by becoming monks—a course which, as we have seen, is often adopted. The Buddhistic Church takes no part in the celebration of any marriage (S. Turner, *op. cit.*, p. 352; C. F. Koeppen, *op. cit.*, p. 321).

[2] A. Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 233. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 227.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 225. Cf. Ahmad Shah, *Four Years in Tibet*, p. 52.

Polyandrous Marriage in other parts of the Himalayan Region and Central Asia.

Polyandrous marriage institutions have survived in Tibet, not because they are peculiarly Tibetan, but because Tibet has remained peculiarly isolated. The same institutions are found at the present day throughout the Himalayan region, but in varying stages of decay and obsolescence. In Assam polyandry occurs among the northern tribes, such as the Abors,[1] the Miris, and the Daflas ;[2] but among the latter it is now difficult to discover the few surviving traces of it,[3] while it has apparently died out among the southern tribes under the influence of Hinduism. Polyandry has often been reported of the Khasis, but changes of partner are so frequent among them that it is difficult to distinguish that successive polyandry from simultaneous polyandry. The existence of the latter is denied by the more wealthy and civilised Khasis, but Captain Fisher thinks it probable that "unqualified polyandry existed formerly, and that it has fallen into disrepute since a more intimate connection with the plains has sprung up."[4] "Polyandry is extinct among the Garos and the Kochs."[5] It is still flourishing in Bhutan,[6] and is found in Sikkim[7] and in the Darjeeling district of Alpine Bengal.[8] It was till lately widespread in Kulu and the Kangra district,[9] but "the change from community of wives to separation is going on, and polyandry will disappear, though it

[1] H. B. Rowney, *The Wild Tribes of India*, p. 158.

[2] E. T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal*, pp. 33, 36.

[3] E. A. Gait, in *Census of India*, 1891, "Assam," vol. i, Report, pp. 222 sq.

[4] Captain Fisher, "Memoir of Sylhet, Kachar, and the Adjacent Districts," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, ix, part ii, p. 834. Cf. E. A. Gait, *op. cit.*, p. 119: "There appear to be traces of its existence at some previous time among the Khasis and also among the Garos."

[5] J. Wise, *Notes on the Races, Castes and Tribes of Eastern Bengal*, p. 126.

[6] Kishen Kant Bose, "Some Account of the Country of Bhutan," *Asiatic Researches*, xv, p. 148; J. C. White, *Sikhim and Bhutan*, p. 320; E. T. Dalton, *op. cit.*, p. 98; E. A. Gait, in *Census of India*, 1891, "Assam," vol. i, Report, p. 119.

[7] J. C. White, *loc. cit.*; H. H. Risley, *The Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, vol. ii, p. 9; Id., *The People of India*, p. 211.

[8] H. H. Risley, *loc. cit.*, G. T. Vigne, *Travels in Kashmir, Ladakh, Iskard*, vol. i, p. 37.

[9] A. F. B. Harcourt, *The Himalayan Districts of Kooloo, Lahoul and Spiti*, p. 241; A. H. Diack, *Gazetteer of the Kangra District*, vol. ii, p. 25, vol. iii, p. 13; K. E. Ujfalvy, *Aus dem westlichen Himalaja*, pp. 35 sqq.; D. Ibbetson, *Report on the Census of the Panjab*, 1881, vol. i, p. 365; E. D. Maclagan, in *Census of India*, 1891, vol. xix, "The Punjab and its Feudatories," Part i, p. 224; Pandit Harikishen Kaul, in *Census of India*, 1911, vol. xiv, "Panjab," Part i, pp. 287, 289; J. Calvert, *Vazeeri Rupi, the Silver Country of the Vazeers, in Kulu*, p. 32.

probably exists to a greater extent than is admitted."[1] In Lahul, it is "a recognised institution and very general."[2] Polyandry is likewise general in Saraj,[3] the Simla hills and the Kanaur district of the Upper Sutlej.[4] Fraser found this 'disgusting practice' in every valley of the western Himalayas which he visited.[5] In Spiti polyandry has disappeared among the general population, not, however, from the development of any moral prejudice against it, which does not exist,[6] but owing to the custom of all the younger brothers in a family becoming monks. The principle continues to be observed, in case of lack of male issue, when one of the younger brothers gives up monastic life to share his elder brother's household and wife.[7] Among the monks of the Pin monastery, who are not vowed to celibacy, complete polyandry is practised.[8] In Ladakh polyandry "is much more universal than polygyny is in India."[9]

The polyandry of the western Himalayan districts is, says Sir James Lyall, "in reality a mere custom of community of wives among brothers who have community of other goods. In one house you may find three brothers with one wife; in the next three brothers with four wives, all alike in common; in the next house there may be an only son with three wives to himself. It is a matter of means and land; a large farm requires several women to look after it. Where there is only one wife to several brothers, it will generally be found that some of the brothers are absent for part of the year working as labourers."[10] In Kanaur the nuptials are celebrated with a good deal of ritual. "After a religious ceremony, the bride's right hand is held by all the bridegroom's brothers, and then all are deemed to have married her."[11]

[1] J. B. Lyall, *Report of the Land Revenue Settlement of the Kangra District, Panjab*, p. 203.

[2] *Ibid.*; H. A. Rose, *A Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Panjab and North-West Frontier Province*, vol. iii, p. 12.

[3] J. B. Lyall, *op. cit.*, p. 153; A. Anderson, cited by Sir D. Ibbetson, *Report on the Census of the Panjab*, 1881, vol. i, pp. 365 sq.

[4] H. A. Rose, *A Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Panjab and North-West Frontier Province*, vol. ii, p. 448; A. Gerard, *Account of Koonawur in the Himalaya*, p. 3; V. Jacquemont, *Voyage aux Indes*, vol. ii, p. 398; *Gazetteer of the Simla District*, 1888–9, pp. 36 sq.

[5] J. B. Fraser, *Journal of a Tour through Part of the Snowy Range of the Himalaya Mountains*, pp. 70, 168, 206 sq., 218. Cf. C. F. Gordon Cumming, *In the Himalayas and the Indian Plains*, p. 406; R. H. W. Dunlop, *Hunting in the Himalaya*, pp. 180 sq.

[6] J. B. Lyall, *op. cit.*, pp. 203 sq.

[7] See above, p. 651.

[8] A. H. Diack, *Gazetteer of the Kangra District*, Part ii, p. 84.

[9] F. Drew, *The Northern Barrier of India, Jummoo and Kashmir Territories*, p. 263.

[10] J. B. Lyall, *Report on the Land Revenue Settlement of the Kangra District, Panjab*, p. 153.

[11] H. A. Rose, *ob. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 448.

The gradual decay of polyandrous institutions which is evidently taking place in the lower valleys of the Himalayan region appears to be chiefly due, not to changes in ethical conceptions, but to the disintegration of the old social organisation. The institution, as Sir James Lyall points out, is bound up with the communal undivided economic household, in which all brothers remain in one family and share alike, the eldest brother being regarded as the representative of them all. With the rise of individual economic interests, and the consequent breaking up of the communal fraternal household, polyandrous marriage is necessarily also broken up; the individual brother, possessing his own property, owning his own land, conducting his own commerce for his own profit, possesses his own wife or wives, and the individual household thus formed takes the place of the old fraternal solidary family traditionally characteristic of Central Asia.

The highland regions of the Himalaya are but a residual cultural island which preserves social customs that had once a far more extensive distribution. The institutions which are found surviving there were once common throughout the greater part of Central Asia. Biddulph is of opinion that polyandrous marriage institutions were once general in Hindu-Kush and Chitral,[1] and his view is substantiated by the testimony of the eleventh-century Arab traveller, Al-Biruni.[2] Those institutions at one time extended as far west as the shores of the Caspian.[3] Chinese writers repeatedly describe the organisation which we find among the Tibetans as being in force among the tribes of Central Asia, among whom sororal polygyny and the levirate are still strictly observed. In Turkestan, according to the encyclopaedic Chinese geographer Ma-twan-lin, who wrote in the thirteenth century, polyandrous marriage was not only customary, but obligatory. Brothers associated in marriage, and in the absence of brothers, cousins, or clan-brothers. Were a man unable to find a relative with whom to share his wife, he was debarred from marrying at all, and was condemned to spend his life in celibacy. The ornaments which the women wore on their heads indicated the number of husbands to whom they were married.[4] In the Pamirs, among the Belors, at the present day, " four or five brothers possess one wife in common and exercise marital rights alternately, one hanging up his boots at night on the door outside in token of being in

[1] J. Biddulph, *Tribes of the Hindoo-Koosh*, p. 82.

[2] *Alberuni's India*, translated by E. C. Sachau, vol. i, p. 108. *Al-Biruni* calls the region 'Panchir'; Dr. Sachau identifies it with Hindu-Kush, Kafiristan, and Chitral (*ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 295).

[3] See below, p. 692.

[4] J. P. Rémusat, *Nouveaux mélanges asiatiques*, vol. ii, p. 245.

possession." [1] Among the Sifans of Koko-Nor polyandrous marriage institutions exactly like those of Tibet are the regular usage of the country.[2]

We have found similar institutions in force at the present day, or up to recent times, among the majority of the aboriginal populations of Northern Asia and the Amur region. Between those northern polyandrous societies and those of Central Asia extend the lands of that Chinese civilisation which has developed out of the culture of Northern and Central Asiatic nomads. We can scarcely expect to find traces of those institutions in China, although the undivided fraternal family is still the rule there. The stringent codes and elaborate marriage institutions of that country present the very polar opposite of the sexual communism of Tibetan peoples, and nothing could well differ more widely from the latter than the strictly enforced principles of jealous ownership which, before marriage and even after the death of her husband, dedicates the Chinese wife to her exclusive lord. As invariably happens where such advanced institutions and moral principles obtain, the memory of any other order of ideas or customs is obliterated and their existence repudiated, save for the mythical tradition that the existing order was instituted by Fu-Hi, and that previous ancestors of the Chinese lived without marriage, like the beasts that perish. But the whole of those principles and institutions is manifestly a very artificial social product; the code of feminine virtue so rigidly enforced upon the Chinese wife is certainly no more primitive than the equally elaborate system of organised prostitution which forms its natural complement. Great as is the difference between the marriage institutions of China and those of Tibet, it is no greater than that presented by many of the transformations which Chinese social usages must undoubtedly have undergone before assuming their present form. In the exogamic clans of China the very same terms are used as in Tibet to indicate the distinction between kinsmen 'of the same flesh'—that is to say, belonging to the family of the wife—and 'of the same bone,' or of the same kinship class as the husband.[3] Sororal polygyny was once as customary in China as with the ruder Mongol and Turkic tribes of Central Asia.[4] To marry the widow of one's brother is, according to present Chinese ideas, regarded as an act so criminal that the man guilty of such

[1] M. Veniukof, "The Belors and their Country," *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, xxxvi, p. 267.

[2] W. J. Reid, "Among the Farthest People," *The Cosmopolitan*, xxviii, p. 449.

[3] W. H. Medhurst, "Marriage, Affinity, and Inheritance in China," *Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society, China Branch*, iv, p. 3.

[4] See above, p. 619.

an abomination is condemned by law to be strangled.[1] Levirate marriage was nevertheless at one time an established usage among the Chinese.[2] A trace of older forms of social organisation survives perhaps in the prevalent custom that if one of several brothers is childless, he adopts the son of one of his brothers, the child being then regarded as the son of both his father and his uncle. His children by one of his wives are reckoned as the grandchildren of his uncle, while those from the 'great wife' are reckoned as the grandchildren of his father.[3] The custom is so prevalent that fifty per cent. of Chinese families are said to have such children by adoption.[4] None of those facts could, perhaps, be regarded as proof that fraternal-sororal group-marriage once obtained in China, but they at least confirm the strong presumption that the differences which now mark Chinese institutions from those of neighbouring and kindred races did not originally exist; and there can be little doubt that the marriage customs of the primitive Chinese were similar to those of the mediaeval Tartars and the present-day Tibetans, and that the geographical gap between the distribution of those customs in northern and in central Asia is due to cultural development and not to racial differences.

Polyandry among the Native Races of Northern India.

South of the Himalayas polyandrous institutions are by no means confined in India to the neighbourhood of the northern hills. The institutions still found surviving there were probably at one time general throughout India. Those customs attracted the attention of the English in the very first part of Bengal which they occupied, the district of Balasore, at the mouth of the Ganges, which constituted the first nucleus of our Indian Empire. "These people," writes one of the eighteenth-century empire-builders, "stretch the Levitical law so that a brother not only raises up seed to another after his decease, but even during his absence on service, so that no married woman lies fallow."[5] The people referred to were in all probability Khonds—a numerous Dravidian race

[1] P. G. von Möllendorff, "The Family Law of the Chinese in its Comparative Relation with that of Other Nations," *Journal of the North China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, N.S., No. 13, p. 105.

[2] H. Yule, *The Book of Ser Marco Polo*, vol. i, pp. 222 sq., n.

[3] "Chinese Family Life," *The China Review*, xi, pp. 364, 366; P. G. von Möllendorff, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 116.

[5] T. Motte, "Narrative of a Journey to the Diamond Mines at Sumbhulpoor," *The Asiatic Annual Register for 1799*, "Miscellaneous Tracts," p. 56.

which forms a large proportion of the population of the Telugu country in southern India, but also occupies a large tract in the Sambalpur district of Orissa, formerly known as Khondan, and which was ruled by Khond dynasties.[1] The same customs still survive amongst them. "The younger brothers are allowed access to the elder brother's wife till the time of their own marriage."[2] The Khonds are in all probability the same race as the Gonds,[3] "the most important of the non-Aryan or forest tribes in India," who constitute many millions of the population of Bihar and the Satpura plateau in the Central Provinces. From the mythical traditions of their race it would seem that they observed the same customs.[4] Another of the most important Dravidian tribes of Northern India is that of the Bhuiya, whose name means 'the Lords of the Soil,' and was probably given to them by the Aryan invaders. Among them also "unmarried brothers have access to an elder brother's wife during his lifetime."[5] The Santals again, are among the most typical representatives of the aboriginal race; they are the chief race of the Hazaribagh region on the southern bank of the Ganges, a little above Plassey. They retain in a perfect form the old Indian communal system of social organisation: the permission of the 'parganuit,' or tribal headman, is necessary for the conclusion of any marriage, and he, after consultation with the village headmen, "has power to fine or expel any person who infringes the tribal standard of propriety."[6] Among them a man has right of access to all the younger sisters of his wife, and his younger brothers also have the same right. In other words, the institution of complete group-marriage between families, strictly regulated by the rules and sanctions of their social organisation, is "part of the social system of the Santals."[7] In addition, "a Santal uncle is permitted a good deal of freedom of intercourse

[1] J. Campbell, *A Personal Narrative of Thirteen Years' Service amongst the Wild Tribes of Khondistan*, pp. 14 sqq.; S. Ch. Macpherson, *An Account of the Religion of the Khonds in Orissa*; H. Risley, *Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, vol. i, p. 397.

[2] R. V. Russell, *Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, vol. iii, p. 468. Cf. *The Imperial Gazetteer of India*, vol. xv, p. 281.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. iii, pp. 41 sqq.

[4] *Ibid.*, vol. iii, p. 55.

[5] *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 317.

[6] *The Imperial Gazetteer of India*, vol. xxii, pp. 67 sq.; H. H. Risley, *Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, vol. ii, pp. 224 sq.

[7] C. H. Craven, "Traces of Fraternal Polyandry among the Santals," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, vol. lxxii, part iii, pp. 88 sqq.; L. O. Skrefsrud, "Traces of Fraternal Polyandry among the Santals," *ibid.*, p. 90; E. A. Gait, in *Census of India*, 1911, vol. i, "India," Part i, p. 240.

with his wife's nieces," a feature which we have noted among the western Gilyak, and which derives from the wide age-grade organisation of the primitive marrying classes.[1] On the other hand, the strictest rules forbid any intimacy between an elder brother and the wives of his younger brothers. As among most populations which retain the primitive organisation of group-marriage, in addition to the relations obtaining normally between the members of corresponding marriage groups, complete freedom of intercourse within the limits imposed by the marriage classes is allowed on certain occasions—namely, the Harvest Festival, or 'Parganait.'[2] Mr. Craven adds to his account of those institutions: "By way of apology for the Santals, I would mention that their immoral practices are common to a number of other castes of Bengal."[3]

Among the hypotheses offered in 'explanation' of polyandry is the suggestion that the people who practise it suffer from some abnormal mental conformation. Concerning the Tibetans, for instance, the opinion of Mr. Wilson is cited that they are "of a peculiarly placid, unpassionate temperament, except in their fits of demoniacal cruelty. They have no hot blood, in our sense of the phrase."[4] On the other hand, Father Desideri says that "the Tibetans are of a lively temperament and of an hilarious disposition";[5] and Father della Penna that "they are somewhat given to lust."[6] It is fairly manifest that those interpretations of character deduced from the constructions placed by observers upon the customs of a people are of no value as explanations of those customs. This is even more manifest as regards statements as to the 'absence of jealousy,' which is the phrase used by most travellers to express the fact that a given people have the custom of sharing wives, and which is used conversely by some theorists to explain the fact that those people do, in fact, share wives. "Though polyandry is due to an excess of men," says Dr. Westermarck, "it would be a mistake to conclude that excess of men always causes polyandry. This practice presupposes an abnormally feeble disposition to jealousy, a peculiarity of all people among whom polyandry occurs. . . . But such lack of jealousy, as we have seen, is a rare exception in the human race, and utterly unlikely to have been universal at any time."[7] What "we have seen" is that "the

[1] C. H. Craven, *op. cit.*, p. 90.
[2] *The Imperial Gazetteer of India*, vol. xxii, p. 68.
[3] C. H. Craven, *loc. cit.*
[4] A. Wilson, *The Abode of Snow*, pp. 230 sq.
[5] C. Puini, *Il Tibet*, p. 107.
[6] C. S. Markham, *Narrative of the Mission of George Bogle*, p. 318.
[7] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage* (1911), pp. 514 sq. Cf. below, pp. vol. ii, pp. 97 sqq.

strongest argument against ancient promiscuity is to be derived from the psychical nature of man"—namely, sexual jealousy—which is, we are told, "a passion of very great intensity . . . belonging to the nature of man."[1] What we are now further invited to see is that 'promiscuity' is to be accounted for by absence of that part of the nature of man. The reasoning appears to be more convenient than conclusive. But in the collection of travellers' statements as to the presence or absence of jealousy which Dr. Westermarck has industriously brought together, he has not thought it worth while to include those concerning the Santals. Far from possessing "an abnormally feeble disposition to jealousy, a peculiarity of all peoples among whom polyandry occurs," the Santal women, we are told, are "usually frantically jealous." Their jealousy assumes, however, a peculiar form; they "often complain that their husband's younger brothers are carrying on intrigues with other girls when they can get all they want at home."[2]

It appears, then, that polyandrous institutions are as familiar to the native races of Northern India as to the dwellers in the Himalayan region, although with the former those primitive usages have tended to disappear under the influence of Brahmanical ideas and customs, and frequently traditions and mere ritual survivals alone bear witness to their former existence.[3] It is mostly in the forests and uplands of northern and central India, where the older aboriginal races took refuge from the invaders whom we call Aryan, that we come upon the survivals of those institutions. In southern India, where many of those races withdrew before the northern invader, and where the latter's power and influence never became so firmly established as in the north, those primitive institutions have, as we shall presently see, persisted much more generally and with but little modification.

[1] E. Westermarck, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

[2] C. H. Craven, *loc. cit.*, p. 89.

[3] Among the Korku, a Kolarian tribe of the Satpura plateau of the Central Provinces and Berar, the bridegroom at the wedding embraces his elder brother's wife seven times. "This," remarks Mr. Russell, "may probably be a survival of the modified system of polyandry still practised by the Khonds, under which the younger brothers are allowed access to the elder brother's wife until their own marriage. The ceremony would then typify the cessation of this intercourse at the wedding of the boy" (R. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, vol. iii, p. 558). Similar ceremonial relics of the former system of fraternal polyandry are found among the Oraons (*ibid.*, vol. iv, p. 306. Cf. also *ibid.*, vol. iii, p. 161 [Gowari]). Sometimes a strict tabu marks the former existence of the custom. Thus among the Kharia, a Kolarian tribe, a woman must not enter the house of her husband's brother, nor touch him. or sit before him, or even cook food for him (*ibid.*, vol. iii, p. 449).

Polyandry among the 'Aryan' Hindus.

But although it is largely under the influence of the religion and customs of the Hindu ruling race that the polyandrous marriage usages of the Dravidian and Mongoloid races of India have gradually tended to disappear, it would be an error to suppose that the divergence between the ideas and institutions of the conquering peoples and those of the aborigines have been due to inherent racial differences. The 'Indo-Aryan,' or 'Indo-Scythic' races of India had the same polyandrous marriage institutions as the Dravidians and Tibetans. Their domination was first established over the sub-Himalayan districts of the Panjab, and was thence extended over the plains of Hindustan; and it is in those districts first occupied by them that they have preserved in a relative measure their racial identity. The polyandrous peoples of the western Himalaya districts are for the most part mixed races, in which, however, the 'Aryan' element predominates. The languages of those districts "are all Indo-Aryan," with the single exception of the Lahuli dialect, which is Tibeto-Burman.[1] Curiously enough Lahul, where the Indo-Aryan element is conspicuously prominent[2] is also the chief centre of polyandry in the district, while the usage is dying out in the surrounding Kulu country, which is ethnically of Tibetan affinities. If the 'Aryan' race in India has any existing representatives these are the Rajputs and the Jats of the Panjab. Of all Hindus they are, as Sir Alfred Lyall remarks, the most "distinctive of the primitive Aryan type." "The Rajput State," says the same high authority, "has managed to preserve unaltered much of the original structure built up out of the needs and circumstances of primitive life."[3] Among those typical representatives of the Indian Aryan, fraternal polyandry subsists as a traditional usage at the present day. It is particularly prevalent in the district of Dehra Dhun, now a part of the United Provinces, which is the classical land of Indo-Aryan tradition. It was the reputed dwelling-place of the god Siva, the home of King Asoka, and one of the chief cradles of Hindu civilisation. The Rajput and Brahman castes form a larger proportion of the population than in any other part of India; they are as pure representatives of the most ancient 'Aryan' race as it is possible to find anywhere in

[1] G. A. Grierson, review of T. Grahame Bailey's "The Languages of the Northern Himalayas, being Studies in the Grammar of Twenty-six Himalayan Dialects," in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1909, pp. 184 sqq.

[2] H. A. Rose, *A Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Panjab and North-West Frontier Province*, vol. iii, p. 18; cf. p. 12, vol. ii, p. 456 n.

[3] A. C. Lyall, *Asiatic Studies, Religious and Social*. First Series, pp. 257, 208.

India, and are specially noted for the unusual fairness of their complexion. Major Young reported in 1827 that the custom of polyandry was then on the decline. "Yet," wrote Mr. G. R. C. Williams in 1874, "it is unquestionably common to this very day. Indeed, a bachelor who has no brothers, it is alleged, experiences some difficulty about getting a wife. The custom of polyandry is supposed to promote good-fellowship among brothers, and is observed so consistently that if a mother-in-law dies leaving an infant son, the daughter-in-law is, properly speaking, bound to rear the boy and marry him herself when he attains the age of puberty."[1] So intimately bound up is the institution with the social organisation of the Rajput and Brahman tribes that it has had to be recognised in the code of native law drawn up by British officials for administrative purposes. Thus it is provided in the official code that "if, according to custom, four brothers have two, or perhaps one, wife between them, and four or five daughters are born, and one of the brothers marries again, the children are not shared between them, but remain with the woman."[2] Rajput polyandry is strictly fraternal, none being permitted to enter into collective marriage relations unless they are sons of the same mother by the same set of fathers. It is associated with polygyny, several wives being common to several brothers.[3] The women, as in all Rajput society, hold a very high status, and enjoy the greatest freedom, any woman being at liberty to leave her husband and marry others, on the sole condition that the latter shall refund the expenses incurred in the celebration of the first marriage.[4] "In the Ambala submontane tract from the Jamna to the Satlei," says Mr. Delmerick, "polyandry is very extensively practised. Indeed, a sister-in-law is looked upon as common property, not only by uterine brothers, but by all 'bhai,' including first-cousins. This is the case among all castes of Hindus."[5]

Among the Jats, of whom the Rajputs are the aristocratic caste,[6] the custom appears to be universally recognised, though, owing to Brahmanical influence, not always openly acknowledged. In the

[1] G. R. C. Williams, *Historical and Statistical Memoir of Dehra Doon*, pp. 60 sq.

[2] *Ibid.*, Appendix viii, "Dustur-ool-umul of Jounsar Bawru, as drawn up by Mr. A. Rose," pp. xxviii sq.; cf. p. xxx.

[3] R. Burn, in *Census of India*, 1901, vol. xvi, "North-Western Provinces and Oudh," p. 121. Cf. W. Crooke, *Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh*, vol. iii, p. 27; *The Imperial Gazetteer of India*, vol. xi, p. 215; E. A. Gait, in *Census of India*, 1911, vol. i, "India," Part i, p. 240; Pandit Harikisham Kaul, *ibid.*, vol. xiv, "Punjab," Part i, p. 287.

[4] G. R. C. Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

[5] Delmerick, cited by Sir D. Ibbetson, *Report on the Census of the Panjab*, 1881, vol. i, p. 365.

[6] See above, p. 352, note [6].

Kanaur district " polyandry is practised without disgrace by both Kanets and Jats." [1] " I believe," says Sir Denzil Ibbetson, " it is the rule, not the exception, for the wife to cohabit with all the brothers. The practice is not openly recognised or admitted to the general public, but the suggestion of it is often denied with a laugh." The very small number of married men, there being rarely found more than one married brother in a family, confirms its prevalence.[2] Among the eastern Jats " there is no attempt to conceal the fact, and it is even a common thing, when women quarrel, for one to say to the other, ' You are so careless of your duties as not to admit your husband's brothers to your embraces.' It is true that Brahmanical influence prevents open cohabitation with an elder brother's wife, but no great pains are taken to conceal it." [3] " Among them it is easier for a man to get a wife if he has brothers, because she cannot then remain a widow, as they say she becomes a ' sada sohirgan,' a ' perfectly married woman.' " [4] Sir J. M. Douie found polyandry practised in the Powadh villages of the Karnal district in southern Panjab at no great distance from Delhi ; and the fact that census returns for that district showed 2,574 more married men than married women suggests that it is by no means uncommon.[5] Among the Gujars, who ethnologically appear to represent the later Scythic invaders, and have to a large extent re-shaped the ancient Kshatriya caste into the present Rajput clans, " it was customary for the wife of one brother, usually the eldest, to be occasionally at the disposal of other unmarried brothers living in the same house." [6] With the Rajputs and Jats in the Sikh regiments of the Indian army, it was, in the middle of the last century, a recognised and common plea for leave of absence that their brothers were away from home and their wife left alone.[7] Similar customs are reported of several Hindu castes, such as the Ahir, or Golkar, a widely distributed caste of herdsmen and

[1] V. Jacquemont, *Voyage dans l'Inde*, vol. ii, p. 398.

[2] D. Ibbetson, *Report on the Census of the Panjab*, 1881, vol. i, p. 365. Cf. H. Davidson, cited in H. A. Rose, *A Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Punjab and North-West Frontier Province*, vol. ii, p. 363 n.

[3] W. Crooke, *Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh*, vol. iii, p. 36.

[4] C. S. Kirkpatrick, " Polyandry in the Panjab," *The Indian Antiquary*, vii, p. 86. Cf. Mian Durga Singh, " A Report on the Panjab Hill Tribes," *ibid.*, xxxvi, p. 277 ; W. Crooke, *op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. clxxvii sq. ; C. L. Tupper, *Punjab Customary Law*, vol. ii, p. 95 ; D. Ibbetson, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 365.

[5] J. M. Douie, *Gazetteer of the Karnal District*, p. 76.

[6] W. Crooke, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, pp. 444 sq. Cf. R. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, vol. iii, p. 172 ; Delmerick, *loc. cit.*

[7] C. Masson, *Narrative of Various Journeys in Balochistan, Afghanistan and the Panjab*, vol. i, p. 435.

agriculturists claiming descent from Brahma, and the Lohars, a Brahmanical caste of ironworkers.[1] Muhammadan historians mention that before embracing Islam the infidels of the Panjab observed the " curious custom " of polyandry.[2]

It has been suggested that the Indo-Aryans adopted their polyandrous customs from the aborigines, or from neighbouring polyandrous peoples.[3] But, apart from the intrinsic improbabilities of the plea—for while communists readily adopt individualistic usages, it is rare for individualists to adopt communistic practices—the facts are strongly opposed to the conjecture. The practice of polyandrous marriage is among the Indo-Aryans of the Panjab associated with other survivals of a more archaic and tribal order of society, which are culturally identical with the usages of the polyandrous peoples of the Hindu-Kush, whence the invaders came to India. " The Rajput tribes," as Colonel Tod remarks, " could scarcely have acquired some of their still existing Scythic habits and warlike superstitions on the burning plains of Ind." [4] Few races, in fact, have shown themselves more tenacious of their traditional customs and more averse to adopting those of foreigners than the Rajputs and the Jats. Polyandry is part and parcel of the social organisation, including the practice of fosterage, which is common to them and to the peoples of Hindu-Kush and Chitral,[5] races which differ entirely from those of Dravidian or Mongoloid affinity, and are in fact as ' Aryan ' as their cousins of the Panjab.[6] Polyandry is, as has been seen, described in Chinese accounts as having been not only customary, but obligatory, among the people of Turkestan, that is, the ancient Baktria and Sogdiana, the main habitat of the Indo-Aryans.[7] Chinese annals of both the earlier and the later Han dynasties make repeated references to the same customs among the Great Get-ti, or Ye-tha.[8] Summing up previous

[1] W. Crooke, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 58, vol. iii, p. 379.

[2] Tarikh'i Mamalik-i Hind, in H. M. Elliot, *The History of India as told by its own Historians*, vol. viii, p. 202; Muhammad Kasim Ferishta, *History of the Rise of the Mahometan Power in India*, vol. i, p. 184.

[3] J. D. Mayne, *A Treatise on Hindu Law and Usage*, p. 79; J. Oppert, *On the Original Inhabitants of Bharatavarsa or India*, p. 617; E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. iii, p. 143.

[4] J. Tod, *Annals and Antiquities of Rajast'han*, vol. i, p. 23.

[5] See above, pp. 598 sq.

[6] K. E. von Ujfalvy, *Aus dem westlichen Himalaja*, pp. 178 sqq.; Id., *Les Aryens au Nord et au Sud de l'Hindou Koush*, passim; G. Bonvalot, *En Asie Centrale: Du Kohistan à la Caspienne*, pp. 44 sq., 76.

[7] See above, pp. 357 sq.

[8] E. Specht, " Études sur l'Asie centrale d'après les historiens chinois," *Journal Asiatique*, 8e Série, x, pp. 338 (History of Liang), *ibid.* (History of Wei), 342 (History of Tcheu), 346 sq. (History of Swi).

information on the subject, Ma-twan-lin states that among those people, brothers marry the same woman, and adds that they, at the same time, have many wives in various localities, which are thus shared by all the brothers of a family.[1] These are the same customs to which Herodotus referred in speaking of the Massa-Getae. "Each man," he says, "marries a woman, but all wives are in common; for this is the custom of the Massagetae, and not, as the Greeks think, of the Scythians. And when a Massagetae desires to have company with a woman, he hangs up his quiver in front of the chariot and has intercourse with her openly."[2]

The polyandrous marriage institutions of the Indo-Aryans are referred to in every period of their ancient literature. In the Sacred Laws of the Aryans it is laid down that "a bride is given to the family of the husband, not to the husband alone." The principle is mentioned in elucidation of the injunction that "a husband shall not make over his wife, who occupies the position of a clanswoman, to other than to his own clansmen in order to cause a child to be begot for himself."[3] The custom referred to, namely, that of a husband introducing a brother or other kinsman to his wife to raise seed unto him in cases of lack of issue, which is known as 'niyoga,' is a time-honoured Hindu custom still recognised and observed,[4] and an attenuated relic of

[1] A. de Rémusat, *Nouveaux mélanges asiatiques*, vol. i, pp. 240 sq., 245.

[2] Herodotus, i. 216. Cf. Strabo, xi. 8. 6. The 'chariots' were the covered wagons, or yurtas on wheels, which were commonly used by all nomadic tribes of Central Asia. Ammianus Marcellinus gives a good description of them: "When the Alani (i.e. the Massa-Getae; see above, p. 356) arrive at a place where there is much grass, they stop and arrange their wagons in a circle. They drive, like moving towns, those wagons which contain their whole possessions. It is there that men and women dwell; their children are born and reared in them, for those wagons are their permanent homes, and wherever they go, they look upon them as their native homes" (Ammianus Marcellinus, xxi, 2. Cf. E. Specht, *op. cit.*, p. 341; F.-G. Bergmann, *Les Gètes*, p. 98; Justin, ii, 2; Josafa Barbas, "Viaggio alla Tana," in G. B. Ramusio, *Navigationi et Viaggi*, vol. ii, fol. 93 sq.; *The Book of Ser Marco Polo*, ed. Yule, vol. i, pp. 252, 254; P. S. Pallas, *Travels in the Southern Provinces of the Russian Empire*, vol. i, p. 172; E. H. Minns, *Scythians and Greeks*, pp. 50 sqq.).

[3] *The Sacred Laws of the Aryas, Apastamba*, ii. 10. 27. 2 and 3 (*The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. ii, pp. 165 sq.). I have substituted the words 'clanswoman' and 'clansmen' for the somewhat unnecessary 'gentilis' in Bühler's translation.

[4] *The Laws of Manu*, ix. 59. 145; E. A. Gait, in *Census of India*, 1911, vol. i, "India," Report, p. 247; W. Crooke, *The Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh*, vol. i, p. cxc; M. Winternitz, "Notes on the 'Mahābhārata,' with special reference to Dahlmann's 'Mahābhārata.'" *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1897, pp. 716 sqq.

polyandry.[1] It would doubtless be regarded by many as sufficiently accounted for on grounds of expediency; those are not, however, the grounds adduced in explanation of it by the Hindu jurist, but the wholly different relation in which the wife stands to her husband's kinsmen and to strangers. Citing from the Puranas, the 'Mahâbhârata' mentions a lady of the name of Jatila, who is spoken of as "the foremost of virtuous women," as having been married simultaneously to ten brothers "who were all souls exalted in asceticism." [2]

In each of the great national epics of the invading race, the 'Râmâyana' and the 'Mahâbhârata,' the marriage of the heroes takes place according to the rules of group-marriage. The full force of the evidence can only be adequately appreciated from a critical survey of that literature as a whole, and of the circumstances in which it originated. The two epics are respectively derived from the sagas of the two main sets of tribes into which the Aryan invaders appear to have been divided, and which are associated with what are termed in the traditional history the Solar and the Lunar dynasties. The former reigned originally at Oude (Ayodhyâ); its representative hero was Râma; and it is under that dynasty that the Brahmanical system chiefly developed. The Lunar dynasty, that of Bharata, which reigned at Delhi (Hastinâpur), preserved an independent spirit and long resisted the ambitions of the Brahmanical class.[3] Râma, the hero of the 'Râmâyana,' attends with his brother Lakshmana a contest at which the Aryan king Janaka offers his daughter to the man who can bend the mighty bow of Siva; which feat the hero, of course, accomplishes with ease. A holy hermit, acting as 'go-between,' then demands in the name of Râma, not only Sita, the daughter of King Janaka, but her sister and her two cousins, or half-sisters, as wives for Râma and his three brothers, who are to him like "other selves." [4] The proposal is received with approval and joy by the assembly and by the king, who thanks the gods for thus uniting the two families; and the four sisters are solemnly married to the four brothers.[5] The marriage of the five sons of Pandu, or rather of Pandu and his brothers, which forms the theme of the first book of the 'Mahâbhârata,' resembles exactly that of Râma and his brothers, except that in this instance only one woman is available, who accordingly becomes the wife of

[1] Cf. above, p. 670, the present day forms of the observance in Spiti.

[2] *Mahâbhârata, Adi Parva* (Calcutta edition), p. 551.

[3] Monier-Williams, *Indian Epic Poetry*, pp. 18 sq.; A. Weber, *Indische Studien*, vol. i, p. 220.

[4] *Râmâyana*, Bk. i, xix, xxii.

[5] *Ibid.*, Bk. i, lxvii–lxxiii.

the five princes. As in the older poem, she is won in a contest of archery in which a gigantic bow, which no one has succeeded in bending, is wielded by the hero Arjuna disguised as a beggar, with such effect that he drives away all the other suitors in confusion. A holy Rishi, acting as 'go-between,' then asks King Drupada, on behalf of the five princes, for the hand of his daughter Draupadi. "Thy daughter, O King," say these, "shall be the common wife of us all; this thy jewel of a daughter hath been won by Arjuna. This, O King, is the rule with us, to even enjoy equally a jewel that we may obtain. Krishna, therefore, shall become the wedded wife of us all." "And Draupadi," continues the Indian poet, "was arrayed in fine garments, and adorned with costly jewels, and married first to the elder brother Yudhishthira, and then to the others, according to their ages; and the King gave large gifts to his sons-in-law, and also to the Brahmans; and Kunti blessed her daughter-in-law, and prayed that she might become the mother of many sons. . . . Now as the five Pandavas were husbands of one wife, each of the brethren had a house and garden of his own, and Draupadi dwelt with each of them in turn for two days at a time." The holy Rishi Yudhishthira, in commending the marriage of the Pandava brothers, is reported as saying: "Let us follow in the way that has been traced by the illustrious of former ages; this practice hath been established, it is to be regarded as old and eternal." [1]

[1] *Mahâbhârata, Adi Parva*, pp. 549 sq., 551. The epic contains some passages expressing disapproval of the practice. In the 'Râmâyana' the evil giant Viradha, a monster "with long legs, a huge body, a crooked nose, a pendant belly, etc., like Death with an open mouth," who is subsequently slain by Lakshmana, taunts the divine brothers with remaining with one woman, and "corrupting divine sages" (*Râmâyana*, iii. 7). In the 'Mahâbhârata,' King Drupada is represented as hesitating to accept the proposal of the Pandava princes and as saying that "this practice has always appeared to me to be of doubtful morality." A long discussion follows in which various sages give their views on the usage, and in which it is represented as having in this instance a mystical significance, the five Pandavas being in reality incarnations of Indra. The epics in their present form are heterogeneous compositions "moulded under direct sacerdotal influence"; the Brahmans adopted "the policy of collecting the rude ballads which they could not suppress, and moulding them to their own purpose. Those ballads which described too plainly the independence of the military caste, and their successful opposition to the sacerdotal, were modified, obscured by allegory, or rendered improbable by monstrous mythological embellishments. Any circumstance which appeared to militate against the Brahmanical system were speciously explained away, glossed over, or mystified" (M. Monier-Williams, *Indian Epic Poetry*, pp. 10 sq.). "A study of the interpolations in the so-called Southern text," says Professor Hopkins, "shows that thousands of verses of narrative and didactic

The latter statement is amply borne out by the Vedic hymns. Thus, in addressing the two Aswins, or Divine Horsemen, the Aryan homologues of the Dioscuri, the Vedic poet compares them to the competitors in a 'swayamvara' contest, resulting in the marriage of the brothers to a common bride, such as forms the subject of the central episodes in the two epics. "Your admirable horses," he sings, "have borne the chariot to which you harnessed them first to the goal of honour; and the damsel who was the prize comes lovingly towards you and acknowledges the marriage, saying: 'You are my husbands.'"[1] Or, again, the Maruts are

material have been added to the epic text, and that the redaction comprises a shameless incorporation of material drawn from the 'Puranas' and from the 'Harivamca,' as well as elaborations of the original text, sometimes by the insertion of a dozen or so verses" (E. W. Hopkins, in *The Cambridge History of India*, vol. i, pp. 255 sq.). The original 'Mahâbhârata' consisted, as is mentioned in the poem, of nine thousand verses; the existing ramshackle composition consists of nearly a quarter of a million lines. "The entire work may be compared to a confused congery of geological strata" (M. Monier-Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 10; cf. E. W. Hopkins, *op. cit.*, p. 256). The original ballads "come from a different source than does the literature of the Brahman, until indeed the all-grasping hand of the priest seized even the epic tales, and, stifling all that was natural in them, converted them into sermons to teach the theology of the priest" (E. W. Hopkins, *op. cit.*, p. 265). It is not surprising that, in those circumstances, expressions should be found that are wholly inconsistent with the main theme of the poems; what is remarkable is that those features should have been too firmly established to render possible the task of obliterating them. "A later age offered various explanatory excuses for the polyandry of the Pandus, who, however, as a northern hill-tribe, or family, probably were really polyandrous, and needed no excuse" (*ibid.*, p. 258). The Pandavas were portrayed as the models of all the virtues and the types and ideals of perfect knighthood, and are so regarded by Hindus to this day; and it is not possible to suppose that they would at the same time be represented as adopting from conquered races a practice to which even a shadow of moral reprobation was attached in ancient Aryan thought.

[1] *Rig-Veda*, i. 119. 5; *Die Hymnen des Rig-Veda*, ed. Th. Aufrecht, vol. i (*Indische Studien*, vol. vi), p. 106; A. Ludwig, *Der Rigveda*, vol. i, p. 41; H. H. Wilson, *Rig-Veda-Sanhita*, vol. i, p. 322; F. A. Rosen, *Rigveda, lib. i*, p. 256; A. Langlois, *Rig-Véda*, p. 118. In the rendering of this and the following citations I have collated the various translations and compared them with the text by means of Monnier-Williams's *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. The diversity of translations is particularly apparent where, as in the present instances, ethnological and ethical theories are implicated. The above passage is among the clearest and easiest. Wilson translates 'pati' by 'lords,' and Ludwig by 'herren.' It is true that this appears to be the etymological meaning of the word, but it is scarcely known otherwise than as the ordinary term for 'husband,' and to render it by any other word is about as justified as it would be to render the English word 'husband' in French by 'propriétaire,' on the ground that that is its etymological meaning. Ludwig (*op. cit.*, vol. iv, p. 38 n.) and Weber ("Vedische Hochzeitssprüche," *Indische Studien*, v, p. 181) are not satisfied to leave it at that. They suggest that 'husbands' here does not mean

pictured as united to a common bride. "Far away the bright Maruts cleave to their young wife, who belongs to them all." [1] Commenting on the passage, Professor Max Müller remarks: "'Sadharani' is used in the sense of 'uxor communis,' and would show a familiarity with the idea of polyandry recognised in the epic poetry of the 'Mahâbhârata.'" [2] Plurality of husbands is repeatedly referred to in other passages, and in those very hymns in particular which are intended as sacred epithalamia to be sung at wedding ceremonies. The bride is in those wedding songs offered not to her husband, but to her husbands. "As a seedfield she comes; her husbands shall sow seed into her; she shall bear fruit unto you in her womb." [3] She is exhorted to perform her duties towards her husband's brothers: "Love thy husband's

'husbands,' but 'matchmakers.' It need scarcely be pointed out that the fact that the passage should be regarded as calling for such feats of exegesis adds greatly to the weight of its significance. The myth to which it refers is thus given by Langlois: Surya, who is the sun-goddess, was promised in marriage to Soma; the other gods being jealous, it was agreed that she should be allotted, according to 'swayamvara' custom, to the victors in a chariot race. The two Aswins won the race, and the lady became accordingly their wife (A. Langlois, *op. cit.*, p. 115 n.). The myth is very frequently referred to in both Vedic and Puranic literature, as well as in the epics. Thus in the *Atharva-Veda*, vi. 82. 2, the bridegroom sings: "The road by which the Aswins carried away as a bride Surya, Savistar's daughter, by that road, Bhoja, fortune told me thou shalt bring me a wife" (M. Bloomfield's translation, *The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xlii, p. 95). "The Aswins," says Professor Bloomfield, in referring to the myth of Surya, "are frequently conceived as her husbands" (*ibid.*, p. 503. For references to relevant passages see M. Bloomfield, "Contributions to the Interpretation of the Veda," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, xv, p. 186). Originally, I have no doubt on comparative grounds, the feminine sun was married to the masculine moon, Soma, the Aswins and many other gods, for Surya was "a much married damsel" (E. W. Hopkins, *The Religions of India*, p. 82), being his co-husbands. In some references to those confused relations the Aswins may be regarded as 'go-betweens,' in accordance with Weber's and Ludwig's exegesis; but "the Horsemen are also Surya's husbands" (E. W. Hopkins, *loc. cit.*), and they are certainly so in the present passage. To urge that the story is mythological is, of course, irrelevant; mythologies do not invent for the gods social customs which are foreign to human society.

[1] *Rig-Veda*, i. 167. 4: "Párâ çubhrâ' ayâ'so yavyâ' sâdharanyèva marúto mimikshuh ná rodasî' ápa undanta ghorâ' jushánta vrídham sakhyâya devâh," ed. Th. Aufrecht, vol. i, p. 156. Cf. A. Ludwig, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 294; *Vedic Hymns*, translated by F. Max Müller, *The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxxii, p. 272.

[2] F. Max Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 276.

[3] *Atharva-Veda*, xiv. ii. 14; W. D. Whitney, *Atharva-Veda Samhita, translated with a critical and exegetical commentary* (*Harvard Oriental Studies*, vol. viii), p. 756; *The Hymns of the Atharva-Veda*, translated by R. H. Griffiths, vol. ii, p. 174; A. Weber, "Vedische Hochzeitssprüche," *Indische Studien*, vol. v, p. 205; F. Ruckert, *Atharwaweda*, p. 195.

brothers" ;[1] "Bring her unto us, O Varuna," sing the bridegroom's brothers in another hymn, "bring her, she who is kind unto brothers."[2] In the same nuptial hymn the bride is invited to become mistress in her husband's house, and to assume supreme control over "his fathers" and "his mother."[3]

The Vedic family, it is of importance to note, was constituted in exactly the same manner as the Tibetan and other polyandrous families, that is to say, brothers continued to live together, forming one common undivided household, even after the death of their fathers; they did not set up separate households, and the eldest brother "acted in all things for all the others"[4]—an arrangement which is almost invariably associated with polyandry. On the other hand, the converse rule, common in India and elsewhere, that a man shall have the right of access to his wife's sisters, is explicitly referred to in the Vedas: "Steal to her sister dwelling with her father," the husband is instructed, "know thou that this is the right of old assigned to

"'Husbands' is in the plural, as if polyandry were referred to," comments Weber, "but this is merely an inaccuracy of expression." In another similar passage, *Rig-Veda*, x. 85. 37, the language is even more naturalistic: "Mitte eam, Pushan, beatificam, in quam mariti ejus seminabunt semen. Ea abducens femora ambo desiderabit nos, et nos eam, protrudentibus membris, desiderabimus" (T. Aufrecht, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 368; A. Ludwig, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 537; A. Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 191). Weber asks: "Is the plural here a so-called plural of majesty?" The plural 'husbands' occurs in a number of other instances in the Vedas and the Sutras; we are assured that in those instances it is "purely generic," an assertion which it would require a minute grammatical examination to verify. Thus, for example, in the *Paraskara-Grihya-Sutra*, i. 7. 3, Agni is invoked: "Mayst thou give back, Agni, to the husbands the wife together with offspring" (*The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxix, p. 283).

[1] *Atharva-Veda*, xiv, ii. 18; A. Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 207.

[2] *Atharva-Veda*, xiv. i. 62; W. D. Whitney, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 752; R. H. Griffith, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 171; A. Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 203. Cf. xiv. ii. 73. Professor Whitney is one of the most distinguished of Sanskrit scholars and the foremost authority on the Atharva-Veda hymns; his translation of this verse is, therefore, doubtless excellent. It has, however, the fault of being neither English nor sense. He translates: "her non-brother-killing." It is difficult to believe that the bride is exhorted in the hymeneal song to refrain from murderous proclivities.

[3] *Ibid.*, 44; W. D. Whitney, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 748; R. H. Griffith, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 168; A. Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 200. Cf. *Rig-Veda*, x. 85. 46. "Why the plural 'cvacureshu'?" asks Weber. "Are we to understand father and grandfather, or father's brothers?" But if "father and grandfather," why not "mother and grandmother"? While the husband is regarded as having only one mother, he has several fathers.

[4] *Sânkhâyana Aranâka*, i. 1, 4, 5 (The Sacred Books of the East, vol. xxix, p. 13), and Dr. Oldenberg's note to the passage; E. Haas, "Die Heiratsgebräuche der alten Inder nach der Griyasutra," *Indische Studien*, v. p. 286.

thee." [1] The Vedic hymns are not descriptive social essays or codes of law, and no more unambiguous testimony as to the usages of the society amid which they were composed could be looked for in somewhat turgid and confused oriental lyrical compositions.[2] Lastly, it is a significant fact, and one difficult to reconcile

[1] *Atharva-Veda*, xiv. ii. 33: "Ud īrs rātāh pativati hyesā veçvāsasum namasā girbhir ile anyam īecha pitrsadam vyaktam sa te bhago janusā tasya viddhi." R. H. Griffith, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 177; W. D. Whitney, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 759; A. Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 210; A. Hillebrandt, "Eine Miscelle aus dem Vedaritual," *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, xl, p. 711. The ingenious manner in which Professor Hillebrandt interprets the passage so as to elude its unambiguous meaning, although the principle of sororal polygyny has never ceased to be an established usage with the Hindus from earliest recorded times to the present day, deserves special mention. Her "sister dwelling with her father" must, he points out, be obviously dwelling with her forefathers—that is, be dead! "Er soll sich eine Gattin unter den Todten suchen." It is instructive to take note of such curiosities of interpretation in order to appreciate similar efforts at their due value.

[2] It is hard to find an excuse for such crude assertions as that "polyandry is not Vedic. There is no passage containing any clear reference to such a custom" (A. A. Macdonell and A. B. Keith, *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*, vol. i, p. 479; cf. A. B. Keith, in *The Cambridge History of India*, vol. i, p. 88; E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. iii, p. 143). Delbrück and others even go so far as to affirm that polygyny "is not Vedic" (B. Delbrück, "Die indogermanischen Verwandschaftsnamen," *Abhandlungen der königl. Sachsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, xxv, pp. 541 sqq.). But this is too much even for Dr. Keith. "Since the words (for wife) usually occur in the plural," he says, "it is possible they may refer not to 'wives' proper, but to 'hetairai.' This is, however, rendered unlikely because the *Rig-Veda* uses the phrase 'paliyar janitvam,' denoting 'wifehood to a husband,' besides containing passages in which they have reference to marriage" (A. A. Macdonell and A. B. Keith, *op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. 274 sq.). Do not the same remarks apply equally to the words used for 'husbands'? Dr. Keith acknowledges that the ingenuity of exegesists has not been successful in supplying a conjecture that can serve to dispose of the inacceptable references to polyandry in each separate instance. But what then is the value of objections to recognising the explicit sense of text after text, while at the same time no confidence is felt in any alternative interpretation? The real ground of the objection, then, is not the weight of any critical consideration, but zeal for the defence of a hypothetical ethical or ethnical doctrine which is flatly contradicted by the evidence under consideration. Clear as is the evidence presented by the Vedic Hymns, it should be remembered that, like the epics, they have been exclusively edited by Brahmans. "The question arises," observes Professor Muir, "whether the compilers of the Vedas and Brahmanas would be likely to bring forward anything found among the materials at their disposal which had become obsolete or which clashed with their own ideas of what was proper and laudable. Would they be likely to refer to antiquated practices often, and especially in the case of such as they had come decidedly to disapprove, like polyandry?" (J. Muir, "On the Question whether Polyandry ever existed in Northern Hindustan," *The Indian Antiquary*, vi, pp. 315 sq.). But it does not appear that the Vedas have undergone much expurgation

with the view that polyandry was foreign to the original customs of the Aryas, that nowhere, either in the Vedas or the Sûtras, meticulous as they are in their didactic moralising, is there a word of condemnation of the practice, although on any view, the Aryas must have been, both before and after their arrival in India, in the closest possible contact with populations among whom polyandry was an established social usage. Anti-Brahmanical Buddhism, which arose among the Aryan Kshatriya, has become the religion of all Tibetan polyandrous peoples, and, but for some reported disclaimers manifestly designed to conciliate 'foreign devils,' it does not appear that any opposition has ever been offered by the Aryan religion to polyandry.

The evolution of other standards and usages has in India, as elsewhere, been the outcome of processes of social development and not of peculiar racial characters. The opposition to primitive marriage customs and their ultimate disappearance among the Hindus has not been due to 'Aryan,' but to Brahmanical influence The principles of individual exclusiveness have been promoted, as in many other instances, in northern India by the growth of an exclusive priestly caste. The development of the power of the Brahmans, which ultimately superseded that of the royal, warrior, or Kshatriya aristocracy, broke up the clan-organisation of the Indian Aryas and transformed it into the caste-organisation, because that power was founded upon functional and occupational privilege and not upon group-kinship. The Brahmanical caste was not an organisation, like the Church of Rome, for instance, but a collection of individuals each of whom based his claims upon his own sacred character, and not upon authority delegated by a caste-head. "When strife arose between priests, as it constantly arose 'apropos' of a fat office to be enjoyed, each individual priest fought for his own hand; he had no bishop over him; and there was no pope to oppose a king."[1] The clan to which the individualist priest belonged was of no significance to him. Brahmanical influence was as antagonistic to the ancient organisation and usages of the warlike conquerors as to aboriginal savagery. The epic poems edited by Brahmans

in this respect. There was indeed little necessity for this. "To the Brahmans alone belongs the right of reading the Vedas, and they are so jealous of this, or rather it is so much to their interest to prevent other castes obtaining any insight into their contents, that the Brahmans have inculcated the absurd theory, which is implicitly believed, that should anybody of any other caste be so highly imprudent as even to read the title-page his head would immediately split in two" (J. A. Dubois, *Hindu Manners, Customs, and Ceremonies*, vol. i, p. 172). I do not, of course, suggest that the remarkable inconsistencies displayed by European Vedic scholars are due to their having rendered themselves liable to that penalty.

[1] E. W. Hopkins, in *The Cambridge History of India*, vol. i, p. 266.

are three-quarters full of apologetics for ancient customs which were no longer approved. The Law Books, such as the 'Laws of Manu,' are perhaps without parallel in any juridic literature for the flat self-contradictions which they present, often in the closest juxtaposition; one and the same practice is condemned in the strongest terms in one paragraph, and in the next directions are serenely given for carrying it out. "The advanced code objects formally to the transaction; at the same time the old provision is retained because it was part of hereditary traditional law."[1] To treat, as is often done, Brahmanical ideas and customs as 'primitive Aryan' usages, is to ignore the whole course of Indian history. "The instincts which led to the creation of the Hindu theocracy, and the marvellous aptitude for religious speculation which the Brahmans subsequently displayed, were no part of the original endowment of the Aryas; they must be otherwise explained."[2] In the long material struggle between the two claimants to power, kings and warriors prevailed for a time over the Brahmans and their allies, but the conquerors were ultimately compelled to yield to those whom they had conquered. "Nothing is more instructive in the history of Indian civilisation," remarks Sir George Grierson, "than the skill and characteristic astuteness with which the Brahmans gradually drew their opponents, and their opponents' allies, into the fold, and enlisted their aid in the life-and-death struggle with Buddhism."[3]

As regards marriage usages, the whole conception of the divine character of the priest, so fundamental in Indian thought, set the highest premium upon him in the capacity of husband; in the competition for Brahman husbands, infant Brahmans were bespoken as husbands for dozens of women.[4] Nothing could be more inapplicable to a Brahman than the system of primogeniture, the impartite Aryan household, the marriage of the eldest brother alone, and fraternal polyandry. From being inapplicable, those usages came to be looked upon as disreputable and as the customs of anti-Brahmanical heretics. Yet nowhere is there, even on the part of Brahmans, any denunciation of them on moral grounds. Nay, in southern India, away from the heat of the contest with aristocratic rivals, the Brahmans themselves retained the constitution of the undivided family, identical with that of Tibet, which obtained among the early Aryans. Division of any family

[1] E. W. Hopkins, in *The Cambridge History of India*, vol. i, pp. 291 sq.

[2] J. Kennedy, "The Aryan Invasion of Northern India," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1919, pp. 508 sq.

[3] G. H. Grierson, "The Battle between the Pandavas and Kauravas," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1908, p. 606.

[4] See below, vol. iii, p. 229.

property entailed loss of caste, the eldest brother alone was permitted to marry, and his children were accounted the offspring of the whole family of brothers.[1] A seventeenth-century Italian traveller, after remarking that the customs of the Nambutiri Brahmans are entirely different from those of the natives of Malabar, the latter transmitting their property to their sister's children, while with the former it passes to their own children, adds that "it is a law with the Brahmans that one son only takes a wife, who is common to all the brothers, but to no one else." [2] "The personal law which the Nambudris carried with them," remarks the learned Hindu judge Sir T. Muttusami Aiyar, "was not Hindu law as expounded by the authors of the Mitakashara, Smriti Chandrika, and Daya Vibhaga, but the ancient Hindu law as it was probably understood and followed about the commencement of the Christian era. Their institutions regarding the union of the sexes suggest that when they arrived in Malabar, Hindu Law, and therefore Hindu society, had not attained such a stage of development as is exhibited in the code attributed to Manu." [3]

Polyandrous Marriage amongst other 'Aryan' Peoples.

It has been a very prevalent expedient to dissociate our own race from those customs and institutions found among other races, which are at variance with our standards, by supposing the latter to be a racial endowment of an imaginary privileged race termed 'Aryan' or 'Indo-Germanic.' Professor Max Müller, who has been largely responsible for popularising the 'Aryan' hypothesis, felt, to his great credit, compelled to repudiate in the strongest terms the far-reaching structure of assumptions which has been built upon it. "There is no Aryan race," he wrote. "Aryan is in scientific language utterly inapplicable to race. It means a language, and nothing but a language. . . . I have declared again and again that if I say 'Aryan' I mean neither blood, nor bone, or hair, or skull. I mean simply those who speak an Aryan language. To me an ethnologist who speaks of Aryan race, Aryan blood, Aryan eyes and hair, is as great a sinner as a linguist who speaks of a dolicocephalic dictionary or a brachycephalic grammar. It is

[1] N. Subbaraya Aiyer, "The Nambudiris," *Malabar Quarterly Review*, vi, p. 113; S. Mateer, "Nepotism in Travancore," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xii, pp. 289 sqq.; J. Shortt, "A Contribution to the Ethnology of Jeypore," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society*, N.S., vi, p. 265; H. Risley and E. A. Gait, in *Census of India*, 1901, vol. i, "India," Part i, p. 449; A. Krishna Iyer, *The Cochin Tribes and Castes*, vol. ii, pp. 183, 198.

[2] Giuseppe di Santa Maria, *Prima speditione all'Indie orientali*, p. 160.

[3] Cited in L. Moore, *Malabar Law and Custom*, pp. 46 sq., n.

worse than a Babylonian confusion of tongues."[1] It would be greatly to the benefit of scientific conceptions could the word 'Aryan' be deleted from our vocabularies. The hypothetical 'Aryan' race has, however, become the bearer of so many cherished theories that, although it has never been discovered, it has come by many to be regarded as a fact vaguely associated with the speakers of Sanskrit. Hence the strenuous apologetics to which the literature and customs of the ancient Hindus have given occasion. It has been a point of honour and of patriotism, more especially with German scholars, to depict in the most exalted terms the moral standards and social institutions of those supposed first-cousins of the progenitors of their race; and in their zeal for the principles and morals of the Hindus of three millenniums ago, they have often appeared to lose all concern for their own principles of common intellectual honesty and veracity. In point of fact the standards of sexual morality of the inhabitants of Hindu-Kush and the Panjab at any period are more conspicuous for their indifference to the ideals it is desired to ascribe to the primitive Aryans than are those of any people of the same degree of culture.[2]

The only Aryans known to history are, we saw, the Medes and the Central Asiatic offshoots of the same race, to which the early, or 'Vedic' invaders of India belonged.[3] In the southern plains of Persia the race became strongly infused with Semitic elements. "Upon reaching the plateau we have passed from areas dominated by Semitic influence to a country where the Aryan is the ruling race."[4] Those historical Aryans were polyandrous. As with the Get-ti of Baktria and Sogdiana and the tribes of Hindu-Kush, polyandry is expressly stated to have been a social institution among the Medes. "By far the larger part of Media," says Strabo, "is mountainous. . . . With their kings it is a general custom to have many wives. But among the Medes of the upland country the custom is observed by all, so that it is not permissible to have less than five. The women, on the other hand, reckon it

[1] F. Max Müller, *Biographies of Words, and the Home of the Aryas*, pp. 89, 90, 120.

[2] See G. S. Robertson, *The Káfirs of the Hindu Kush*, p. 533; J. Tod, *Annals and Antiquities of Rajahst'han*, vol. i, p. 613; D. Bray, in *Census of India*, 1911, vol. iv, "Balochistan," pp. 107 sq. There is assuredly nothing approaching to European standards of sexual morality in the epics or in Vedic literature. Much has been done to bring the licentiousness and obscenity which pervades it into line with approved conceptions, but Drs. Macdonell and Keith, who have laboured hard in that difficult field, feel compelled to admit that "there is abundant evidence that the standard of ordinary sexual morality was not high" (A. A. Macdonell and A. B. Keith, *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*, vol. i, p. 480).

[3] See above, pp. 348 sqq.

[4] Sir P. Sykes, *A History of Persia*, vol. i, p. 95.

an honour to have many husbands, and to have less than five is accounted a misfortune."[1] The polyandry of the Medes is again referred to by Strabo in speaking of the Tapyri, that is to say, the inhabitants of Tabaristan, or as it is called at the present day, Mazanderan. The country, which extends along the southern shores of the Caspian, was, together with the adjacent province of Azarbayjan, the Holy Land of the Avesta and of Medic religion; Zarathustra was supposed to have been a native of Azarbayjan.[2] The old faith and the old customs lingered there long after the Islamisation of the rest of the country. "For more than a century after the Arab conquest of the rest of Persia, the native rulers, called the Ispahbads of Tabaristan, were independent in their mountain fastnesses, and until the middle of the eighth century their coinage continued to be struck with Pahlavi legends, and the Zoroastrian faith was dominant throughout the forests and fens of the great mountain range."[3] Among them, says Strabo, it was the custom to exchange wives between friends.[4] The custom lingered down to Islamic times, and the women of Azarbayjan were esteemed in proportion to the number of their husbands.[5]

Nor is there any ground for assuming that the conceptions and social institutions of the peoples whose languages are related to Sanskrit differ in the phases through which their development has passed from those of races speaking other languages. If they differ from more primitive phases, and if many features of the latter are abhorrent to the sentiments of the peoples most advanced in civilisation, that difference is not due to racial characters, but to the developmental distance that separates European societies from more archaic stages of social evolution. All goes to show that in the course of their growth the social institutions of those races which represent Western civilisation at the present day, have passed through the same phases as those of savages and primitive peoples in other races. Principles of sexual communism and polyandrous marriage institutions are not by any means unknown among the peoples from whom European civilisation has issued, whether they are or not culturally or racially related to the 'Aryans' of India. In Greece, in the community which preserved most faithfully the

[1] Strabo, xi. 13. 11. The passage has been amended by several editors so as to represent the polyandry of the Medes referred to by Strabo as polygyny. Dr. Groskurd, in his translation, justifies the manipulation of Strabo's text on the interesting ground that "for women to have a number of husbands is, indeed, a custom altogether unknown in any part of the East" (C. G. Groskurd, *Strabons Erdbeschreibung*, vol. ii, p. 428 n.).

[2] P. Sykes, *A History of Persia*, vol. i, pp. 97, 105.

[3] G. Le Strange, *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, p. 369.

[4] Strabo, xi. 9.

[5] E. Balfour, *The Cyclopaedia of India and Eastern and Southern Asia*, vol. iii, p. 244.

primitive organisation of the Hellenic race, fraternal polyandry was a legally recognised institution justified by the whole spirit of the social constitution which the Spartans ascribed to their traditional law-giver, and which they so jealously preserved. "In Sparta," says Polybius, "several brothers had often one wife between them, and the children were brought up in common." [1] It was the custom to exchange wives, and to offer them to strangers; [2] and, during the absence of their spouses, Spartan women had a recognised right to take 'secondary husbands.' [3] Other circumstances, such as the sacred and magical virtue ascribed in some Greek communities to rituals of sexual promiscuity, go to confirm the inference that the Spartan institution was, like other features of Lacedemonian society, but the survival of a phase through which the Greek race as a whole had passed.[4]

Among the Etruscans, according to Theopompos, it was a legal institution that wives should be held in common.[5] This, of course, may be no more than a rhetorical way of referring to the

[1] Polybius, xii. 6. Cf. Plutarch, *Vit. Lycurg.*, xv; Xenophon, *Respublic. Lacedemoniae*, i. 9. It goes without saying that every effort has been made by scholars who lacked the background of anthropological perspective to explain away this and other features of Spartan society. Nevertheless, so high and sympathetic an authority as Ottfried Müller, speaking from the classical point of view alone, says: "It must be confessed that the Spartan institution was very likely to lead to the terrible abuse which Polybius mentions. . . . It is therefore possible that the Hebrew institution of levirate-marriage was extended in Sparta to the lifetime of the childless elder brother" (C. O. Müller, *The History and Antiquities of the Doric Race*, vol. ii, p. 201). There is no indication in any of our authorities that fraternal polyandry was, in Sparta, restricted to cases of childless marriages, or in any other way.

[2] Theopompos, cited by Athenaeus, vi. 20; Justin, iii. 5; Diodorus Siculus, viii. 21; Polybius, xii. 5. 6; Hesychius, s. vv. *ἐνεύναχται* and *παρθενίοι*.

[3] Nicholas Damascenus, in *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, vol. iii, p. 458; Plutarch, Polybius, *loc. cit.*

[4] See below, vol. iii, p. 202. The very prevalent customs of ritual sexual licence do not constitute collective sexual organisations, and I concur with the critics who insist upon a clear distinction between the two. Nevertheless, it is not possible to suppose that rites of sexual promiscuity, whatever religious or magical purposes they may have been regarded as serving, could have had their origin in a society where individual sexual claims were fully established and regularly enforced. The religious character of ritual sexual licence may certainly have caused its survival for some time after social sexual usages had changed. But, as a matter of fact, wherever those changes to a stricter sexual and connubial code have taken place, ritual licence tends at once to become modified and ultimately to disappear; nowhere does unmodified sexual licence exist in a ritual or ceremonial form and a strict code of exclusive marital possession in the social order. Cf. below, pp. 750 sq.

[5] Athenaeus, xii. 14.

general laxity of sexual relations among the Etruscans. But such general imputations of laxity so commonly turn out, on closer investigation, to result from the impression produced by what are in fact regularly established institutions, that it may at least be suspected that in this instance also the expression of Theopompos represents the truth more closely than mere charges of lawless lasciviousness and licence. The matriarchal social organisation of the great Italic nation, in which the relations of father and of husband seem to have been of little account, was perhaps originally founded upon some system resembling that which obtained amongst the Nayars of Malabar.

The juridic institutions and ethical conceptions of patriarchal and monogamic Rome which, transmitted to modern Europe, constitute a large element of our own corresponding conceptions and institutions, had also, as has been noted, not always been such as we know them. It can scarcely be supposed that the sexual organisation out of which sprang those primitive Latin princes and those kings who did not know their fathers were monandrous 'familiae.' From the most brilliant epoch of the Roman Republic comes the report of an incident which, but for the background, would appear utterly strange and inexplicable. It is mentioned by Plutarch with his usual embarrassment when called upon to relate startling social facts. A friend and admirer of the second Cato, he relates, expressed a desire " to be more than a mere associate and companion of Cato, and in some manner to bring his whole family and blood into community of kinship with him." In order to effect this purpose he first proposed to Cato that the latter's daughter, who was married to Bibulus, should be *lent* to him " as noble soil for the production of children " ; for, he argued, " community in heirs among worthy men would make virtue abundant and widely diffused in their families, and the State would be closely cemented together by their family alliances." Should the husband, Bibulus, be, through some sentimental scruple, averse to the proposition, he, Cato's friend, solemnly promised to give back his wife to him as soon as she had borne a child. Those arguments and proposals did not come from an American Redskin, a Melanesian, Siberian, or Australian savage, but from the brilliant Quintus Hortensius, " a man of splendid reputation and exalted character," the famous rival of Cicero. Cato, far from being in any way offended, expressed himself flattered by the token of affection shown to him by Hortensius, and " thought highly of a community of relationship with him," but entertaining probably some doubt as to the willingness of Bibulus to fall in with the proposition, regretted that he did not see his way to acceding to the request. Hortensius then made

another proposition which overcame the difficulty of having to obtain the consent of a third party; he suggested that Cato should lend him his own wife. To this Cato could see no objection, but thought it only fair to talk the matter over with his wife's father, Philippus. The latter entirely concurred with the reasonable proposition, and Cato accordingly lent his wife to Hortensius agreeably to the most approved Chukchi, Tibetan, or Australian precedents, subsequently taking her back, after the death of Hortensius, according to some accounts, though this is not stated in others.[1] Plutarch, as I said, though he conscientiously reports the circumstances in his biography of Cato, does so with obvious embarrassment, anxious to make the best of a business he could not understand. The learned Strabo, however, like the true anthropologist he was, saw the incident in its real perspective. He refers to it after mentioning the polyandrous customs of the Medes of Tabaristan, or Tapyri, which we have already noticed. "In the same manner," he goes on to say, "in our own day Cato lent his wife to Hortensius, upon the latter's request, following in this an ancient custom of the Romans." [2]

Among the barbarians of northern Europe it was by no means unusual for men to exchange wives.[3] Until quite late in the Middle Ages it was a recognised and perfectly legal practice in Germany, if a marriage proved without issue, for the husband to introduce some relative or friend to his wife in the hope that he might have better luck.[4] The usage is said to have lingered almost to our own time among the peasants in some of the remoter districts of Germany.[5] In Nordic and Teutonic mythology the goddess Frigga, when her husband Odin goes on a journey, cohabits with his brothers in the same fashion as a Tlinkit lady.[6]

Caesar states that the ancient Britons practised community of wives, groups of ten or twelve, especially brothers, having their wives in common.[7] Dio Cassius, in the epitome of Xiphilinus, makes Queen Boadicea say, exhorting her warriors: "It is over Britons that I rule, men unskilled indeed in husbandry or handicraft,

[1] Plutarch, *Cato secundus*, xxv; cf. Appian, *De bellis civilibus*, ii. 99; Lucan, ii. 326 sqq.; Quintillian, *Institutio oratoria*, iii. 5. 8; x. 5. 13; Tertullian, *Apolog.*, xxxix; St. Jerome, *Adv. Iovin.*, 146; Augustin, *De fid. et op.*, vii. 10; *De bon. conjug.*, xviii. 21.

[2] Strabo, xi. 9.

[3] K. Gjerset, *History of the Norwegian People*, vol. i, p. 92.

[4] J. Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer*, pp. 443 sqq. Cf. O. von Gierke, *Der Humor im deutschen Recht*, p. 56.

[5] G. L. von Maurer, *Geschichte der Dorfverfassung in Deutschland*, vol. i, pp. 338 sq.

[6] K. Weinhold, *Altnordisches Leben*, p. 249.

[7] Caesar, *De bello Gallico*, v. 14.

but well trained in the arts of war, men who have all things in common, who have even their wives and their children in common." [1] Bardesanes states that "in Britain several men have one wife between them." [2] Similar usages are reported of the Caledonians and the tribes of the border: "They live in tents, naked and barefooted, having wives in common, and rearing the whole progeny." [3] Strabo was told that the Irish had free access to one another's wives, and even did not bar incestuous relations, but does not vouch for the reliability of the information.[4] St. Jerome, before the introduction of Christianity, enlarges with theological exaggeration upon the manners of the northern Britons of his day. "The nation of the Scots," he says, "have no individual wives; and, as if they had been reading Plato's 'Republic,' or wished to imitate the example of Cato, a man, amongst them, has no wife of his own, but each one indulges his lasciviousness according to his pleasure, after the manner of beasts." [5] A Roman dame of high degree, Julia Augusta, once taunted a Caledonian lady with the polyandrous customs of her countrymen, but the Scotchwoman answered with considerable spirit that, seeing that human nature was very much the same in this respect in Scotland and in Rome, her countrymen managed these things, she thought, much better than did the Romans; for in her country a woman might consort openly and lawfully with the best men, whereas in Rome the women were sullied by secret and adulterous relations with the worst.[6] There appears to be no justifiable ground for questioning; as needless to say has been done, the accuracy of those statements.[7] They do

[1] Xiphilinus, epitome of Dio Cassius, *Hist. Rom.*, lxii. 6.

[2] Bardesanes, in Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica*, vi. 10.

[3] Xiphilinus, epitome of Dio Cassius, *Hist. Rom.*, lxxvi. 12.

[4] Strabo, iv. 5. 4.

[5] Jerome, *Adversus Jovinianum*, vii, in Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus*, vol. xxiii, col. 296.

[6] Dio Cassius, lxxvi. 16.

[7] It has been suggested that Caesar mistook the somewhat promiscuous herding of Celtic families in their huts for sexual communism; or that he confused reports concerning some 'non-Aryan' populations in some remote part of the British Islands with the habitual customs of the general population of Britain. Both those suppositions are quite improbable. Caesar was not a fool; he is no more likely to have formed a groundless conclusion as to the social conditions of the natives than as to their strategic position or resources. The statement he makes in his brief, precise, military style, with intimate Druid friends at his side and the best means of information at his disposal, rested, we may be sure, on reliable information. Had he been mistaken, his erroneous impression would have been corrected, instead of being confirmed, during the long subsequent residence of the Romans in Britain. As to 'non-Aryan' populations invented for the purpose, there is not a shred of evidence of the existence of such in the British Islands. To save the 'Aryan' ethical doctrine it is necessary to accept not this alone,

not currently appear in Celtic literature; but that could scarcely be expected seeing that all the Celtic literature we possess has been set down in Christian times and by Christian priests. The Irish priests were not sternly fanatical in their editing of the traditional literature of their country, but polygamy, and 'a fortiori' polyandry, is just what they would not willingly record. Nevertheless, it is mentioned in the 'Ulster Saga' that the princess Clothru married three brothers, and that her son, Lugaid Riab n-Derg, who became supreme king of Ireland, had thus three fathers.[1] Multiple fatherhood is also referred to in mythological texts.[2] The usages referred to by the classical writers are in entire accordance with the general tenor of sexual relations among the ancient Celts.[3] They are further in strict harmony with the principles of the constitution of the Celtic family; the property was indivisible, and, unless a son went to seek his fortune, brothers continued together, forming one common household. The name and symbol of that fraternal household was not the house, but significantly enough the bed; the Celtic family was called 'com lebaid,' 'the common bed' in Irish, 'gwely,' 'the bed' in British.[4]

There is, thus, no indication of a peculiar monogamic tradition or disposition among the peoples who have been called 'Aryan,' whether in Europe or in Asia, or of any immunity of those races from the phases of social evolution through which other races have passed; and any divergence between the ideas and customs of the former and of the aboriginal races of Asia represent different phases of development rather than different racial types of social conduct and sentiments.

Collective Marriage in Southern India.

In the southern portion of Hindustan the survivals of collective sexual organisations are so general as to leave little doubt that

not one, but a score and more of such hypothetical apologetic suggestions and groundless conjectural explanations in as many different fields of enquiry. It is, of course, possible that such conjectures may be right in some cases, but to adapt a famous saying, they cannot be right all the time and in every case.

[1] W. O. E. Windisch, *Irische Texte*, vol. iii, pp. 332, 415; R. Thurneysen, *Die irischen Helden- und Königsage*, p. 584; Whitley Stokes, "On the Death of Some Irish Heroes," *Revue Celtique*, xxiii, p. 333.

[2] J. A. McCulloch, *The Religion of the Ancient Celts*, p. 224.

[3] See below, vol. iii, pp. 378 sq.

[4] H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, *La famille celtique*, pp. 49 sqq. The Hon. John Abercromby is of opinion that the disposition of certain ancient British graves is most naturally accounted for by polyandrous family institutions (J. Abercromby, *A Study of the Bronze Age Pottery of Great Britain and Ireland and its Associated Grave-Goods*, vol. i, p. 73).

they once constituted the usual form of marriage among the native races.

Group-marriage is in full force at the present day among the tribes of the Nilgiri Hills, and more especially among the Todas. As in most other instances it has been described as simple polyandry, that aspect of the usage which is most strange to patriarchal conceptions being alone taken note of. The marriage institutions of the Todas are, however, not simple polyandry, but sororal-fraternal group-marriage. "If there be four or five brothers and one of them, being old enough, gets married, his wife claims all the other brothers as her husbands, and as they successively attain manhood she consorts with them; or if the wife has one or more sisters, they in turn, on attaining a marriageable age, become the wives of their sister's husband or husbands, and thus in a family of several brothers there may be, according to circumstances, only one wife for them all, or many; but, one or more, they all live under one roof, and cohabit promiscuously."[1] The two families are betrothed when the eldest of the children are still infants, and "all subsequent brothers of the bridegroom-elect become from their birth bound to the common prospective wife." Notwithstanding the scarcity of women due to the practice of female infanticide, the Todas never contract marriages with other tribes, though living on the most friendly terms with them.[2] Where the brothers are already grown up at the time, they each in turn take part in the marriage ceremony by which the groups are united, placing their foot upon the heads of the women. Not only are the brothers of one family co-partners in the group-marriage of that family with another, but other young men, members of the same clan, that is, tribal brothers, are also admitted into the connubial group. The Todas thus present an instance of the rule, which is common in fraternal-sororal group-marriage, that the group is seldom strictly limited to the family of brothers, but tends to include in addition a greater or lesser number of the members of the class to which the group of brothers belongs. "Notwithstanding these singular family arrangements," says Major Ross King, "the greatest harmony appears to prevail among all parties—husbands, wives, and lovers. The children live happily with their putative parents, equally well treated on every side, and as common to all alike, though, I believe, if any special reason demands it, the senior husband can claim the elder children."[3] In 1902 the Todas addressed a petition to the Indian Government for special legislation to legalise their marriages on the lines of the

[1] E. A. Gait, in *Census of India*, 1911, vol i, "India," Part i, p. 240.

[2] W. Ross King, "The Aboriginal Tribes of the Nilgiri Hills," *Journal of Anthropology*, 1870–71, pp. 32 sq.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 32.

Malabar Marriage Act.[1] Other tribes of the Nilgiri Hills, such as the Kurumbas, observe the same usages as the Todas.[2]

According to Dr. Rivers there is every reason to believe that the Todas migrated to their present segregated habitat from the coast of Malabar at the time of the Aryan invasion.[3] That view is confirmed by Mr. K. H. Panikkar, who points out that many of the customs thought to be peculiar to them, such as the religious ideas connected with their dairies, which are in fact their temples, are common to most of the Tamil populations of that region and are found in Travancore 150 miles from the dwelling-place of the Todas.[4] The ancient fortifications, the remains of which are found everywhere on the escarpments of the Nilgiris, it may be added, also go to confirm the view that those hills served as a place of refuge for the populations of the plains.[5] If that be so it would appear that the Todas must be regarded as representing in their present social constitution the original form of organisation which was formerly common to all the native races of Malabar and Travancore. That conclusion is supported by the reports of the older travellers and by what we know of the usages of the populations of that country at the present day. Among the Tottiyan cultivators, for instance, " after marriage it is customary for the women to cohabit with their husband's brothers and near relatives, and with their uncles; and so far from any disgrace attaching to them in consequence, their priests compel them to keep up the custom if by any chance they are unwilling." [6] Fraternal polyandry is still observed by the Tiyans (toddy tappers) of Malabar. The Tiyan woman sleeps in a room, and her husbands outside; when one of them is engaged with her, a knife is placed on the door-frame as a sign that entrance into the room is forbidden to the other husbands. Among the Kappiliyan cultivators it is permissible " for a woman to cohabit with her brothers-in-law without thereby suffering any social degradation. It constantly happens that a woman is the wife of ten, eight, six or two husbands." [7] Among the Badagas " it is etiquette that when a woman's husband is away

[1] E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, p. 111. " The Government was of opinion that legislation is at present unnecessary, and that it is open to such of the Todas as are willing to sign the declaration prescribed by Section 10 of the Marriage Act, III, of 1872, to contract legal marriages under the provision of that Act."

[2] E. Thurston, *Tribes and Castes of Southern India*, vol. iv, p. 169.

[3] W. H. R. Rivers, *The Todas*, pp. 699 sqq.

[4] K. M. Panikkar, " Some Aspects of Nayar Life," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlviii, p. 291.

[5] *The Imperial Gazetteer of India*, vol. xix, p. 89.

[6] E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, p. 108.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 112.

she should be accessible to her brothers-in-law." [1] Fraternal polyandry is reported of the Krisnavakkakars of Travancore.[2] The Kanisans admit that fraternal polyandry was formerly common among them, but say that it has now died out.[3] The Reddi, a noble caste who were formerly rulers in the Telugu country, still observe fraternal polyandry.[4] In the towns of the Malabar coast fraternal polyandry is still practised by the artisan castes, namely, the Ashary, or carpenters, the Mushaly, or brass-founders, the Tattar, or goldsmiths, the Peroon-kallan, or iron-smiths.[5] Among the Kammalan artisans the priest solemnly marries the brothers in order of seniority to the bride or brides, by offering them milk. "The eldest brother cohabits with the bride on the wedding day, and special days are set apart for each brother. There seems to be a belief among the Kammalan women that the more husbands they have the greater will be their happiness. In some cases a girl will have brothers ranging from twenty-five to five, whom she has to regard as husbands, so that by the time the youngest brother reaches puberty she may be over thirty, and the young man has to perform the duties of a husband with a wife who is twice his age." [6] Among all the artisan classes if a younger brother wishes to marry he must live apart and set up business for himself; but if any of the brothers junior to him resides with him, the elder brother's wife is common to both.[7] Hence polyandry is most prevalent among the poorer castes, and especially among the blacksmiths.[8]

In former days, however, it was not among the poorest castes that the traditional custom had to be sought. It is with reference to the noblest and wealthiest aboriginal caste of the land that it has obtruded itself upon the notice of travellers and observers. Concerning the marriage system of the Nayars, or Nairs, as the name—which means 'lords,' or 'chieftains'—used to be spelt, we have a considerable number of accounts dating from the time of the first landing of the Portuguese in India to the present day.[9] Apart from a few misconceptions which are

[1] E. Thurston, *Tribes and Castes of Southern India*, vol. i, pp. 105 sq.
[2] Id., *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, p. 113.
[3] *Loc. cit.*
[4] *Ibid.*; J. A. Baines, in *Census of India*, 1891, "General Report," p. 255.
[5] E. Balfour, *Cyclopaedia of India*, vol. iii, p. 623.
[6] E. Thurston, *op. cit.*, p. 114.
[7] E. Balfour, *loc. cit.*
[8] E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, pp. 114 sq.
[9] The following are among the more important of the older references:—Niccoló Conti, "Travels of Niccoló Conti in the East," in R. H. Major, *India in the Fifteenth Century*; Abd-er-Razzak, "Narrative of the Journey of Abd-er-Razzak," *ibid.*; Hieronimo di Santo Stefano, "Account of the Journey of Hieronimo di Santo Stefano," *ibid.*; Duarte Barbosa, in G. B. Ramusio, *Primo Volume delle Navigationi et Viaggi*, fol. 342; Ludovico

easily rectifiable, those accounts are remarkably consistent and, in the light of present comparative knowledge, accurate and discerning. "Each of them," says the Portuguese bishop Osorius, speaking of the Nayars, "is joined in marriage to girls of his own caste, for it would be a sin with them to cohabit with a woman who is not noble. On their side the women have also as many lovers as they choose, but they must all be noble. Jealousy does not exist among the men; they follow one another in turn. If a man has cohabited with a woman that is not noble he is put to death by his fellows of the same class. The woman suffers in the same way who oversteps

Bartema, *ibid.*, fol. 174; Pedro Alvarez, *ibid.*, fol. 137; Fernão Lopes de Castanheda, *Historia do descobrimento e conquista da India pelos Portuguezes*, Coimbra, 1551 (the relevant passages are translated in R. Kerr, *A General History and Collection of Voyages and Travels*, vol. ii, p. 353); Giovanni di Barros, *L'Asia, tradotta nuovamente di lingua Portoghese* dal S. A. Ulloa (Venice, 1562), fol. 176; *The Voyage of M. Caesar Fredericke, Merchant of Venice, into the East India and beyond the Indies, translated out of the Italian by Mr. Thomas Hickocke, Hakluyt Voyages*, vol. v, p. 394; Hieronymus Osorius Lusitanus Episcopus, *De rebus Emmanuelis Regis Lusitaniae* (Coloniae, 1576), fol. 35; *Voyage de Pyrard de Laval, contenant sa navigation aux Indes Orientales*, etc. (Paris, 1619); Zeirreddin, Mukhom, translated by J. Duncan, *infra*; Philippus Baldaeus, *Naauwkeurige beschrijvinge van Malabar en Choromandel, der zelver aangrenzende Ryken en Ceijlon* (Amsterdam, 1672), p. 15; Giovanni Francesco Gemelli Careri, *Giro del Mondo* (Venice, 1728), vol. ii, pp. 150, 171 sq.; Dr. Dellon, *Nouvelle Relation d'un Voyage fait aux Indes orientales* (Amsterdam, 1699), pp. 138 sq.; *The Travels of Pietro della Valle in India*; Alexander Hamilton, *A New Account of the East Indies* (1744), in Pinkerton, *Voyages and Travels*, vol. viii, pp. 374 sq.; John Henry Grose, *A Voyage to the East Indies* (London, 1766), vol. i, pp. 243 sq.; T. K. Sonnerat, *Voyage aux Indes orientales et à la Chine*, 1774–81, vol. i, pp. 430 sq.; Jonathan Duncan, "Historical Remarks on the Coast of Malabar, with some description of the Manners of its Inhabitants," *Asiatic Researches*, v, pp. 13 sqq., 29; F. Buchanan, *A Journey from Madras through the Countries of Mysore, Canara and Malabar* (1807), in Pinkerton, *Voyages and Travels*, vol. viii, p. 737; James Forbes, *Oriental Memoirs, a Narrative of Seventeen Years' Residence in India* (London, 1834), vol. i, p. 247; K. Graul, *Die Reise nach Ostindien in den Jahren 1849 bis 1853* (Leipzig, 1854), vol. iii, p. 41.

Camoens sang of the marriage usages of the Nayars:—

> "Geraes são as mulheres, mas somente
> Para as da geração de seus maridos:
> Ditosa condição, ditosa gente,
> Que não são de ciumes offendidos!"
>
> *Luciad*, VII, xli.

They were known to Montaigne, who probably got his information from Ramusio. "Those of Calicut made of their nobility a degree above humane. Marriage is interdicted and all other vocations except warre. Of concubines they may have as many as they list, and women as many lechardes without jealousies one of another. But it is a capital crime and unremissible offence to contract or marry with any of different condition" (*Essays of Michael Lord of Montaigne*, translated by John Florio, Bk. iii, ch. 5, vol. iii, p. 86).

the bounds of the law." [1] Another account of the same period, that of Fernão Lopes de Castanheda, states: "By the laws of this country these Nayars cannot marry, so that no one has any certain or acknowledged son or father; all their children being born of mistresses, with each of which three or four Nayars cohabit by agreement among themselves. Each one of this confraternity dwells a day in his turn with the joint mistress, counting from noon of one day to the same time of the next, after which they depart, and another comes for the like time. Thus they spend their lives without care or trouble of wives and children, yet maintain their mistresses well according to their rank. . . . These mistresses are all gentlewomen of the Nayar caste, and the Nayars, besides being prohibited from marrying, must not attach themselves to any woman of a different rank. . . . All inheritances among the Nayars go to their brothers or the sons of their sisters born of the same mothers, all relationship being counted only by female consanguinity and descent." [2] The Venetian merchant, Caesar Fredericke, reports: "These Nairs have their wives in common among themselves, and when any of them goe into the house of any of these women, he leaveth his sword and target at the doore, and the time that he is there, there dare not be any so hardie as to come into that house." [3] "The women of the Nairs," says Giovanni di Barros, "are common to all men of the same class. So general is the law among the noble, that a Nair girl of ten, at which age she is given over to the men as marriageable, will give herself to whomsoever she likes, not only of the Nairs, but also of the Brahmans, their priests, who enjoy the same freedom. To receive any other man in her house would constitute adultery." [4] Grose, writing in the eighteenth century, says: "It is among the Nair that principally prevails the strange custom of one wife being common to a number; in which point the great power of custom is seen from its rarely or never producing any jealousies or quarrels among the co-tenants of the same woman. Their number is not so much limited by any specific law as by a kind of tacit convention, it scarce ever happening that it exceeds six or seven. The woman, however, is under no obligation to admit above a single attachment, though not less respected for using her privilege to its utmost extent." [5] "In the province of Malayalam," says Mr. F. W. Ellis, "among the superior castes of Sudras, all women, with certain restrictions as to tribes,

[1] Hieronymus Osorius Lusitanus Episcopus, *De Rebus Emmanuelis Regis Lusitaniae*, Coloniae, 1576, fol. 35.

[2] Fernão Lopes de Castanheda, in R. Kerr, *A General Collection of Voyages and Travels*, vol. ii, p. 353.

[3] *The Voyage of M. Caesar Fredericke*, p. 394.

[4] Giovanni di Barros, *L'Asia*, fol. 176.

[5] J. H. Grose, *Voyages to the East Indies*, vol. i, pp. 243 sq.

are common to all men, and this state of things is equally productive of public order and private happiness as the stricter institutions of Europe." [1]

The very typical and interesting social organisation of the Nayars, has already been noted ; [2] it is one of the purest examples of unmodified matriarchal organisation, the motherhood, or 'târwad,' composed of all the descendants of a common ancestress in the female line constituting the only unit of Nayar society. It should further be observed that the Nayar 'târwads' were classified in order of seniority, or nobility, there being no less than a hundred such orders of rank, or castes.[3] During the period over which our records extend, the strictest rule governing Nayar marriages was that every Nayar woman should marry in a caste higher than her own ; or in other words, "in no case can an inferior male have intercourse with a female of superior class." [4] Breach of that rule would, as Barros correctly states, "constitute adultery," and would be punishable with the severest penalties, according to most accounts with death. Caste organisation, however, is not an aboriginal institution, and that terminology must consequently have been borrowed from Aryan ideas. Probably, in the original form of the system sexual relations were confined by tribal law to certain corresponding intermarrying 'târwads,' possibly to one only. The French physician, Dr. Dellon, writing in the seventeenth century, states that "they observe a regular order in their alliances, and their scruples extend to all their commerce with women. A man may marry a woman of his own rank only, or one of that immediately inferior to him ; he may have an amorous intrigue with her, but not when she is of higher rank, and both sexes incur the death penalty if they are convicted of contravention to that law. The women of the Gentiles of Malabar have the right to have as many husbands as they please, without this causing any disorder." [5] It appears clearly from those accounts that collective intercourse was strictly confined to certain intermarrying 'târwads,' and this is confirmed by the fact that a Nayar, even at the present day, is supposed to marry his mother's brother's daughter [6]—that is to say, to marry in the same 'târwad' as the other members of his own 'târwad.'

[1] F. W. Ellis, *The Kural of Tiruvalluvar, with English Translation and Commentary* (Madras, 1816), p. 109.

[2] See above, p. 302.

[3] T. K. Gopal Panikkar, *Malabar and its Folk*, Madras, 1901, p. 21. According to Jonathan Duncan, the number of castes, or 'classes' as he calls them, was thirty (*Asiatic Researches*, v, p. 17).

[4] S. Mateer, *Native Life in Travancore*, p. 178.

[5] Dr. Dellon, *Nouvelle Relation d'un voyage fait aux Indes Orientales*, pp. 129, 138.

[6] K. M. Panikkar, "Some Aspects of Nayar Life," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlviii, p. 270.

There was neither permanent cohabitation nor economic association of any kind between husbands and wives. The husband was a visitor and the woman never left her maternal home. Presents were given by the man to the woman; it was understood that he should contribute towards her supplementary expenses, that is, the upkeep of her wardrobe.[1] The acceptance by a woman of a man as sexual associate was, indeed, celebrated in the presence of her relatives by a kind of family ceremony, which consisted in presenting her with a piece of valuable cloth and in offering less valuable presents to her relatives.[2] But beyond those formal presents and the customary 'pin-money,' there was no economic bond or association between a man and his sexual mate. There was no law of maintenance; "wife and children do not possess the legal privilege of claiming maintenance from the father, who is invariably looked upon as a useless legal party in Nair society."[3] "Marriage among the Nayars," says another Nayar, "is indeed pure and simple, unmixed with considerations of civil rights of property—a marriage for the sake of marriage alone. It is not an institution intended, as in more advanced Hindu societies, for the perpetuation of the family, but a social arrangement intended for the peaceful satisfaction of the 'blindest appetite' of man. Such an arrangement is evidently possible without the slightest disturbance of the civil laws regulating inheritance or the transfer of property."[4] Nayar marriage thus offers a concrete example of the most primitive conditions of sexual organisation, more primitive, indeed, than many similar systems among surviving savage tribes, for sexual relations were entirely dissociated from economic relations.

The very strict and severe laws regulating marriage among the Nayars had no reference to the relations between individuals within permissible marriage classes, but only to the determination of those classes. Individual marriage did not exist. In his account of marriage customs Castanheda states that "by the laws of their country the Nayars cannot marry."[5] In the Arabic MS. of Zeirreddin the matter is accurately described: "The Nayars practise not marriage except as far as may be implied from the tying a thread round the neck of a woman at the first occasion. Wherefore the acts and practical maxims of the rest are suited to their condition, and they look upon the existence or non-existence

[1] Lewis Moore, *Malabar Law and Custom* (3rd edition, Madras, 1905), p. 92.
[2] L. Mateer, *Native Life in Travancore*, p. 175.
[3] T. K. Gopal Panikkar, *Malabar and its Folk*, p. 22.
[4] K. Kannan Nayar, "The Matrimonial Customs of the Nayars," *The Malabar Quarterly Review*, vii (1908), p. 183.
[5] L. F. L. de Castanheda, *loc. cit.*

of the matrimonial contract as equally indifferent." [1] Jonathan Duncan, Governor of Bombay, and one of the makers of modern India, states that the Nayars "do not marry according to the usually received sense of the term in other parts of the world, but form connections of a longer or shorter duration according to the choice of the partners, without, however, the reputed father having, or pretending to, any paternal claim to the children of those transitory engagements." [2] "Nayar customs," says the Rev. S. Mateer, "admit of no real marriage, nothing, in fact, that can rightly be called marriage, the trivial bond being dissolvable with a word at the will and pleasure of either party." [3] "There is no recognised form of marriage by which a Nayar man and woman could bind one another, even if they wished, for life." [4] "Up to the date of the passing of Act IV of 1896 (Madras)," says Mr. Justice L. Moore, "it was absolutely impossible for a man or a woman who follow Marumakhattayam law to contract a valid marriage, using the word marriage in its ordinary signification." [5] "There are two sides to a marriage," says Mr. Gopal Panikkar, "a legal and a religious. Now in the case of our marriage both elements are wanting. They are not legal because they do not create any correlative rights and duties, and because in the majority of cases there is no agreement between the contracting parties. We have no law of divorce or maintenance. There is, in fact, no fixed rule or custom as to marriages in Malabar. They are terminable at the will of either party and the law takes no notice of them." [6]

J. F. McLennan, relying chiefly on the account of Buchanan, regarded Nayar polyandry as the type of non-fraternal, as he regarded Tibetan marriage as the type of fraternal polyandry,[7] and the impression that Nayar marriage was non-fraternal has continued among writers on ethnology to the present day.[8] But there is every reason for thinking that this is an error. Non-fraternal polyandry, as an original and traditionally established institution, is extremely rare, if indeed it exists at all. Those instances, such as the collective marriages of the Chukchi, or the polyandry still surviving in the Darjeeling district,[9] which are described as non-

[1] Zeirreddin Mukhdom, in J. Duncan, "Historical Remarks on the Court of Malabar," *Asiatic Researches*, v, p. 13.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 29.

[3] S. Mateer, "Nepotism in Travancore," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xii, p. 291.

[4] Id., *Native Life in Travancore*, p. 181.

[5] L. Moore, *Malabar Law and Custom*, p. 69.

[6] T. K. Gopal Panikkar, *Malabar and its Folk*, pp. 22, 47.

[7] J. F. McLennan, *Studies in Ancient History*, pp. 93 sq.

[8] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. iii, pp. 141, 200.

[9] H. H. Risley, *The People of India*, p. 203, quoting Mr. Earle: "There are instances in the Darjeeling district, but apparently not in Sikkim or

fraternal polyandry, are clearly seen on examination to be but degenerate forms of collective relations in which the husbands were originally brothers, own or tribal. In the same manner as the original organisation has become modified in those instances by the admission of strangers, so the organisation of Nayar marriage has been obscured by the circumstance that Nambutiri Brahmans were admitted to participate in marriage with Nayar women. "The custom of concubinage so freely indulged in by the Brahmans with Nair women," says Mr. Gopal Panikkar, "obtained such a firm hold upon the country that it has only been strengthened by lapse of time. At the present day there are families, especially in the interior of the district, who look upon it as an honour to be thus united to Brahmans."[1] But that circumstance is entirely adventitious, and has nothing to do with the original constitution of Nayar marriage though it has led travellers to mistake the nature of the latter. In the lower castes, and wherever polyandry still survives among Nayar castes at the present day, it is confined to the fraternal form.[2] Zeirreddin, mistaking that unmodified preservation for an imitation, says: "The lower castes, as carpenters, ironsmiths and others, have fallen into the imitation of their superiors, the Nayars, with this difference, however, that joint concern in a female is among them limited to the brethren and male relatives by blood."[3] The Italian traveller Gemelli Careri expressly states that the husbands in Nayar marriage were brothers; "when one brother marries a woman," he states, "she is common to all the others."[4] Other travellers, misled by the part played by Brahmans in such unions, and also by the fact that in the Nayar social system there were no 'actual,' but only 'tribal' brothers, that is, members of the same 'târwad,' have described Nayar polyandry as non-fraternal. Since there was no 'family,' there were no brothers in the family sense, but only in the clan sense. That Nayar polyandry was fraternal follows from the obligation to marry in certain 'târwads' only, and seemingly in that into which a man's mother's brothers have married. At the present day, cultured Nayars, who are extremely reluctant to admit any survival of the polyandrous customs of their ancestors, acknowledge that a trace of it is retained in the relations between brothers. "The wife of a brother," says

Tibet, of a number of men, not brothers or near relations, taking a wife between them; but this appears a novel practice." It is pretty obvious that the 'novel practice' is a corrupt adaptation of the fraternal polyandry which is immemorial throughout the Himalayas.

[1] T. K. Gopal Panikkar, *Malabar and its Folk*, p. 22.

[2] R. S. Mateer, *Native Life in Travancore*, p. 173.

[3] Zeirreddin Mukhdom, in J. Duncan, "Historical Remarks on the Coast of Malabar, with some Description of the Manners of its Inhabitants," *Asiatic Researches*, v, p. 14.

[4] G. F. Gemelli Careri, *Giro del Mondo*, vol. iii, p. 172.

Mr. K. M. Panikkar, "is looked upon as a person to whom one could openly, though not legitimately, pay court, and any favour short of sexual relationship which she confers upon them is allowed by public opinion. . . . All the brothers treat her half as a sister and half as a wife." [1] Nayar marriage was, in fact, identical with all other institutions of fraternal sororal polygamy which we have come upon, and differed only from the Tibetan form as it exists to-day, in being of a more primitive type, the marrying groups being unmodified matriarchal clans and not, as in Tibet, semi-patriarchal families. The fact that no instance of non-fraternal polyandry, as a general custom of spontaneous and independent origin, is definitely known, and that, where such a practice is found it appears invariably to be derived from fraternal group-marriage as an adaptation and modification of the established tradition, is significant. For if, as some have supposed, polyandry were the outcome of various local and accidental conditions, such, for instance, as scarcity of women, there would be no apparent reason why such a practice should not have commonly assumed the form of a deliberate and compacted partnership between persons not necessarily related, as, in fact, it has where polyandry arises adventitiously from such conditions. But no instance is known of such an economic or otherwise deliberately devised polyandry having become customary except as a modification of already existing fraternal group-marriage. It thus appears that polyandrous marriage has its root in the fact of relationship and not in adventitious circumstances; that it is a manifestation of traditional organisation, and not of local conditions.

The collective connubial relations of Nayar women, though attended with little or no formality, were preceded by a ceremony, the tying of the 'tali,' which was performed on Nayar girls before the age of eleven. The 'tali' is a small gold leaf through which a hole is bored with the finger, and which is tied round the neck of the girl. The rite is not peculiar to the Nayars, but is general among Dravidian races in India. Very similar customs are observed by other peoples. Thus, in the island of Serang, an old woman takes the girl's index finger and thrusts it through a pisang-leaf, which is then placed on the lintel of the house as a sign that the girl is marriageable.[2] The rite is one of those 'puberty rites' which are universally customary. Puberty rites are not marriage ceremonies in the sense of the solemnisation of a union between particular

[1] K. M. Panikkar, "Some Aspects of Nayar Life," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlviii, p. 293. Mr. N. S. Aiyar (*Census of India*, 1901, vol. i, "India," *Ethnographic Appendices*, p. 137) also states that Nayar polyandry was fraternal.

[2] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua*, p. 134.

persons, but they are marriage ceremonies in a more general sense, being regarded as indispensable to entrance into sexual life, without any reference to any particular partner. We shall see that, in fact, religious marriage ceremonies having special reference to such particular unions have had their origin in puberty rites by the coalescence of the conception of preparation for sexual life in general with that of exclusive union with a given sexual partner. The preliminary puberty rite is originally conceived as the union of the marriageable girl with a god represented by a priest, a sacred person, a stranger, or by an idol or symbol of the god. The rite usually involves the defloration of the girl by the representative of the god.[1] The ' tali-kettu ' ceremony of the Nayars is sometimes performed by a Brahman priest,[2] and it appears to have been the custom that he should then deflower the girl.[3] More usually the ' tali ' was tied by a Nayar bridegroom, who spent three or four nights with her,[4] but he " is thereby, in some places at least, debarred from marrying her all his lifetime, though in other respects he may be eligible. Thus, instead of giving the man a right to marry the girl, the

[1] See below, vol. iii, pp. 204, sqq.

[2] E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, p. 30; E. A. Gait, in *Census of India*, 1911, vol. i, " India," Report, p. 242; L. Moore, *Malabar Law and Custom*, p. 70; S. Mateer, " Nepotism in Travancore," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xii, p. 293.

[3] T. Herbert, *Some Yeares Travels into Divers Parts of Africa and Asia the Great*, p. 337; P. Sonnerat, *Voyage aux Indes orientales*, vol. i, p. 431; C. M. Guyon, *A New History of the East Indies*, vol. i, p. 431; J. Roggewein, in J. Harris, *Navigantium atque Itinerantium Bibliotheca*, vol. i, p. 297; J. A. de Mandelsloe, *ibid.*, p. 767; G. Balbi, *Viaggio dell'Indie orientali*, foll. 75, 137; W. Schouten, *Ost-Indische Reyse*, p. 168. Cf. L. Moore, *loc. cit.*

The services of a Brahman, though much sought, were expensive and appear to have been generally reserved for wealthy and aristocratic families. " The common people cannot have that compliment paid to them," says Alexander Hamilton, " but are forced to supply the priests' places themselves " (A. Hamilton, " A New Account of the East Indies," in Pinkerton, *Voyages and Travels*, vol. viii, p. 374). Barthema says that the privilege was entirely confined to the king, but it appears that noble families also enjoyed the same privilege (A. Hamilton, *loc. cit.*; P. W. Verhoeven, *Kurtze Beschreibung einer Reyse, so von den Holländern und Seeländern, in die Ost Indien*, p. 56).

Among the Nattukottai Chetti the ' tali ' is tied by an old man who must be the father of many children (E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, p. 99); among the Illuvas it is tied by the bridegroom's sister (*ibid.*, p. 78); among the Konga Vellalas of the Salem district it is tied by a barber (*ibid.*, p. 71); in other instances it is tied by the girl's mother (*ibid.*, p. 123), or by any old woman that may be present (*ibid.*, p. 29).

[4] " Sommario di tutti li regni, città e popoli orientali," in G. B. Ramusio, *Navigationi et Viaggi*, vol. i, fol. 331; D. Barbosa, *ibid.*, vol. i, fol. 342; F. Buchanan, " A Journey from Madras through the Countries of Mysore, Canara, and Malabar," in Pinkerton, *Voyages and Travels*, vol. viii, p. 737; K. Graul. *Reise nach Ostindien*, vol. iii, p. 337.

ceremony destroys even what right he previously possessed." [1] The ceremonial preliminary defloration might, however, be performed by another person, such as a stranger.[2] The 'tali' puberty rite is often performed as a mock-marriage in which the bridegroom is represented by a sword, or a clay doll.[3] Such puberty mock-marriages are common throughout India,[4] and are, with sacred hierodules, a necessary preliminary to the exercise of their duties.[5] The 'tali' ceremony is often performed on batches of girls, including infants.[6] In one form of the usage there were as many ritual bridegrooms as marriageable girls,[7] and it is thus possible that the ceremonial marriage constituted in those instances the actual marriage of a group of girls to a group of bridegrooms.

In the struggle of the Nayars against the sort of ethical persecution to which, on account of their ancient customs, they have been subjected, they sometimes adduced the 'tali-kettu' ceremony in defending themselves against the charge of having no proper marriage; [8] but Sir T. Muttusami Ayer, the chairman of the Malabar Marriage Commission, concludes in his report that "in relation to marriage it has no significance save that no girl is at liberty to contract it before she goes through the 'tali-kettu' ceremony." [9]

The marriage customs of the Nayars have now become almost, though not entirely, obliterated in conformity with prevalent ideas

[1] T. K. Gopal Panikkar, *Malabar and its Folk*, pp. 143 sq. Cf. Buchanan, Graul, *ll. cc.*

[2] D. Barbosa, in G. B. Ramusio, *Navigationi et Viaggi*, vol. i, fol. 342; P. Alvares, *ibid.*, fol. 137; Hieronimo de Santo Stefano, in R. H. Major, *India in the Fifteenth Century*, p. 5.

[3] *Report of the Malabar Marriage Commission*, p. 19; S. Mateer, "Nepotism in Travancore," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xii, p. 293.

[4] E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, pp. 34 sqq.; R. V. Russel, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, vol. iii, p. 15. Among the Kammalans, as among the Nayars, the 'tali' ceremony, which is performed before the girl can be married, is carried out by a man engaged for the purpose, who must afterwards walk away without looking back (S. Mateer, "Nepotism in Travancore," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xii, p. 124).

[5] E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, pp. 29 sq.

[6] R. S. Mateer, "Nepotism in Travancore," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xii, p. 293; N. S. Aiyar, in *Census of India*, 1901, vol. i, "India," *Ethnographic Appendices*, pp. 136 sq.

[7] N. S. Aiyar, *loc. cit.*, p. 137.

[8] *Report of the Malabar Marriage Commission*, p. 18: "While a small minority of strict conservatives still maintain that the 'tali-kettu' is a real marriage intended to confer on the bridegroom a right to cohabit with the bride, an immense majority describe it as a fictitious marriage, the origin of which they are at a loss to explain. And another large section tender the explanation accepted by our president that in some way or other it is an essential caste observance preliminary to the formation of sexual relations." Cf. T. K. Gopal Panikkar, *Malabar and its Folk*, pp. 134 sqq.

[9] *Ibid.*, "Memorandum A," p. 4.

and modern economic conditions. In 1788 Tipu Sultan issued the following proclamation: "Since it is a practice with you for one woman to associate with ten men, and you leave your mothers and sisters unconstrained in their obscene practices, and are thence all born in adultery, and are more shameless in your connections than the beasts of the field, I hereby require you to forsake these sinful practices, and to live like the rest of mankind." [1] It would appear that it is from the date of that edict that Nayar marriage customs began to be modified and to disappear in North Malabar. Writing about ten years later Jonathan Duncan comments as follows on the account of Zeirreddin: "This description ought, I believe, to be understood of the Nayrs inhabiting the more southern parts of Malabar, from the Toorecherie or Cotta river to Cape Comorin, for to the northward of the said river the Nayr women are said to be prohibited from having more than one male connection at a time, for failure in which she is liable to chastisement without, however, incurring loss of caste unless the paramour be of a lower tribe than her own." [2] This is confirmed by the German Lutheran pastor Graul, writing in 1853: "From Nilesschuara southward a man may have several wives but the women only one husband; from Pudapattam southward a woman has many men and a man many wives." [3] Polyandry appears, indeed, to have always been more general and more extensively practised in the remoter southern districts than in the northern parts of Malabar and the neighbourhood of the court.[4]

As the original customs became broken up in northern Malabar, a tendency became established to form no more than one connection at a time, polyandrous relations becoming successive instead of simultaneous. Mr. F. W. Ellis describes the practice in the following terms: "In Malayalam, as is well-known, the vision of Plato in his ideal republic is completely realised, the woman among the Nayars not being restricted to family or number, but, after she has been consecrated by the usual rites before the nuptial fire, in which ceremony any indifferent person may officiate as the representative of her husband, being in her intercourse with the other sex only restrained by her inclinations; provided that the male with whom

[1] T. A. Kalyanakrishna Aiyar, in *Malabar Quarterly Review*, vii (1908), cited by E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, pp. 118 sq.

[2] J. Duncan, "Historical Remarks on the Coast of Malabar, with some Description of the Manners of its Inhabitants," *Asiatic Researches*, v, pp. 13 sq., n.

[3] K. Graul, *Die Reise nach Ostindien in den Jahren 1849 bis 1853*, vol. ii, p. 41.

[4] C. A. Innes and F. B. Evans, *Madras District Gazetteers, Malabar and Anjengo*, p. 100. That distribution alone excludes the apologetic hypotheses that polyandry was introduced into Malabar by the Brahmans, or that it was 'instituted' in order to keep a military class free from family ties.

she associates be of an equal or superior tribe. But it must be stated for the glory of the female character, that, notwithstanding the latitude thus given to the Nayattis, and that they are thus left to the guidance of their own fancy (which in other countries has not always been found the most efficient check on the conduct of either sex), it rarely happens that they cohabit with more than one person at the same time. Whenever the existing connection is broken, whether from incompatibility of temper, disgust, caprice, or any of the thousand vexations by which, from the frailty of nature, domestic happiness is liable to be disturbed, the woman seeks another lover, the man another mistress." [1] Among aristocratic Kovîlakam families the old usages survive at the present day in that modified form. The ladies do not marry, but form temporary liaisons with Brahman priests.[2] Among the lower castes "a poor man engaged as husband by a wealthy family," says the Rev. S. Mateer, "may be sent off at a moment's notice without wife or children." [3] He mentions the instance of a man who had been cohabiting with a woman for years, who, on calling one day, was informed by her brother that he could not be admitted as she had taken another husband.[4]

Polyandry is, according to Mr. Gopal Panikkar, observed at the present day by that caste of Nayars which exercises the profession of barbers.[5] Among the Nayars of Travancore Mr. Fawcett knew "six brothers keeping two women, four husbands to one, and two to the other." "In another case where two brothers cohabited with one woman, and one was converted to Christianity, the other brother was indignant at the Christian's refusal to live any longer in that condition." [6] In his Memorandum annexed to the 'Report of the Malabar Marriage Commission,' Sir T. Muttusami Ayer, the President of the Commission, states: "There is positive evidence to show that polyandry still lingers in the Ponnani and Valluvanal Taluks, especially on the Cochin frontier of the former Taluk. There is general reticence on the subject among the witnesses, probably because, as stated by one of them, it is considered that a candid acknowledgment of its existence is a reflection on the community to which they belong, and that it is not proper for a man of respectability to say that it prevails among his neighbours. The fact that a woman has occasionally had four or five husbands in succession is some internal evidence that polyandry has only recently gone out

[1] F. W. Ellis, *The Kural of Tiruvalluvar*, p. 176.

[2] *Report of the Malabar Marriage Commission*," Memorandum A," pp. 2 sq.

[3] S. Mateer, "Nepotism in Travancore," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xii, p. 292.

[4] Id., *Native Life in Malabar*, p. 175.

[5] T. K. Gopal Panikkar, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

[6] E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, p. 119.

of recognised practice in South Malabar. Among carpenters and blacksmiths in the Calicut, Valluvanal and Ponnani Taluks several brothers have one wife between them." [1]

It will be well to note in this connection a phenomenon which is of general application in all researches into social history. Strange as it may seem, the group-marriage of the Nayars has been strenuously denied 'in toto.' Thus a Nayar gentleman writing in a Madras journal protests as follows in baboo English: "I can most confidently assert that the above abominable custom of one woman being kept by two or three men at the same time never in ancient or modern times was once known." [2] Such repudiations are universal. The suggestion that observers, travellers and high officials of all nationalities have during four centuries described hallucinations drawn from the depth of their inner consciousness is, of course, preposterous; but it is not more preposterous than four-fifths of the contentious, controversial attempts at counter-evidence and 'explanations' which obstruct at the present day the advance of social anthropology. Such repudiations are invariable wherever

[1] *Report of the Malabar Marriage Commission*, "Memorandum A," pp. 3 sq.

[2] Kookel Keloo Nair, District Munsiff in Malabar, "Memorandum on the Syrian and Jewish Copper Plate of Malabar," *Madras Journal of Literature and Science*, N.S., vol. v (1859), p. 53. Mr. K. M. Panikkar, whose study of present-day Nayar customs constitutes an extremely valuable contribution to our knowledge, rejects the accounts of ten generations of observers concerning Nayar polyandry, though he appears to admit that fraternal polyandry was recognised (*Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlviii, p. 293). He mentions that, according to native rules, none of the travellers on whose reports our knowledge rests could have approached the house of a Nayar within sixty yards. If I understand the native custom rightly on this point, the rule did not apply to the early Portuguese settlers and travellers, who were regarded as of an even higher caste than Brahmans and shared the same privileges, as is expressly stated by Barbosa and by Sonnerat: "This privilege the Portuguese, who were esteemed as a great caste, obtained and preserved, till their drunkenness and debauchery betrayed them into a commerce with all sorts of women" (T. K. Sonnerat, *A Voyage to the East Indies*, vol. ii, p. 24). But in any case I should scarcely recommend it as the best method of enquiring into the connubial usages of a people to endeavour to peep through the key-hole.

Cf. the account of the Nayars given by Mr. N. S. Aiyar, in *Census of India*, 1901, vol. i, "India," *Ethnographic Appendices*, pp. 136 sqq. The circumstance that Nayar marriages were polyandrous is merely mentioned incidentally by the author after a detailed account of their customs, with the remark: "That fraternal polyandry once prevailed in Malabar on a noticeable scale and still prevails to a very small extent in certain parts of the country is not improbable. But to trace the custom to primitive bestiality is not only unkind in the extreme, but unscientific in the highest degree. . . . This form of marriage, says Westermarck, seems to require a certain degree of civilisation. It was probably in most cases an expression of fraternal benevolence on the part of the eldest brother."

new moral ideas and values have become adopted and old usages have been abandoned in consequence. The Parsees repudiate at the present day the well-known law of next-of-kin marriage or 'xvaetvadatha,' of Mazdanean religion,[1] an institution laid down in their Sacred Books, and the practice of which for centuries is a matter of history. Yet Parsee scholars, who write works displaying great culture and learning, "attempt the heroic, but impossible, task of denying that their predecessors meant anything of the kind." [2] The Todas indignantly repudiate the practice of female infanticide, although it is perfectly well known that they practise it at the present day. In Africa, tribes mutually accuse one another of cannibalism, while each denies the impeachment. An educated Europeanised Maori once very earnestly assured me that the impression that cannibalism was once practised in New Zealand was wholly devoid of foundation. A little consideration will show that such repudiations are, from the nature of the case, inevitable. An acquired moral idea cannot be such unless it is regarded as of absolute and universal validity; and, since to admit that it was not always so regarded would be in direct contradiction with that conception, any usage opposed to that acquired moral value which was formerly looked upon as traditionally sacred must of necessity be disowned. All peoples, whether savage or civilised, except in those rare instances where knowledge and scientific truth have themselves become ethical values, reject with moral indignation any evidence that what they consider moral laws were not at all times recognised as such by themselves and their forefathers. The fact that a practice is known to be viewed by anyone with moral reprobation is, with savages especially, sufficient to exclude any admission in regard to it, even if it be not an object of moral condemnation to themselves.

The same institutions which were general among the aboriginal races of India were, as might be expected, common to the peoples of the same race in Ceylon.

Among the Singhalese fraternal polyandry was an established institution. One of the oldest Portuguese chroniclers thus describes their usual connubial relations at the time of the Portuguese occupation: "Their marriages excite laughter. A girl makes a contract to marry a man of her own caste (for they cannot marry outside it), and if the relatives are agreeable they give a banquet and unite the betrothed couple. The next day a brother of the husband takes his place, and if there are seven brothers she is the wife of all of them,

[1] Jivanji Jamshedji Modi, *Marriage Customs of the Parsees*, Bombay, 1900.

[2] J. A. Moulton, Hastings's *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. viii, p. 243.

distributing the nights by turns without the first husband having a greater right than any of the others. She can refuse herself to none of them; whichever brother it is that contracts the marriage the woman is the wife of all; and if the youngest marries none of the other brothers has any right over her, but he can claim access to the wives of all of them whenever he likes . . . The woman who is married to a husband with a large number of brothers is considered fortunate, for all toil and cultivate for her and bring whatever they earn to the house, and she lives much honoured and well supported. And for this reason the children call all of them father." [1] "It is a whole family that marries," says Mr. Joinville, "consequently the children belong to the whole family, in the same way as lands, which are not divided. . . A man may have as many wives and concubines as he can maintain." [2] Dr. Davy, as well as other reporters, however, says that "polygyny is not so general as polyandry. In the Kandyan country, as in Tibet, a plurality of husbands is more common than of wives. One woman has frequently two husbands; and I have heard of one having as many as seven. This singular species of polygamy is not confined to any caste or rank; it is more or less general amongst high and low, the rich and the poor. The joint husbands are always brothers." [3] Polyandry was recognised by law until the year 1859; [4] but it continued to be practised much later in the interior.[5]

Evidence of Polyandry among the Ancient Semites.

Polyandrous marriage was a familiar institution among the ancient Semites. The philosophical Arab writer, Al-Biruni, in mentioning the polyandry of the Hindus and the natives of Chitral, remarks that the Arabs had exactly similar institutions, and that "several men cohabited with one wife." [6] Bukhari likewise says that among

[1] Ribiero's *History of Celao*, translated by P. E. Pieris, Colombo, 1909, pp. 143 sq.

[2] Joinville, "On the Religion and Manners of the People of Ceylon," *Asiatick Researches*, vii, pp. 427 sq.

[3] J. Davy, *Account of the Interior of Ceylon*, p. 286. Cf. R. Knox, *Ceylon*, pp. 93 sq.; H. C. Sirr, *Ceylon and the Cingalese*, vol. ii, pp. 162 sq.; A. A. Perera, *Glimpses of Singhalese Social Life*, p. 11; Ph. van Mökern, *Ostindien*, vol. ii, p. 83; J. Forbes, *Eleven Years in Ceylon*, vol. i, p. 332; J. E. Tennent, *Ceylon*, vol. ii, p. 428.

[4] J. E. Tennent, *loc. cit.*; J. Bailey, "An Account of the Wild Tribes of the Veddahs of Ceylon," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society*, N.S., ii, p. 292.

[5] E. Haeckel, *Indische Reisebriefe*, p. 240.

[6] *Alberuni's India*, ed. E. C. Sachau, vol. i, pp. 108 sq.

the Arabs in the Days of Ignorance " it was a custom for a number of men, perhaps as many as ten, to have one wife between them." [1] The usage of the Arabs was known to Strabo; " all the kindred," he says, " have their property in common, the eldest being lord; all have one wife, and the first that comes has access to her. The man who enters leaves at the door the stick which it is usual for them to carry; but she spends the night with the eldest." [2] The account has received interesting confirmation from the inscriptions of southern Arabia. It is common on those inscriptions for reference to be made to a man's 'fathers.' Those plurals were thought to be most naturally interpreted, according to existing conditions, as having reference to the person's father, grandfather, and great-grandfather. That interpretation is, however, excluded by the more particular statements of some of those inscriptions. In one dating from the first century B.C., Nash-i-karib, King of Saba and Zuraidan, calls himself the son of two kings, Hishar Jachdhub and Jazil Bajjan, and these are in turn expressly called brothers.[3] In another, a whole genealogy is given in which brothers twice appear as the common fathers of their descendants.[4]

Early Babylonian records refer in like manner to polyandrous marriage relations.[5] The important part played by the institution of levirate marriage which, in Mosaic legislation, is expressly connected with the custom of brothers living together in an undivided household, indicates the former prevalence of similar usages amongst the Hebrews.[6]

[1] Cited by J. Wellhausen, " Die Ehe bei den Arabern," *Nachrichten von der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, 1893, pp. 460 sq.

[2] Strabo, xvi. 4. 25.

[3] E. Glaser, " Polyandrie oder Gesellschaftsehen bei den alten Sabäern," *Beilage zur allgemeine Zeitung*, 6 December, 1897, p. 7.

[4] H. Winckler, " Polyandrie bei Semiten," *Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie*, 1898, p. 29; Id., *Altorientalische Forschungen*, vol. ii, pp. 81 sqq.

[5] H. Radau, *Sumerian Hymns and Prayers to God Nin-Ib*, p. 3.

[6] Cf. J. Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p. 461. The criticisms to which the above facts have been subjected have not been successful. Dr. Westermarck remarks in reference to the statement of Bukhari, that " Nöldeke observes that a Muhammadan theologian can hardly be regarded as a reliable witness as to the customs of Arabic paganism " (*op. cit.*, vol. iii, p. 154). There can be no doubt that it is owing to that circumstance that those accounts are not more numerous, for Muhammadan, like Christian, theologians would in general naturally be anxious to obliterate any evidence of former polyandry among their people.

CHAPTER XII

GROUP-MARRIAGE AND SEXUAL COMMUNISM

(continued)

Sexual Communism in Africa.

IN Africa the organisation of primitive society has undergone profound changes owing to the extensive development of private property and of consequent individualism; aristocracies, monarchies, and even large and powerful empires have come into existence. Marriage institutions have accordingly tended to assume the form of personal economic, and even purely commercial, transactions. Yet in spite of the sense of personal property in purchased wives which such an individualistic development in African society has tended in general to create, the continent presents typical examples of the collective conception of sexual relations, and of the common right of the members of the primitive group, or clan, to the women who might be wives to any of the members of the group.

Among the Banyoro, or Bakitara—an important nation of pastoral tribes in the Uganda Protectorate—"the relationship between members of the same clan was of such a character that any man's wife was common to him and the other members of his clan. It was perfectly legitimate for a man to have relations with the wives of the men he called brothers, that is, his clan-fellows, and such action was not looked upon as adultery. A man might use his influence with his wife to make her refrain from such action, and might be annoyed if she admitted to her bed a member of the clan with whom he was not on good terms, but he could not accuse her of unfaithfulness for so doing. Adultery lay in admitting to her bed a man of some other clan than her husband's. . . . Every man in a clan had the right to use the wife of any of his clan-brothers, and this was so completely taken for granted that the matter was seldom mentioned. No husband would think of making any complaint on the subject, and no one would think of blaming the woman for allowing her husband's clan-brother to share her bed any more than for allowing her husband to do so. No judge would

condemn such a woman for adultery, for the act was perfectly legal. The woman was, however, restricted to men of her husband's clan." [1] Similar usages obtain among the Banyankole or Bahima; but the restriction to clan-brothers of the husband is not insisted on among them, so that a wife is free to admit any man she pleases, and the husband enjoys a like liberty as regards any other woman.[2] So likewise among the Bakunta on the shores of Lake Edward, a woman after marriage was expected to admit any of her husband's friends to her favours.[3] Again, among the Akamba, a Bantu tribe inhabiting the highlands of East Africa between the upper course of the Tana river and the line of the Uganda railway, a married woman is placed by her husband at the disposal of all the members of his own clan. It is a source of pride to a rich man who possesses many wives, to be able to entertain in this way a numerous crowd of guests from his clan, each guest being accommodated with a separate hut and a wife.[4] Such hospitality is, however, limited to members of the same clan. Sometimes a very intimate friend belonging to another clan will be honoured in the same manner; "but it is a rare occurrence." [5] Half-brothers, the sons of the several wives of a polygamous family, have a recognised right of habitual access to the wives of their half-brothers of a corresponding age.[6]

Farther south, among the Masai and other kindred tribes, the right of access to one another's wives among members of the same marriage class is recognised and observed. Those classes are, however, not constituted by the clans, but by 'age-groups' consisting of the men who have passed through the puberty ceremonies at the same time. Among the Masai, individual marriage does not take place until comparatively late in life, after a man has retired from military service. While they still belong to the class of warriors, the younger men live in separate kraals, and together with them the unmarried girls and women of corresponding ages; sexual relations are unrestricted. Those communal practices do not, however, terminate with the period of military service. When individual marriage takes place after that period, a man's companions of the same age-grade claim

[1] J. Roscoe, *The Bakitara, or Banyoro* (*The First Part of the Report of the Mackie Ethnological Expedition to Central Africa*), pp. 239, 265.

[2] Id., *The Banyankole* (*The Second Part of the Report of the Mackie Ethnological Expedition to Central Africa*), p. 129.

[3] Id., *The Bagesu, and other Tribes of the Uganda Protectorate* (*The Third Part of the Report of the Mackie Ethnological Expedition to Central Africa*), p. 160.

[4] G. Lindblom, *The Akamba in British East Africa*, pp. 81 sq.

[5] C. W. Hobley, *Ethnology of the A-Kamba and other East African Tribes*, p. 64.

[6] G. Lindblom, *loc. cit.*

priority of intercourse with the bride, a claim which the bridegroom would be dishonoured by refusing. After marriage temporary exchange of wives is usual between members of the same age-grade, and they have the right to claim the fullest sexual hospitality from one another. A man may at any time claim the right from an age-grade brother by thrusting his spear in the ground before his hut. Shame and disgrace would fall upon the man who should refuse access to his wife in those circumstances.[1] Exactly similar customs obtain among the Nandi. A married man calling upon a member of the same age-grade has the wife of the latter placed at his disposal. The claim, however, does not hold if the visitor is unmarried. No punishment exists for 'adultery' by a member of the same age-grade as the husband.[2] So again among the Wataweta, "adultery is only punishable when the man who commits it is not of the same 'age' as the husband of the woman. If a man were to rape the wife of a comrade of his own 'age' he could at most be fined a goat for assault."[3] In the Chaga States, about Kilimanjaro, at Moschi and elsewhere, polyandry is practised, the husbands being always brothers.[4] It is of interest to note that almost in the same district, in different sections of the population, there exist two forms of polyandry: at Taveta, a man lends his wives to a comrade of the same 'age'; at Moschi, a man's brothers only have an equal right to his women.[5] Thus marriage-class sexual communism and fraternal polyandry appear to merge into one another as local variations of the same usages. Exchange of wives between 'age-grade' brothers also takes place among the Wandorobbo.[6]

Among the Angas of northern Nigeria it is considered nothing unusual for a woman to have several husbands.[7] Among the Ekiti, a tribe speaking a Yoruba dialect, "within the compound all the women are common to all the men, except to their sons."[8] Among the M'bre, on the shores of lake Chad, all the brothers in a family have equal rights of access to one another's wives. They are polygamous, and may have as many as ten wives, whom

[1] A. C. Hollis, *The Masai*, pp. 261 sqq.; M. Merker, *Die Masai*, pp. 49 sqq., 70, 222, 231; M. Weiss, *Die Völkerstämme im Norden Deutsch-Ost-Afrikas*, p. 386.

[2] A. C. Hollis, *The Nandi*, pp. 76 sq.

[3] Id., "Notes on the History and Customs of the People of Taveta, East Africa," *Journal of the African Society*, i, p. 124.

[4] C. W. Hobley, *Ethnology of the A-Kamba and other East African Tribes*, p. 65.

[5] A. C. Hollis, *loc. cit.*

[6] M. Merker, *Die Masai*, p. 232.

[7] O. Temple, *Notes on the Tribes, Provinces, Emirates and States of the Northern Provinces of Nigeria*, p. 15.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 103.

they obtain from other tribes. The father possesses his own wives; but each of the brothers acquires wives, and these are common to all the brothers.[1] A similar arrangement obtains among the tribes of the Bauchi plateau in West Africa: when one brother of a family acquires a wife or wives, these are added to the common stock and are shared indifferently by all the brothers of the family.[2] Similarly, in the Upper Congo, among the Bambala, "there is no doubt that in a family there is great freedom of access to the women belonging to the members of the family by the men of the family."[3] Among the Mosobanza of the same region, in the families of chiefs at least, the men not only have marital rights over the wives of their brothers, but also over the sisters of their wives, and likewise of their brothers' wives.[4]

The Herero, the great western branch of the southern Bantu, have an elaborate institution of sexual communism which presents certain features of particular interest. They are known to have, like other Bantus of South Africa, migrated to their present abode from the north, and the time at which that migration took place is variously estimated at from one hundred to three hundred years ago.[5] Owing to the secluded nature of their somewhat barren country, they are noted as having preserved in their manners and customs a more primitive character than the majority of Bantu people. They are divided into well-defined totemic clans, some of which are strictly matriarchal in their rules of kinship and descent, the children belonging to the clan of the mother, while in others the paternal rules of descent are observed; they thus appear to be in a state of transition from a matriarchal to a patriarchal type of social organisation.[6] The clans appear to be exogamic,[7] and the rule of cross-cousin marriage is strictly observed, while at the same time the marriage of ortho-cousins is regarded with horror as a form of incest.[8] Sororal polygyny and likewise the levirate are

[1] F. Delisle, in *L'Anthropologie*, xiv, p. 229, reviewing, J. Truffert, "Le Massif des M'Brés," *Revue générale des Sciences*, 1902.

[2] A. Lethbridge, *West Africa the Elusive*, p. 190.

[3] J. H. Weeks, "Anthropological Notes on the Bangala of the Upper Congo River," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxix, pp. 442 sq.

[4] H. H. Johnston, *George Grenfell and the Congo*, vol. ii, p. 674.

[5] J. Irle, *Die Herero*, pp. 49 sqq., 53 sqq.; J. G. Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, vol. ii, p. 354 n.

[6] J. G. Frazer, *op. cit.*, pp. 354 sqq., and the authorities there cited.

[7] That at least seems to be the rule with the maternal clans (E. Dannert, "Soziale Verhältnisse der Ovaherero," *Mitteilungen der geographischen Gesellschaft (für Thuringen) zu Jena*, vi, p. 117). The clans with paternal descent, on the other hand, are careless in the observance of the rule (J. Kohler, "Das Rec[illegible] Herero," *Zeitschrift ür vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*, xiv, pp. 300 s[illegible]ing to Bensen and Meyer. The accuracy of the latter report is, h[illegible]btful. See J. G. Frazer, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 364).

[8] E. Dannert [illegible] *te der Herero*, pp. 38, 39 sqq.

customary.[1] Speaking of the Ovaherero in particular, Dr. Hahn says that every man and every woman stands towards certain other men and women in a particular relation called 'upanga,' a word originally meaning 'friend' or 'companion.'[2] Every man can claim at any time access to the wives of his 'upanga'; and, similarly, every woman has the right to have sexual relations with the husbands or the lovers of her female 'upanga.' Dr. Hahn adds that those customs are the same "in all the neighbouring tribes."[3] This is confirmed by all other writers on these people, though there are some slight differences in the various accounts.[4] The relation of 'upanga' involves other claims besides those sexual ones; according to some accounts a man has rights over the cattle of his 'upanga.'[5] This is denied by Dr. Dannert, but he states that nevertheless it is an understood thing that no favours can be refused to a 'upanga' if a request for such is made.[6] In addition 'upanga' men and women are bound to stand by one another in all things.[7] The relation would thus appear to resemble an extensive system of artificial 'blood-brotherhood.' According to some authorities the 'upanga' who have access to one another's wives are brothers.[8] But Dr. Dannert states that this is not so, and adds that, far from 'upangas' being brothers, there exists a definite prohibition strictly forbidding not

[1] P. H. Brincker, *Wörterbuch und kurzgefasste Grammatik des Otji-Herero*, p. 227.

[2] J. Hahn, "Die Ovaherero," *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin*, iv, pp. 489 sq.

[3] P. H. Brincker, "Character, Sitten und Gebräuche speciell der Bantu Deutsch-Südwestafrikas," *Mitteilungen des Seminars für orientalische Sprachen zu Berlin*, iii, Part iii, p. 86; Id., *op. cit.*, p. 227; J. Kohler, *op. cit.* p. 298 sqq.; H. von François, *Nama und Damara, Deutsch-Süd-west-Afrika*, pp. 198 sq.; E. Dannert, *op. cit.*, pp. 39 sqq.; H. Schinz, *Deutsch-Süd-West-Afrika*, p. 173; G. Fritsch, *Die Eingeborenen Süd-Afrika's*, p. 227. A dissentient testimony is supplied by Pastor Viehe, who will not hear of group-marriage at any price. Group-marriage, he says, does not exist among the Herero because "no instance is known to me of several men and several women living together in the same house in group-marriage" (G. Viehe, "Die Ovaherero," in S. R. Steimetz, *Rechtsverhältnisse von eingeborenen Volkern in Afrika und Ozeanien*, p. 307). The testimony is received with applause by Dr. Steinmetz and Dr. Westermarck. By parity of reasoning we should, of course, have to deny the existence not only of group-marriage, but also of individual marriage, among a considerable number of people.

[4] C. G. Büttner, "Sozialpolitisches aus dem Leben der Herero," *Das Ausland*, lv, pp. 828 sq.

[5] P. H. Brincker, *op. cit.*, p. 86; Bensen, cited by J. Kohler, *op. cit.*, p. 298.

[6] E. Dannert, *op. cit.*, p. 41. Brincker, in another place (*Wörterbuch und kurzgefasste Grammatik des Otji-Herero*, p. 227), makes the same statement, in contradiction, with that above cited.

[7] H. von François, *Nama und Damar... 'sch-Süd-west-Afrika*, pp. 198 sq.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 199; H. Schinz, *Deutsch-Süd-West-Afrika*, p. 173.

only brothers, but all persons closely related by blood, from entering into the relation of ' upanga ' with one another. That rule does not, however, apply to the women, who may be sisters.[1] Statements to the effect that the members in a communal sexual group are not brothers are, as already noted, often incorrect, at least so far as regards the original character of the institution; but there appears no sufficient reason to doubt the accuracy of the express statement of Dr. Dannert in this instance, and the contrary statements of other writers are, perhaps, not wholly irreconcilable with it. If the above facts are correct, the system of sexual communism of the Herero presents a remarkable anomaly. The vast majority of instances of group-marriage or of polyandry are, we have seen, fraternal, the members being actual or tribal brothers; and those instances where strangers are admitted to such groups, or where they are at the present day entirely constituted of unrelated members, are clearly traceable to a process of decay or of adaptation of an organisation in which the sexual partners were brothers, actual or tribal. Such an eventuality might easily have come about among the Herero in relation to the development of private property. The Herero are at the present day great pastoralists, and their cattle constitute their whole wealth and the hinge upon which their economic life revolves, a man's herd being to him the most precious thing in this world. Primitive communism as regards sex relations carries with it communism in regard to property. In a group-marriage between clans, the cattle would be the common property of the members. Such communism always tends to be done away with where property becomes of great value, and the development of pastoral property among a people who, no doubt, were previously hunters would inevitably lead to a corresponding development of individualistic motives, and a desire for exclusive control by a man of his own favourite herd. The essential step in abolishing the primitive economic clan-communism and establishing rights of private ownership would be to abolish the marriage-communism which stamped its communal character upon the group. But the sexual communism itself, independently of its economic implications, may have been regarded as too essential and old-established an institution to be entirely done away with, there being no special reasons for such a change in sexual freedom. That sexual communism would therefore be simply modified in character, and be entered into by a special pact with non-relatives instead of automatically between clan-relatives. The prohibition regarding relatives applies to the men, but not to the women, who, among the Bantus, are never owners of cattle; it therefore has no reference to the mere fact of relationship as such, but to its economic consequences.

[1] E. Dannert, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

In every part of Madagascar sexual relations between a man and the sisters and female cousins of his wife, and with the wives of his brothers and cousins, or of a woman with the brothers and cousins of her husband, or of his sisters or of his female cousins, are authorised. None of those relations can ground an action for adultery, or justify, according to native law, any act of vengeance. If the brother of her husband calls at his house while he is away, a woman is bound to entertain him and to regard him as her husband; she places round his neck an ornament which is the symbol of the relation, and bids him take charge of the house. Should the husband return while his brother is in the house, the former seeks a night's lodging with some friend. But, although younger brothers have recognised access to the wives of their elder brothers, the latter are not supposed to have a right to the wives of their younger brothers. Owing to the wide interpretation of kinship, all the men living in one village have practically access to all the women, except those within the prohibited degrees, the only relations which constitute an offence are those between a married woman and a slave, or a stranger who is not the guest of her husband.[2]

Sexual Communism in New Guinea and Oceania.

In northern Papua, among the Kai, sexual relations with the wife of a fellow-tribesman are, as with most uncultured peoples, not accounted adultery, and are in no way resented.[3] Like the Masai and other African tribes, the Southern Massims of British New Guinea are divided into age-grades, all males and all females of approximately the same age being classified as belonging to the same class, the members of which are called 'kimta.' All the 'kimtas' residing in one village or district are 'eriam,' regard themselves as bound by ties of close fellowship, and whatever personal property they possess is available to all. "Each male of the fellowship has marital rights over the wives of his fellow 'eriam,' of which he does not hesitate to avail himself." The relationship is quite open—the absence or the special consent of the individual 'husband' is not necessary; when one 'eriam' desires the company of a fellow 'eriam's' wife he informs her of the fact, and they meet in the bush, the 'husband' being duly informed. As among the Chukchi, the children of an 'eriam' brotherhood are not allowed to marry, for, as they say, "our father is one, our mother is one."[4]

[1] A. and G. Grandidier, *Histoire physique, naturelle et politique de Madagascar*, vol. iv (*Ethnographie*), Part ii, pp. 154 sq.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 155, 218. Cf. J. Sibree, *The Great African Island*, p. 253.

[3] C. Keysser, "Aus dem Leben der Kai Leute," in R. Neuhauss, *Deutsch Neu-Guinea*, vol. iii, p. 87.

[4] C. Seligman, *The Melanesians of British New Guinea*, pp. 470 sqq.

Similar institutions flourished in Polynesia. In Tahiti and the Friendly Islands, the aristocratic classes were united as members of a consecrated brotherhood, known as the 'areoi.' This was of the nature of what is somewhat inaptly termed a 'secret society,' and generally represents a survival of the tribal organisation.[1] Any 'areoi' was entertained by his fellow-members "with the most boundless hospitality"; [2] but relations between the wife of an 'areoi' and a non-member were accounted adulterous.[3] In addition to those fraternal rights of sexual communism frequent periodical gatherings took place amid much feasting and pomp, lasting several days, during which unrestricted promiscuous intercourse took place, all women being in common to all the men, and no woman being permitted to abide with the same man for more than three nights. The offspring resulting from those festive gatherings is said to have been disposed of by infanticide, but this was not obligatory if the child was, as is usual in Polynesia, adopted by other parents.[4]

The south-easternmost or Marquesan group of islands escaped for a long time from the civilising influences which have obliterated the records of Polynesian social history; so that it was possible for Dr. L. Tautain, who was for several years the French 'administrateur' of the group and devoted himself to the study of native customs, to investigate these scientifically. In those islands, not only was the general rule observed, as everywhere in Polynesia, that when a man married he acquired marital rights over all the sisters of his wife, that right being exercised whether the sisters were married or not to other men, but the complementary rule of fraternal polyandry also obtained. All brothers of the husband had the right of access to his wives. That the fraternal sororal polygamy

[1] W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, vol. i, pp. 229 sqq.; D. de Rienzi, *Océanie*, vol. ii, pp. 320 sq.; G. Forster, *A Voyage Round the World*, vol. ii, pp. 316 sqq.; J. R. Forster, *Observations made during a Voyage round the World*, pp. 410 sq. Cf. below, vol. ii, pp. 719 sq. The accounts vary in many details; that of Ellis, which he derived from the king of Huahine, appears, on the whole, the most reliable. That of Dr. J. R. Forster is couched in the best eighteenth-century style. The following sentence may serve as a specimen: "But as this custom (of sexual communism) was contrary to the spirit of the original institution of Arreeoys (whom he conceives to have been originally an order of religious ascetics vowed to celibacy), the sages of the nation made another law, according to which all infants, the offspring of the connection of Arreeoys with women, should instantly be killed after their birth, because the increase of the Arees was thought detrimental to the State" (J. R. Forster, *op. cit.*, p. 413). The Forsters supposed the 'areois' to be unmarried, although they themselves mention some who were married; but the Rev. W. Ellis, who had better information, states that they all were.

[2] J. R. Forster, *op. cit.*, p. 412.

[3] W. Ellis, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 239.

[4] D. de Rienzi, *Océanie*, vol. ii, p. 320.

of the Marquesans was derived from an originally wider form of tribal sexual communism is indicated by the fact that it was obligatory for the bride to be placed at the disposal of all the tribal brothers of the husband before marriage.[1]

Similar customs are found at the other extremity of the area inhabited by the Polynesian race. Hawaii was, there is reason to believe, the first Polynesian settlement in the Pacific, and the centre of dispersion of the race to the islands lying farther south. The reports of the earliest missionaries, making due allowance for the emotions of the scandalised reporters, indicate pretty clearly the character of the sexual organisation which was in force. The Rev. H. Bingham, one of the earliest, states that he found there " polygamy implying plurality of husbands and wives." [2] Dr. Bartlett likewise affirms that " the natives had hardly more modesty or shame than so many animals. Husbands had many wives, and wives many husbands, and exchanged with each other at pleasure." [3] " There existed among the Hawaiians," wrote Dr. Rivers, " a definite system of cicisbeism in which the paramours had a recognised status. Of these paramours those who would seem to have had the most definite status were certain relatives, viz., the brothers of the husband and the sisters of the wife. These formed a group within which all the males had marital rights over the females ; and I was told that even now, nearly a century after the general acceptance of Christianity, these rights of ' punalua ' are still sometimes recognised, and give rise to cases which come before the law courts, where they are treated as cases of adultery. In addition to these ' punalua ' who had a recognised status owing to their relationship to the married couple, there were often other paramours apparently chosen freely at the will of husband or wife." [4] It would thus appear that the " system of cicisbeism " of the Hawaiians was a fraternal sororal group-marriage identical with that found at the opposite extremity of the Polynesian region.

Although the same institutions are not definitely reported from the intermediate parts of Polynesia there are indications that, as we might expect, they were not local peculiarities of the Hawaiian and Marquesan groups. " The relationship of ' punalua,' " says Judge Louis Andrew of Honolulu, " is rather amphibious. It arose from the fact that two or more brothers with their wives, or two or more sisters with their husbands, were inclined to possess one

[1] L. Tautain, " Étude sur le mariage chez les Polynésiens (Mao'i) des îles Marquises," *L'Anthropologie*, vi, p. 644.

[2] H. Bingham, *A Residence of Twenty-one Years in the Sandwich Islands*, p. 21.

[3] Bartlett, *Historical Sketch of the Mission to the Sandwich Islands*, cited by L. H. Morgan, *Ancient Society*, p. 415.

[4] W. H. R. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society*, vol. i, pp. 386 sq.

another in common; but the modern use of the word is that of 'dear friend' or 'intimate companion.'"[1] But the term 'punalua' is not peculiar to Hawaii; it is in general use throughout Polynesia, and means precisely "a multiplicity of spouses," "the several husbands of one wife, or several wives of one husband." It is used in that sense in Tahiti no less than in Hawaii.[2] In New Zealand the term was applied to all the suitors who might lay claim to a woman, that is to her 'potential' or 'facultative' husbands, and also to the several actual wives of one husband.[3] Although no longer an established institution, polyandry was not regarded as an abnormality in New Zealand. If a dispute arose between a woman's husband and her lover, the matter was sometimes amicably settled, at the suggestion of relatives, by agreeing that the lover should join the family as co-husband of the woman.[4] Fraternal polyandry, which had fallen into disuse in New Zealand, is referred to in Maori myths.[5] Polyandry was usual among the natives of Easter Island.[6]

Very much the same customs as in Polynesia obtained throughout the islands of the Micronesian region. Polyandry among the upper classes has been reported as common in the Gilbert Islands,[7] in Nauru,[8] and in the islands of the Marshall group.[9] But pre-nuptial and informal relations played as considerable a part with the Micronesians as formal marriage associations, which were generally entered into rather late in life and from motives of economic alliance. The same sexual communism was usual as regards the former as in the latter. In the Mariannes or Ladrones Islands, as in other parts of

[1] L. H. Morgan, *Ancient History*, p. 427.

[2] E. Tregear, *Maori-Polynesian Comparative Dictionary*, p. 373. Polyandry was usual in Tahiti among the women of higher rank (W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, vol. i, p. 274).

[3] The Rev. R. Taylor appears to have supposed that the word 'punarua' meant the contest which sometimes took place among a woman's suitors (R. Taylor, *Te Ika a Maui*, p. 166); whereas it means the suitors themselves.

[4] E. Best, "Maori Marriage Customs," *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute*, xxxvi, p. 28.

[5] G. Grey, *Polynesian Mythology*, p. 49. Cf. E. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, p. 298.

[6] J. R. Forster, *Observations made during a Voyage round the World*, pp. 428, 430 sq.

[7] A. Grimble, "From Birth to Death in the Gilbert Islands," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, li, p. 33.

[8] A. Senfft, "Die Insel Nauru," *Mitteilungen aus den Deutschen Schutzgebieten*, ix, p. 106; A. Brandeis, "Ethnographische Beobachtungen über die Nauru-insularen, *Globus*, xci, pp. 76 sq.

[9] A. Senfft, "Die Marshall-Insulaner," in S. R. Steinmetz, *Rechtsverhältnisse von eingeborenen Völkern in Afrika und Ozeanien*, p. 433; J. Kohler, "Das Recht der Marshallinsulaner," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*, xiv, p. 416.

Micronesia, the unmarried men lived in common 'bachelors' houses,' in the company of the unmarried girls, and as many as ten or twelve might be found cohabiting with one young woman.[1]

Collective Marriage in Australia.

The various collective sexual organisations which we have considered, in which a group of men have marital rights over a woman or group of women, differ in several respects in their constitution. Most commonly the group of husbands is one of actual or half-brothers, or may include other near relatives, such as cousins; and those fraternal groups present again several varieties according as all brothers are regarded as equal or as the eldest brother is accounted the representative of the indivisible fraternal family. Or the marital group may consist of a limited number of members of a clan, as in the original organisation of the Nayars; or again the recognised marital rights may extend to all clan-members, or to all the members of a given marriage-class or 'age-class.' The two main types, the fraternal and the clan or marriage-class group, are found to co-exist side by side in the same locality and among peoples of the same race and in closely related tribes, as in Malabar or in East Africa. We have further noted in collective organisations of the purely fraternal type indications that they were formerly associated with an organisation into clans or marriage-classes, and in all probability derived from the wider form of collective sexual communism. If, as we were led to conclude, the earliest regulation or organisation of sexual relations, apart from, but a direct consequence of, the rule of exogamy or incest prohibition, was an understanding between two primitive groups or clans, and had no reference to individual marriage, collective sexual communism between clan-brothers, or the right of access of all members of one marriage-group to all those of the opposite sex in the intermarried group, would constitute the most primitive form of marriage as a regulated social institution.

Mr. Northcote Thomas prefaces his study of Australian kinship and marriage organisations with the remark that "it is becoming an axiom in anthropology that what is needed is not discursive treatment of large subjects, but the minute discussion of special themes, not a ranging at large over the peoples of the earth past and present, but a detailed examination of limited areas."[2] The

[1] C. Le Gobien, *Histoire des Isles Marianes*, pp. 61 sq., 103, 225. The Rev. W. Ellis and M. D. de Rienzi both thought that the institution of the 'bachelors' houses' in the Marianne Islands was similar to that of the 'aeroi' of Tahiti (W. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, vol. i, p. 230; D. de Rienzi, *Océanie*, vol. i, p. 394).

[2] Northcote W. Thomas, *Kinship Organisation and Group Marriage in Australia*, p. 3.

'axiom'—more properly speaking, the rule of method—is in its way a sound one, and one which it is well to emphasise in view of the superficial methods which have long been current with many writers. But, on the other hand, the now fashionable method of basing general theories and universal conclusions on monographic studies has also its drawbacks and dangers. All anthropological sciences rest, after all, on the comparative method, and are possible only by its use. It is by such wide surveys that those ideas, customs, institutions, which were wont to be thought 'singular,' 'strange,' 'unique,' are seen to be in their essence universal and to reveal the history of the human mind and of human society. To discard, even in part, that fundamental method in the study of the institutions and customs of a particular people is to open the way for the old pre-scientific sources of misconception, and is, in any case, to run the risk of forming distorted conceptions and conclusions drawn from a particular phase of society torn from its context in human evolution.

Those considerations apply with particular force to the Australian tribes, and, if they be borne in mind, an attempt to form a concise estimate of the bearing of their marriage organisations on the general development of those institutions will be considerably facilitated and simplified. Primitive clan-organisation has remained with them substantially unchanged. Yet their present condition is separated from their original state by as wide a gulf of centuries as is that of Europeans. It cannot be supposed that, although their material culture has not advanced during that period, nor led to those social changes which generally follow upon such advance, their social organisation has remained altogether unchanged. We have, on the contrary, definite evidence that it has undergone very important changes. The race with whom, owing to exceptional conditions of agelong isolation, primitive clan-organisation has survived in its most typical form, is at the same time, as we have noted, of all existing races in the lowest stages of culture that where male domination has become most despotically established. Nowhere is the desire of the men to secure the advantages and conveniences arising from exclusive claim to the services and labour of the women enforced in a more unchecked manner. That individual association and control is thus most absolute in the very society where we should expect to find primitive sexual organisation in its most unmodified form. Australian aboriginal society is, in fact, more patriarchal in character than many that are in a far higher stage of cultural and social development, and it is only owing to its low culture and isolation that the patriarchal social system and the patriarchal family have not entirely supplanted amongst them the primitive organisation of maternal clans.

No uniform development of one definite principle of social

constitution has taken place in Australia; the matriarchal clan has never there had the opportunity of reaching those higher stages of defined and consolidated organisation which we have found in the Pueblos of America, in the motherhoods of Assam, or the 'târwads' of Malabar. Instead of such a uniform and consistent development, Australian society, in the course of the tens of thousands of years during which it has existed in isolation and without cultural advance, has been called upon to adopt several quite different principles of organisation which have become variously combined and mutually modified. Those principles of organisation are essentially three in number. First there exist totem-groups consisting of persons having the same animal or plant for their totem, or mark of kinship; secondly, there are territorial classifications consisting of individuals residing in the same camping-ground as members of one community; thirdly, there are marriage classes deliberately and consciously devised for the regulation of intermarriage. Each of those modes of tribal classification is subject to modifications and adaptations; thus, while in one tribe the totem is transmitted through the mother, in another the transmission is transferred to the father, in others again an arbitrary decision of the mother or of the community decides to which totem a particular child shall belong. Again, change of residence may transfer a particular individual from one territorial group to another. The marriage classes themselves are subject to continual tampering and modification; thus, among the Dieri, when no woman is available for a man in the marriage-class from which he must draw his wife, the matter is remedied by deliberately altering the relationship of some women so that, instead of 'husband's sisters,' they become 'daughters of mother's brother.'[1] The obvious question occurs constantly to anyone endeavouring to thread his way through those superimposed complexities, how it is that savages so low in culture as the Australians, who are scarcely able to reckon above two figures, can bear in mind their own intricate organisation so as to observe its rules. The answer is that few of them do so as a whole. The old people, especially the women, devote a great deal of thought to the subject, and, in their superstitious anxiety to obey tribal law, they "carefully kept in memory all the marriages, descents, and resultant relationships which were specially considered at such times as the jeraeil ceremonies,"[2] and their authority depended to a large extent on their ability to interpret the tribal law in such matters. But the individual knows, as a rule, only those aspects of it which immediately concern him, and which are drilled into him by constant reference to them; "a man knows with which his

[1] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 190; cf., p. 178.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 271.

totem marries, and he knows those of his kindred of either side, but less of more distant persons," and " there is always a difficulty in working out the totemic marriages unless there are persons present, especially old men and old women, of the different sub-classes and totems." [1]

The great complexity of Australian tribal organisations is not a manifestation of extraordinary ingenuity, but, on the contrary, of the low cultural grade and abnormal development of Australian society. That complexity of organisation means a corresponding complexity in the rules that regulate sexual relations; for the chief, and indeed the sole, object of those organisations is to regulate sexual relations. Nothing, obviously, could be more inappropriate than to speak of ' promiscuity ' with reference to people with whom the regulation of sexual relations is an object of so much attention; in Australia those relations are hedged in with a network of rules incomparably more complex than any to be found in any system of morality in civilised society. Those rules, since their chief purpose is to regulate the relations between the sexes, may properly be said to be concerned with sexual morality; but in a sense which is very different from that which the term connotes amongst ourselves. The object of the regulation of sexual relations is with the Australian aborigines totally different from that of moral rules in civilised communities. With us sexual morality is mainly directed towards safeguarding the claims of individual marriage, both in regard to the retrospective demand for pre-nuptial purity and to connubial fidelity and the prevention of adultery. The Australian tribal laws are not concerned with those objects, but with an entirely different aspect of sexual morality, namely, the prevention of incest, which with us, owing to the range of what we regard as incestuous relations and the danger of their occurrence being so limited, is not a matter of very serious concern. With the Australian aborigines the ' prohibited degrees,' instead of comprising as with us only a few near relations, extend so as to include a large proportion of the persons of the opposite sex, and the sole object of those elaborate rules which constitute the Australian regulation of sex relations is to avoid the risk of a person marrying within those extended ' prohibited degrees,' or, as an Australian black would put it, of ' mixing the same blood.' To do so would be attended with the direst consequences, not only for the guilty persons, but for the whole tribe, and it is a haunting, obsessing, superstitious dread of those awful consequences, and not the safeguarding of the sanctity of individual marriage, which constitutes the ruling motive of all sexual regulations, and therefore of all tribal organisation, among the Australian aborigines. " No one

[1] A. W. Howitt, *op. cit.* p. 210.

should marry so as to mix blood" [1] is the alpha and omega of what amongst them corresponds to sexual morality. "So repugnant is this subject to the Dieri that they will become indignant if it is introduced and they are asked about it. The elders of the tribe, the old men and old women, in their leisure hours lecture the young people on the laws of the tribe, impress on them modesty and propriety of conduct, and point out the heinousness of incest." [2] The penalty for a breach of that primal law is usually death for both the man and the woman.[3] Not the utmost lawlessness among the blacks dare go so far as to set aside those rules. Even in cases of forcible violence and rape, a not uncommon occurrence, the victim is first asked to what class she belongs.[4] Among the tribes of South Queensland, when a corroboree disperses at dark, women are sometimes pounced upon, but the assailant of a woman "asks when he has seized her of what class she is, and, if not suitable, immediately lets her go." [5] "If a man takes in war from another tribe a woman whom he cannot legally marry and uses her as his mistress, the tribe will kill them both." [6] No man is ever permitted to touch a captured woman who does not belong to the class with which it is licit for a member of his class to have sexual relations. The superstitious dread of sexual relations within the far-stretching bounds of 'forbidden degrees,' which makes it unlawful for a Chinaman to marry a woman of the same name from the remotest part of the Empire, overrides all other considerations and determines all the precautionary regulations of Australian tribal organisation. Some natives will undertake long journeys from the interior to the coast in search of a wife, from the fear of unwittingly 'mixing blood.' [7] The whole tangle of tribal organisation has for its object security against that awful risk, and it has been further complicated again and again with a view to insuring more effectively against it.

[1] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 262.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 186.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 194, 196, 208; Id., "Australian Group Relations," *Smithsonian Report*, 1883, p. 804; G. Taplin, *The Folklore, Manners, Customs and Languages of the South Australian Aborigines*, p. 90; F. J. Gillen, "The Natives of Central Australia," *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society of Australasia: South Australian Branch*, iv, p. 26; G. Grey, *Journals of Two Expeditions of Discovery in North-West and Western Australia*, vol. ii, p. 808; W. E. Roth, "North Queensland Ethnography, Bulletin No. 10," *Records of the Australian Museum*, vii, p. 2; R. H. Mathews, "Australian Tribes, their Formation and Government," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xxxviii, p. 945.

[4] L. Fison and A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, p. 66; J. Mathew, "The Australian Aborigines," *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales*, xxiii, p. 403.

[5] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 234.

[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 344 sqq., 195, 220, 233 sqq.

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 249 sq., 262.

Tribal distinctions and badges are regarded by the Australians, as they are by the North American Indians, as having reference mainly to the distinction between those who may and those who may not have sexual relations. "Muramura," according to a legend of the Dieri, "ordered that the tribe should be divided into branches, and distinguished one from another by different names, after objects animate and inanimate, such as dogs, mice, emu, rain, iguana, and so forth, the members of any such branch not to intermarry, but with permission for one branch to mingle with another." [1]

The purpose and foundation of sexual regulations and sexual morality are thus radically different among the Australian aborigines from what they are amongst ourselves. Sexual relations in native Australian society are not regulated by the rules and claims which have reference to individual marriage, but by rules and laws which have reference to marriage groups or classes. The breach of those rules does not constitute the offence of adultery or of fornication, but the crime of incest.

Individual marriage, that is, the habitual cohabitation of individuals of different sexes and their association for economic purposes, is found at the present day amongst all Australian tribes. That association owes its existence to economic necessity and is so regarded by the aborigines. "When asked why they are anxious to obtain wives, their usual reply is, that they may get wood, water and food for them, and carry whatever property they possess." [2] As a very general rule that individual economic association is entered into, according to primitive standards of sexual development, very late in life. In some tribes a man is absolutely forbidden, even under pain of death, to marry before he is thirty, and in many tribes it is "rare to find a married man under thirty or forty years of age." [3] It is a commonplace of Australian ethnological literature that the women are monopolised by the older men, so that the younger ones often have no wives.[4] The circumstance is usually

[1] L. Fison and A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, p. 25; W. E. Roth, *Ethnological Studies among the North-West-Central Queensland Aborigines*, p. 69; S. Gason, *The Dieyerie Tribe of Australian Aborigines*, p. 13; G. Taplin, *The Folklore, Manners, Customs and Languages of the South Australian Aborigines*, p. 67.

[2] E. J. Eyre, *Journals of Expeditions of Discovery into Central Australia*, vol. ii, p. 321. Cf. below, vol. ii, p. 164.

[3] R. Salvado, *Mémoires historiques sur l'Australie*, p. 277; E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race*, vol. i, p. 107; C. Lumholtz, *Among Cannibals*, p. 163; E. Elymann, *Die Eingeborenen der Kolonie Südaustralien*, p. 131; E. T. Hardman, "Notes on some Habits and Customs of the Natives of the Kimberley District, Western Australia," *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, Ser. iii, i, p. 71; E. M. Clerke, "On the Aborigines of Western Australia," *Report of the Sixty-first Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science* (Cardiff, 1891), p. 717.

[4] See below, p. 741.

interpreted as a manifestation of the selfishness, greed and tyranny of the elder men. But it is not at all clear that this is the whole explanation. Old people are in general treated with great tenderness and consideration, even when they become quite helpless.[1] The older men often become very inactive, and spend their time twining rope and manufacturing other small articles, leaving the more active pursuits of the chase to younger men. It is natural that they should be in greater need of the economic assistance which the women are required to supply. We are frequently told that the old men monopolise all the young women, and that the younger men have to be content with cast-off old 'lubras.' But among the natives of Sunday Island, in Western Australia, the reverse has been noted; only strong full-grown women are in demand for purposes of economic cohabitation, so that hardly any of the young girls can succeed in getting 'married.'[2] The necessity for such economic association could have been dispensed with only if a pure matriarchal clan-organisation had been maintained and its continuous development had been possible. But the establishment of male ascendancy at a stage of culture so low that the economic advantages of women in early phases of society had no opportunity of making their weight felt, has not permitted of such a development; Australian society afforded no scope for the development of the maternal clan. Failing such a development there is no alternative but individual economic association of men and women, that is to say, individual marriage.

One of the features of special interest in Australian social organisation, and at the same time one of the chief grounds of misunderstanding and confusion which have been a fertile source of controversial argument, is that such individual marriage is not only an essentially economic association, as indeed it is in most primitive societies, but that it has scarcely acquired the character of an exclusive sexual claim. While individual marriage establishes the rights of the husband to the company, obedience and labour of the woman, which are eagerly desired, rigorously enforced, and jealously guarded, those individual claims do not extend to exclusive sexual possession. Sexual relations are not regulated by the rules and claims which have reference to individual marriage, but by the rules and laws which have reference to marriage-groups

[1] J. Fraser, "The Aborigines of New South Wales," *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales*, xvi, p. 228; W. Ridley, *Kamilaroi and other Australian Languages*, p. 169; E. Thorne, *The Queen of the Colonies*, pp. 333 sqq.; A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 766.

[2] W. D. Campbell, "An Account of the Aboriginals of Sunday Island, Kind Sound, Kimberley, Western Australia," *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Society of Western Australia*, i, p. 62.

and classes. The regulation of sexual relations is thus not founded upon the existence of individual economic marriage, and is, in fact, little affected by it; it consists in the rules intended to avoid the 'mixing of blood,' and not in any rules intended to uphold exclusive individual claims. Here again the same character of Australian native society appears as throughout all aspects of its constitution. New features have in course of time become introduced, but they have become superimposed upon older features without supplanting or abolishing them. Just as maternal descent, mother-in-law avoidance, and other features of a matriarchal society continue in full force under a purely and even strenuously patriarchal organisation, just as totemic clans, territorial groups, artificial marriage-classes are superimposed in a palimpsest of social deposits, so individual patriarchal marriage has become established without at the same time supplanting group-marriage.

Group-marriage relations, or sexual communism between members of the corresponding marriage-classes, is extremely widespread among Australian tribes, and has long been known as a feature of their social organisation. It is referred to in the earliest account in which that organisation into corresponding marriage-classes is for the first time accurately described. Speaking in 1832 of the natives of the southern part of Western Australia, or, as it was then called, the Swan River colony, Scott Nind remarks that "their customs as regards the women are not only very curious, but also so intricate and involved in so many apparent contradictions and singularities that it is probable that we have been mistaken in some of them." "The whole body of natives," he continues, "are divided into two classes, 'Erniung' and 'Tem,' or 'Taaman'; and the chief regulation is that these classes must intermarry, that is, an 'Erniung' with a 'Taaman.' Those who infringe this rule are called 'yureclangers,' and are subject to very severe punishment. The children always follow the denomination of the mother. Thus a man who is 'Erniung' will have all his children 'Taaman'; but his sister's children will be 'Erniung.' This practice is common to all the tribes in the neighbourhood, with the exception of the Murra." After giving further details concerning the modes of contracting marriages by infant-betrothal, this first scientific observer of Australian social ethnology proceeds to inform us that "the majority of the men are single until past thirty years of age—some much longer. The old men have not only several wives, but of all ages. This state of things is in some measure compensated by what is called 'tarramanaccarack'; it is, in fact, courting a wife while her husband is living." Not only do the relatives of a man inherit his wives after he is dead, but they "court" them under his very nose during his lifetime. "This practice is done openly and

permitted." [1] We know, in fact, that among the tribes of Western Australia generally, the temporary exchange of wives between tribal brothers "is extremely frequent." [2] Of the large group of tribes near Spencer Gulf, known as the Parnkalla, the Rev. C. W. Schürmann says that "as for near relatives, such as brothers, it may be said that they have their wives in common. This practice is a recognised custom." [3] Among the tribes of Gippsland, according to the reluctant admission of Mr. Curr, "there is reason to believe that custom sanctions a single man cohabiting occasionally with his brother's wife, and also a married man with his wife's sister." [4] Similarly, in the Wa-imbio tribe of Victoria it is common for brothers to exchange wives temporarily.[5] Of the tribes of the Port Lincoln District, Mr. Wilhelmi says that "of relations, brothers in particular, it may be said that they possess their wives jointly." [6] In the Aldolinga tribe of south-central Australia, a man "may sleep with his brother's wife, or his brother with his wife; and this occurs very frequently." [7] Among the Dieri the same relations are usual between a man and his brothers' wives, and a woman and her sisters' husbands; when "two brothers are married to two sisters, they commonly live together in a group-marriage of four." [8] In the Kunandaburi tribe, between a man and his brothers' wives and his wives' sisters "intercourse constantly takes place," "a group of men who are own or tribal brothers, and a group of women who are own or tribal sisters, cohabit when the tribe assembles, or indeed at any time when the group are all together." [9] In the Yunawinyah tribe the married men "get

[1] Scott Nind, "Description of the Natives of King George's Sound (Swan River Colony) and adjoining Country," *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, i, pp. 37 sqq., 39.

[2] J. D. E. Schmeltz, "Ethnological Notes on the Western Australian Aborigines," *Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, xvi, p. 12.

[3] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 191. Cf. J. D. Woods, *The Native Tribes of South Australia*, p. 223.

[4] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race*, vol. iii, p. 546. Mr. Curr's informant, the Rev. J. Bulmer, makes, as we shall see (below, p. 761), no such guarded qualifications as Mr. Curr introduces.

[5] L. Fison and A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, p. 209.

[6] C. Wilhelmi, "Manners and Customs of the Australian Natives, in particular of the Port Lincoln District," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Victoria*, v, p. 180.

[7] F. E. H. W. Krichauff, "Further Notes on the 'Aldolinga' or 'Mbenderinga' Tribe of Aborigines," *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society of Australasia: South Australian Branch*, ii, p. 77.

[8] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 181.

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 192 sq. Mr. O'Donell, from whom the information is derived, speaks of such relations as being regarded as "improper" and of "pretence of concealment." But Mr. Gason states that "the law allows intercourse" (A. W. Howitt, "Australian Group Relations," *Smithsonian Report*, 1883, p. 808).

all the young men of the clan, other than relatives, to cohabit with the gins." General promiscuity takes place periodically; but "only brothers can sleep with brothers' wives." [1] Among the men of the Hyali tribe of Brighton Downs, connubial relations are communal: "it is quite a common thing for them to lend their 'gins' to one another and to exchange wives." [2] Similarly, in the Ucumble tribe of Western Falls, in northern New South Wales, "brothers can interchange wives." [3] Still farther north, in Queensland, in the Wakelbura tribe on the Belyando River, if a man of a group of brothers is married and the others unmarried, "they and the woman married to their brother call each other husband and wife, and the men have and exercise marital rights as to her." [4] So likewise among the tribes of the Tully River, a man has and uses marital rights over all his wife's sisters whether they are married to other men or not, and he has also the same rights over all his brothers' wives, and cohabits with them habitually.[5] In the Narrangga tribe of York Peninsula, when the tribe meets, brothers exchange wives temporarily, but they do not lend them to strangers.[6] So much is that fraternal polyandry a matter of course among the northern tribes that in cases of adultery it is not usual for the husband himself to chastise the guilty woman; that disciplinary duty is customarily undertaken by one of his brothers.[7]

Those customs, which are thus found across the length and breadth of the Australian continent, from north to south, and from east to west, appear very similar to the many usages of fraternal polyandry which we have noted in most parts of the world. But a closer enquiry into the facts shows that the sexual organisation of the Australian aborigines differs in some important features from any which we have hitherto considered. In some respects it does not represent so clearly an unmodified sexual communism between corresponding marriage-classes as do the marriage institutions of the Nayars, for instance, because there is in every instance in Australia some form of individual economic association. Nor is Australian fraternal polyandry an organised marriage of the

[1] B. H. Purcell, "Rites and Customs of the Australian Aborigines," *Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte*, 1893, p. 288.

[2] S. Hill, "Ceremonies, Customs, and Food of the Hyali Tribe," *Science of Man*, 1901, p. 25.

[3] W. T. Wyndham, "The Aborigines of Australia," *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales*, xxiii, p. 36.

[4] A. W. Howitt, *The Natives Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 224; Id., "The Dieri and other kindred Tribes of Central Australia," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xx, p. 63.

[5] W. E. Roth, "North Queensland Ethnography, Bulletin No. 10," *Records of the Australian Museum*, vii, pp. 3, 12.

[6] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 260.

[7] W. E. Roth, *North Queensland Ethnography*, Bulletin No. 8, p. 6.

whole fraternal family-group as is the marriage of the Tibetans or of the Todas; for the eldest brother nowhere acts as the representative of such a family-group, nor are the other brothers restricted from having wives of their own who are likewise accessible to all the other brothers equally. Indeed there is no such thing in Australian social organisation as a definitely constituted and juridically recognised family-group. On the other hand, Australian sexual communism, in spite of the existence of individual economic associations between men and women, appears to represent in other respects a more primitive form of sexual organisation than the Asiatic institutions we have considered.

As we have so often had occasion to note, relations such as are referred to in the above-cited reports are commonly viewed and described by casual observers as 'irregular,' or licentious aberrations, or, as a seventeenth-century missionary would have said, 'disorders.' The persons with whom, besides their individual partners, Australian native men and women commonly consort, are usually spoken of by European settlers as their 'paramours.'[1] But it is manifest from what we have already had repeated occasions to note concerning the sexual organisation of the aborigines of Australia that no expression would seem to be more inapplicable to them than such terms as 'disorders,' 'laxity,' or 'promiscuity.' Those organisations are, on the contrary, remarkable for nothing more than the elaborate and detailed rules by which sexual relations are regulated, and by the stern, superstitious, and almost fanatical severity with which they are adhered to and enforced. As with the Siberian or Eskimo peoples in regard to whom similar language is used to that by which the 'disorderly' relations of the Australian natives are sometimes referred to, it turns out on closer investigation that those relations are in no sense 'irregular,' but are part and parcel of that rigidly organised system upon which all native Australian society is founded. In the first place it follows from the nature of that organisation that any 'disorder,' licentiousness, or promiscuity is by the rules of that organisation strictly confined to relations between members of the corresponding intermarriage classes. Any relations outside those determinate groups are dreaded and abhorred and are usually punished with death. Any promiscuity which exists is, then, a rigidly defined group promiscuity, and sexual relations among the Australian natives are characterised at one and the same time, by licence tending to promiscuity as regards those intermarriage groups, and by severe morality outside that relation. Thus, for

[1] A. W. Howitt, "The Diery and other Kindred Tribes of Central Australia," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xx, pp. 55 sq. "My attention," says Dr. Howitt, "was, when exploring in that part of Central Australia, attracted by the unusual laxity which I observed in the intersexual relations."

example, the Ucumble tribe of northern New South Wales, which consists of a number of territorial sub-tribes scattered over a considerable region, is, as usual in Australia, divided into corresponding clans, or marriage-classes, called Cumbo, Bya, etc. "All Cumbos consider themselves brothers, never minding how distant the tribe, nor how remote the relationship; so with Bya, and all others. The same with the women. These brothers can interchange wives." [1] Or according to another account of the same tribe, "every man in any one class is supposed to have marital rights over every woman in the class with which he can marry." [2] Or again in the Aldolinga or Mbenderinga tribe of the upper Finke River, which is divided into four clans known respectively as Beltare, Kumare, Burule, and Bunanke, "the class system," says Mr. Krichauff, "is so far good that it prevents marriage between the nearest relations such as between father and daughter, or mother and son, but it carries with it another bad practice. A Beltare man can cohabit with any Kumare woman, or a Burule with all the Bunanke women." [3]

Some aspects of the collective relations of the Australian aborigines have been investigated and described in greater detail by Dr. Howitt, Sir W. B. Spencer, and Mr. Gillen with reference to the Dieri and the Urabunna tribes of Central Australia. In the Dieri tribe the unions, which we should call 'irregular,' are officially and ceremoniously solemnised with considerably more formality than attends the contracting of the individual economic associations. A special ceremony, known as 'kandri,' is performed at the great tribal gatherings in connection with the rites of circumcision and puberty, by the head of the totem-group to which the men belong, and the names of the persons united are proclaimed "in slow and measured sentences" before the assembled tribe and repeated by the members of the gathering. "The various couples who are thus allotted to each other are not consulted, and it is not considered whether there is or is not any mutual liking or affection between them. The council of elders decides as to their suitability." [4] The partners in those unions are known as 'pirrauru.'

[1] W. T. Wyndham, "The Australian Aborigines," *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales*, xxiii, p. 36.

[2] J. Fraser, "The Aborigines of New South Wales," *ibid.*, xvi, p. 222.

[3] F. E. H. W. Krichauff, "Further Notes on the 'Aldolinga' or 'Mbenderinga' Tribe of Aborigines," *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society of Australasia: South Australian Branch*, ii, p. 77. It should be noted that the above statement, derived from the missionaries of Hermannsburg, who lived in constant close contact with the tribe mentioned, and whose accounts of them are marked by moderation, dates from several years before the publication of Mr. Fison's views, and are therefore wholly unaffected by any preconceived theory.

[4] A. W. Howitt, "The Diery and other Kindred Tribes of Central Australia," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xx, p. 56; Id., *The Native*

'Pirra' means 'the moon,' and the term thus appears to mean 'moon spouses'; [1] in the Yandairunga tribe they are called simply 'pirras,' 'moons.' [2] The moon plays an extremely important part in primitive ideas and is especially associated with the reproductive powers.[3] In fact, in the Warramunga tribe, the intermarriage classes are supposed to have been established, and all the rules of sexual relations regulated by the moon-god.[4] The tribal gatherings at which the 'pirrauru' unions are solemnised are, like most Australian tribal ceremonies, held by moonlight, and were no doubt primitively associated with influences supposed to be connected with the moon. "It is not merely two pairs of 'pirrauru' who are allotted to each other, but the whole of the marriageable and married people, even those who are already 'pirraurus,' are re-allotted, the 'kandri' ceremony being performed for batches of them at the same time." [5] The 'pirrauru' partners have liberty, and are in fact enjoined, to unite immediately, and general sexual intercourse takes place.[6] The relation is, however, a permanent one; "once a 'pirrauru,' always a 'pirrauru.'" [7] Such unions, which are celebrated with a solemnity which does not attend the formation of individual economic marriages between 'noas,' or, as they are designated by Dr. Howitt in his larger work, 'tippa-malku' marriages, are obviously not describable as 'irregular' relations between 'paramours.' A missionary, with the respect which such ritual solemnity inspires in Europeans, goes so far as to say that "the practice of 'pirrauru' is worthy of praise, for its strength and earnestness in regard to morality, since no practice could less accord with the hetairism which Lord Avebury imagined for the Australian aborigines." [8] Each man, married or unmarried, has one or more 'pirrauru' wives, and each woman may have a number of 'pirrauru' husbands in addition to her

Tribes of South-East Australia, pp. 181 sq.; Id., "On the Organisation of the Australian Tribes," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Victoria* (New Series), i, Part ii, p. 124.

[1] S. Gason, *The Dieyerie Tribe of Australian Aborigines*, p. 46; A. W. Howitt, "Australian Group Relations," *Smithsonian Report*, 1883, p. 805 n.

[2] A. W. Howitt, "The Diery and other Kindred Tribes of Central Australia," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, p. 60.

[3] See below, vol. ii, pp. 583 sqq. Cf. p. 695.

[4] W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 412 sq.

[5] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 182.

[6] Id., "Australian Group Relations," *Smithsonian Report*, 1883, p. 805.

[7] Id., "Native Tribes of South-East Australia," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxxvii, pp. 272 sq. Cf. Id., "The Diery and other Kindred Tribes of Central Australia," *ibid.*, xx, p. 56.

[8] Rev. Otto Siebert, cited by A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 186.

'tippa-malku' partner.[1] A man exercises marital rights over his 'pirrauru' with the formal assent of the 'tippa-malku' husband if the latter be present, and as a matter of course if he be absent. When both are in camp they may lodge together, "the husband sleeping next the fire, the 'tippa-malku' next to him, and the 'pirrauru' next to her."[2]

Exactly similar institutions have been described by Sir W. B. Spencer and Mr. Gillen in the Urabunna tribe. The term for 'spouse,' corresponding to the term 'noa' among the Dieri, is 'nupa'; but there is no special term to distinguish between a person's individual 'nupas' and his so-called 'potential' wives. A man is individually married to one or more of his 'nupas.' "In addition, however, each man has certain 'nupa' women beyond the limited number referred to with whom he stands in the relation of 'piraungaru.' In the marriage of the Urabunna a woman is allotted to a man as his individual wife, but at the same time she is allotted to several other men as their 'piraungaru.'"[3] Sir W. B. Spencer and Mr. Gillen lay great stress on the fact that in no instance is a woman allotted to, or acquired by, a man as his exclusive sexual partner. "In the Urabunna tribe," they say, "every woman is the special 'nupa' of one particular man, but at the same time he has no exclusive right to her, as she is the 'piraungaru' of certain other men, who also have the right of access to her. There is no such thing as one man having the exclusive right to one woman. The elder brother, or 'nuthi,' of the latter, in whose hands the matter lies, will give one man a preferential right, but at the same time he will give other men of the same group a secondary right to her. Individual marriage does not exist either in name or in practice in the Urabunna tribe."[4] The latter statement, offered as a challenge to critics, alludes to the ambiguity with which the term is used; if by 'individual marriage' be meant an individual association having reference to economic conditions, then 'individual marriage' certainly exists in the Urabunna, as in all other Australian tribes. But if it is understood to imply exclusive sexual rights, then, as Sir W. B. Spencer and Mr. Gillen clearly show, it does not exist in practice or even in name, the same term being used for all the women of the corresponding class.

It is manifest that the institutions which have been more closely investigated and described in the Dieri and Urabunna tribes are

[1] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 181; Id., "On the Organisation of the Australian Tribes," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Victoria* (N.S.), i, Part ii, pp. 115, 124.

[2] Id., *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 184.

[3] W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 62. Cf. Id., *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 72 sq.

[4] Id., *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 62 sq.

similar to those which have been referred to in more general terms in regard to a large number of Australian tribes in every part of the continent; the recognised right of access of brothers, own or tribal, to one another's wives, and to their wives' sisters, is a regularly established and recognised principle of the social organisation of those tribes. Thus, for example, in a quite different part of the Australian continent, in northern Queensland, a man has marital rights over all the sisters of his wife, no matter whether they be married or not, and she in turn, whenever he is absent, "can without fear of any consequences regularly sleep with any of his blood-brothers." Thus "polygamy and, within certain limits, polyandry are practised throughout the North, the limits depending upon the suitable exogamous group, acquiescence or absence of the original husband." [1]

The features presented by the forms of marriage organisation of the Australian aborigines suggested to the Rev. L. Fison and to Dr. Howitt the view that collective group-relations preceded amongst them any form of individual marriage as a social institution—a view which has gained support from later investigations and which has been endorsed by the most eminent authorities on Australian ethnology. Thus Dr. Roth, the Chief Protector of the Aborigines in Queensland, speaking of the customs of the natives of that part of the continent, remarks that they "bear strong evidence of communal marriage in a very primitive condition, before the distinction had come to be made between blood- and group-members of the different class-systems." [2] That view has given rise to a great deal of very vehement opposition on the part of those to whom the application of the doctrine of evolution to human institutions, and more especially to the institution of individual marriage, appears objectionable. "I must admit," somewhat superfluously declares Dr. Westermarck, to whose expressions of opinion they are in the habit of appealing—"I must admit that the facts produced by Messrs. Spencer and Gillen, and the severe criticisms which they have passed on my sceptical attitude towards Mr. Fison's group-marriage theory, have not been able to convince me." [3] As to questions of fact the testimonies of the highly competent observers who have spent their lives in the close study of the Australian aborigines must, of course, be regarded as having more weight than Dr. Westermarck's convictions, and so, it may be added, must the conclusions which they draw from their intimate

[1] W. E. Roth, "North Queensland Ethnography, Bulletin No. 10," *Records of the Australian Museum*, vii, p. 12.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

[3] E. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*, vol. ii, p. 395; Id., *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. iii, p. 260.

familiarity with those facts. The existence of group-marriage relations in Australia is not, so far as I am aware, disputed by anyone at the present day.[1] The only questions which are in dispute, and which can be possible subjects of controversy are two in number, namely, (1) whether the individual economic association and preferential rights which are found in conjunction with the sexual communism between members of marriage classes in Australia are anterior or posterior to the establishment of those relations; and (2) whether that sexual communism does, or formerly did, extend to the whole of the intermarriage classes. Any criticism of the conclusion of the Australian scientists, namely, that the individual relations are a later development grafted upon an organisation in which all members of one group had recognised access to all members of the opposite sex in the corresponding group, must perforce postulate, and show the plausibility of, the only alternative, that is to say, that the original organisation of those tribes was founded upon individual marriage similar to the European form of the institution and claiming exclusive individual sexual rights, and that those individual claims were, for some cause, abandoned, and the sexual communism which at present exists established and recognised.

The ground upon which Dr. Westermarck chiefly founds his hypothesis, that claims to exclusive individual rights originally formed the basis of Australian marriage institutions, is the supposition that those claims are innate in human nature. That assumption is in accordance with the conceptions of popular psychology. We shall have to examine it later, and we shall, I think, see that it is erroneous and rests upon a fundamental misconception. What is spoken of as jealousy in primitive societies has no reference to exclusive sexual possession; what excites the sentiment and what the primitive male guards against is not the sharing of his claims of access to a given female, but the economic loss of that female and her abduction. The evidence for those facts is at least as strong and conclusive in Australia as anywhere else in uncultured societies. There are numerous statements to the effect that the Australian aborigines are ' very jealous,' but there is no evidence to show that such ' jealousy ' refers to exclusive individual possession, and there is abundant evidence

[1] Mr. Curr did, indeed, make the astounding assertions that "amongst the Australians there is no community of women," and that "the women in our tribes have never been found living with one man one day and with another the next, but that the reverse is a matter of notoriety" (E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race*, vol. i, pp. 109, 126). But the eccentricities of Mr. Curr in matters of ethnological ethics are well known, and no ethnologist nowadays takes much account of his statements where his preconceptions are implicated.

that it does not. In Australia, as elsewhere in the primitive world, it would require very weighty reasoning and very strong evidence to explain how, if such claims to exclusive possession were a primary and fundamental character of the sexual instinct in man, institutions of sexual communism and polyandry directly opposed to such claims had ever come to develop and to be adopted and established. There is no more reason, on the hypothesis that such claims are primarily inherent in human nature, why any consideration of expediency or other motives should cause them to become generally abandoned among the Australian aborigines rather than among present-day Englishmen, and the former event would stand quite as much in need of a very convincing explanation as the latter, or rather more so, for primal instincts are naturally far stronger in savages than in civilised humanity. It is not, of course, scientifically admissible that the hypothesis of an original individual marriage organisation should be selected merely on grounds of ethical preferences, because such considerations are well known to be apt to deflect judgment and lead into grave errors. Thus the Rev. J. Mathew, who has written a great deal on Australian ethnology, bases his objection to the former of the two alternatives on the ground that it " is quite an imaginary starting-point and reduces mankind to a state of degradation lower than the brutes, which in many cases, and especially in the case of the higher apes, go in pairs. If gorillas have sufficient decency to pair off, why may not primitive man have done the same? "[1] Mr. Mathew doubtless derived the notion that " gorillas have sufficient decency to pair off " from Dr. Westermarck, who at one time gave considerable currency to that version of the natural history of that animal; but we now know that this is " quite an imaginary starting-point." And even if gorillas—or ' Pithecanthropus,' on which, now that the habits of the gorilla are better known, Dr. Westermarck falls back[2]—had been accustomed to conform to European standards of decency and to live in isolated pairs, such decent habits would inevitably have entirely abolished any chance of those animals ever developing the strong social instincts, the intelligence and ultimately the power of speech which have rendered possible the emergence of humanity. For it is precisely by that remarkable solidarity of the larger primitive human group, or clan, a solidarity which, as we find it among primitive peoples, is to us almost unintelligible,[3] and which has been destroyed by the later development of individualism—it is by that close communion between tribal brothers, which the Australian aborigines cement by drinking one another's blood,

[1] J. Mathew, " The Australian Aborigines," *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales*, N.S., xxiii, p. 400.

[2] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. i, p. 69.

[3] See below, vol. ii, pp. 489 sqq.

and of which the obligation of sexual communism is regarded as the most essential token, that human society has in the first instance been rendered possible. And Sir W. B. Spencer and Mr. Gillen are therefore well justified in their remark that " this system of what has been called group-marriage, serving as it does to bind more or less closely together groups of individuals who are mutually interested in one another's welfare, has been one of the most powerful agents in the early stages of the upward development of the human race." [1]

The hypothesis that the development of Australian marriage institutions has taken place in the opposite direction is extremely difficult to conceive and to harmonise with the facts. For the transition from fully developed individualism to the obliteration of that individualism by communistic sentiments and practices is a course of events which is unknown in any sphere of social development, and the whole of history bears witness to the desperate difficulties in the way of even checking those individualistic tendencies when once they have developed and established their claims. The early phases of social development, on the other hand, have been made possible only by the circumstance that those individualistic interests were at first undeveloped and were held in abeyance by the strong solidarity which constituted the foundation of the organisation of primitive human groups.[2] As regards the relations between the sexes Dr. Westermarck himself, while engaged in minimising the prevalence of polygyny and polyandry, has occasion to remark that those forms of marriage are invariably prone to be " modified in directions tending towards monogamy." [3] That tendency, due to the inevitable operation of economic causes, is undeniable. But the statement is in flat contradiction with the same writer's view that polygyny and polyandry have themselves developed out of monogamic institutions, and that in particular " the Urabunna custom may very well have developed out of ordinary individual marriage," the latter losing in the process not only its individualistic claims, but even its name. Both views can scarcely be claimed to

[1] W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 74.

[2] " It appears strange to me," remarked Mr. Lorimer Fison many years ago, " that, though the existence of the group as the social unit among savages has been so long seen and acknowledged with regard to other matters, it should still be so vehemently denied with regard to marriage and relationship. Land tenure and inheritance are based upon it. . . . Blood feud also shows the group as a social unit. . . . If, then, it be the group, not the individual, that holds land, that inherits, that succeeds to office, that strikes or is struck, what difficulty is there in the way of our accepting the fact that it is the group which marries and is given in marriage ? " (L. Fison and A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, pp. 156 sqq.).

[3] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage* (1911), p. 457.

be equally correct; if there be a natural tendency operating in the direction of modifying polyandry so as to transform it into individual marriage, it is difficult to maintain at the same time that individual and monogamous marriage have in every part of the world been modified into polygyny and polyandry, and the two opposite theories which are applied alternately at the discretion of the theorist, according as he desires to blow hot or cold, are mutually destructive.

It must be admitted that, while criticisms of Dr. Fison's theory of the origin of Australian social organisation from collective intermarriage between groups have been very persistent, little has been done to elucidate the alternative theory of its evolution from the institution of individual marriage. The transformation of Australian marriage institutions from exclusive individual marriage to sexual communism has usually been assigned to the difficulty of obtaining wives owing to the scarcity of women, and to the benevolent consideration shown by the older married men in endeavouring to remedy the distress of the younger members of the community by allowing them access to their own wives.[1] But, unfortunately for those suggestions, they are directly contradicted by all known relevant facts. Almost every account tells us that it is precisely the greed and selfishness of the older men who seek to monopolise the women which is the chief cause of the scarcity of the latter and of the difficulty which the younger men find in obtaining wives.[2] Far from endeavouring to remedy the situation, the older men, on the contrary, expressly prevent the younger ones, sometimes it appears under pain of death, from marrying at all. They even look unfavourably on young men entering into 'pirrauru' relations.[3] Where several men are 'pirrauru' to the same woman,

[1] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. iii, pp. 253 sqq.; N. W. Thomas, *Kinship Organisations and Group Marriage in Australia*, p. 138.

[2] O. Barsanti, *I selvaggi dell' Australia*, p. 137; S. Nind, "Description of the Natives of King George's Sound (Swan River Colony) and adjoining Country," *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, i, p. 39; G. F. Angas, *Savage Life and Scenes in Australia and New Zealand*, vol. i, p. 94; J. W. Fawcett, "Customs of the Wannah-Ruah Tribe," *Science of Man*, 1898, p. 180; E. T. Hardman, "Notes on some Habits and Customs of the Natives of the Kimberley District, Western Australia," *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, Ser. iii, i, p. 71; J. Mathew, "The Australian Aborigines," *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales*, xxiii, p. 407; Id., *Eaglehawk and Crow*, p. 113; G. Grey, *Journals of Two Expeditions of Discovery in North-West and Western Australia*, vol. ii, p. 229; P. Beveridge, *The Aborigines of Victoria and Riverina*, pp. 22 sq.; J. Dawson, *The Australian Aborigines*, p. 35; R. Brough Smyth, *The Aborigines of Victoria*, vol. ii, p. 291; L. Schulze, "The Aborigines of the Upper and Middle Finke River, their Habits and Customs," *Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Society of South Australia*, xiv, p. 224; E. Eylmann, *Die Eingeborenen der Kolonie Südaustralien*, p. 131; C. Lumholtz, *Among Cannibals*, p. 184.

[3] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 182.

the right of precedence is regulated by seniority, the older men having the first claim and the younger ones the last.[1] And, in fact, we are expressly told that it is the old men and not the younger ones who invariably have the largest number of 'pirraurus';[2] and the Dieri and other tribes state that the older men are the chief beneficiaries in 'pirrauru' relations, and constantly claim access to the wives of the younger married men and to their 'pirraurus.'[3]

The bulk of the criticisms of which the conclusions drawn from Australian ethnology have been the object have been directed against the accounts which Dr. Howitt has given of the customs of the Dieri tribe. Thus Mr. N. W. Thomas, who has devoted a whole book to an onslaught on the views of those misguided ethnologists whom he pleasantly calls 'group-marriagers,' who are unable to see in the institution of individual marriage the true root and foundation of the sexual collectivism and polyandrous organisations of the Australian aborigines, is chiefly concerned with discussing the details of Dr. Howitt's accounts of the 'pirrauru' and 'tippa-malku' institutions. Those criticisms have been thought to be "very damaging," and he himself is led to the belief that "it is therefore not rash to say that the case for group-marriage, so far as Australia is concerned, falls to the ground."[4] It is, accordingly, only right that, in our survey of the ruins, we should take account of the havoc wrought by Mr. Thomas's remarks. I must confess that the customs of the Dieri, and in particular the 'pirrauru' institution, appear to me to constitute but a very small item of the evidence pointing to the fundamentally collective character of the social organisation of the Australian aborigines. What it chiefly serves to show is the broad fact that the collective and polyandrous relations between members of corresponding marriage-classes, which are common to the majority of Australian tribes, are part and parcel of an established and traditional organisation, and not adventitious laxities of conduct. Dr. Howitt's accounts of the Dieri customs afford greater scope for controversial discussion, because they offer much fuller details than those available concerning other tribes. That, of course, is in general a great advantage. It, however, not infrequently happens that to place too great a reliance on minutiae of detail in accounts

[1] A. W. Howitt, "On the Organisation of Australian Tribes," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Victoria* (New Series), i, Part ii, pp. 125, 126.

[2] Id., "The Diery and other Kindred Tribes of Central Australia," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xx, p. 57; Id., *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 184.

[3] E. Eylmann, *Die Eingeborenen der Kolonie Südaustralien*, pp. 136 sq.

[4] Northcote W. Thomas, *Kinship Organisation and Group Marriage in Australia*, p. 147.

of the working of customs in uncultured societies, as a basis for far-reaching conclusions, is more apt to mislead than to enlighten; for such customs scarcely ever have the same fixed rigidity as a juridic procedure in a civilised community. The satisfying precision with which the customs of an uncultured society are sometimes described, and we are informed that a certain person takes three paces forward, and stands for two-and-half minutes facing north-east-by-north, is prone to be at times illusory; and in regard to so difficult a subject of investigation as the actual sexual relations obtaining in a community of liars, for such the Australian aborigines are, the chances of error increase enormously the more detailed our accounts. Dr. Howitt's accounts of the customs of the Dieri were drawn up at various times from successive reports and investigations, and have been modified as fresh information became available. It has been urged that they contain inconsistencies, and that they remain obscure on several points. The chief of those obscurities or inconsistencies lies in the fact that Dr. Howitt laid great emphasis on the ceremony by which 'pirraurus' are allotted at tribal gatherings, according to his first account, at circumcision festivals; and he was even so impressed with the fact that he was disposed to assume that some such official ceremony or allotment must have existed in other tribes having similar customs, although we have no evidence of this. At the same time it would certainly appear that the 'pirrauru' relation does not invariably depend upon such ceremonial and arbitrary allotment. He states, for instance, that "the relation arises through the exchange by brothers of their wives,"[1] and it would seem that the recognised access to a brother's wife or a wife's sister, which is so prevalent a feature with many tribes, is quite independent of any formal ceremony or allotment that may take place. My own impression is that, just as the term 'noa' may denote somewhat different relations, in the circumstances at present existing, 'potential' wife and 'actual' wife, so the term 'pirrauru' also corresponds to relations that become established in several different ways. The term 'pirrauru,' "moon-spouse," and the semi-religious ceremony which so impressed Dr. Howitt, suggest that the term primarily applies to associates in those rites or customs of general sexual licence, which are so well-known a feature of all Australian tribal gatherings; and that the term has become extended to all recognised relations between members of intermarriage groups which are not an economic cohabitation established by infant-betrothal ('tippa-malku').

Mr. Thomas draws up a list of questions concerning the organisation and institutions of the Dieri, which remain obscure. The same might, of course, be done in regard to the institutions of

[1] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 181.

the English, else the occupation of our lawyers and judges would be gone. It would appear more profitable to attend to points which are definite and clear. In the first place one point which is very definitely clear is that both the 'pirrauru' and the 'tippa-malku' institution as they are now found are all in favour of the men and to the disadvantage of the women. While a man may have several 'tippa-malkus,' a woman can never have but one;[1] while a man can claim any 'noa' woman as his 'pirrauru,' a woman can only in very favourable circumstances request the permission of her 'tippa-malku' to have a particular man as her 'pirrauru';[2] while a man can dispose of his 'pirrauru' as he pleases,[3] a woman who is allotted as 'pirrauru' to a man is no more free to refuse to submit to the arrangement than in the case of the 'tippa-malku' relation.[4] Both institutions are then wholly one-sided, and can therefore only have been established in their present form in a social state characterised by male supremacy, if not despotism. On the other hand, we have definite evidence that male supremacy in Australia has been preceded by a condition of either complete equality between the sexes, or at any rate a far greater approximation to such equality than now exists.[5] It follows that both 'tippa-malku' and 'pirrauru' are in their present form somewhat late innovations and not primitive institutions, and that it is quite impossible to regard them, in that form, as part of the original organisation of the Australian tribes.

That being so the question to which Mr. Thomas chiefly devotes his attention, whether 'pirrauru' or 'tippa-malku' be the older institution, cannot be regarded as of fundamental importance. Indeed, the question appears to me to be devoid of meaning, for the undifferentiated relation between all 'noas,' which it is suggested was the original form of Australian regulations, is not the same thing as the 'pirrauru' relation in its present form, and the latter is as much an innovation on that postulated original condition as is 'tippa-malku,' and is an adaptation to that individual relation and inseparable from it. Assuming, from a quite unwarranted interpretation of a statement of Dr. Howitt's, that a woman cannot enter into the 'pirrauru' relation unless she is already an 'individual wife,'[6] Mr. Thomas proceeds to

[1] A. W. Howitt, *The Tribes of South-East Australia*, pp. 179, 184.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 181.

[3] Id., "The Diery and other Kindred Tribes of Central Australia," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xx, p. 58.

[4] Id., *The Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 187.

[5] See above, pp. 338 sq.

[6] In his book of 1904, Dr. Howitt says: "Every woman becomes a 'tippa-malku' before she becomes a 'pirrauru' wife" (*The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 181). In his previous papers dealing with the subject in the *Smithsonian Report for* 1883, the *Transactions of the Royal*

argue: "The 'pirrauru' relation is, for the woman, a modification of a previously existing 'tippa-malku' marriage; that being so, it cannot be quoted as evidence of a more pristine state of things in which she was by birth the legal and actual spouse of all men of a certain tribal status."[1] Why not? On the same page Mr. Thomas notes the fact that to a girl before marriage "free love is permitted." If, as Mr. Thomas appears to assume, the order of

Society of Victoria of 1889, the *Journal of the Anthropological Institute* of 1891, there is no such statement; and in a subsequent paper it is expressly rectified and withdrawn ("The Native Tribes of South-East Australia," *Folk-lore*, xvii. 1906, pp. 174 sq.). It is not difficult for anyone who has gone into the matter with any care to perceive the cause of the inadvertency. In his larger work, Dr. Howitt uses the term 'tippa-malku' as the equivalent of what is termed 'individual marriage,' and the use of the term for that purpose has been retained by Mr. Thomas and by most subsequent writers who have discussed the subject. But 'tippa-malku' does not mean 'individual marriage' in the language of the Dieri; it means 'infant betrothal' (A. W. Howitt, "Australian Group-Relationships," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxxvii, p. 279; cf., Id. *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 177). The Dieri term for what we call 'individual marriage' is 'noa' (see below, p. 757), and is the same as is used to denote the relation between all members of the opposite sex in the intermarriage classes. In all his earlier papers Dr. Howitt used the correct Dieri term, 'noa,' adding the explanatory prefix 'specialised,' to distinguish the individual relation. In his larger book he thought it advisable to adopt the term 'tippa-malku' for 'specialised noa' in order to simplify the exposition and avoid confusion. This he afterwards regretted, as he soon discovered that the substitution led to even worse confusion. "I have always found," he says in an article published shortly after, "a difficulty in explaining the system of Dieri 'pirrauru' marriage to those who have no actual knowledge of the conditions. In my earlier works I endeavoured to meet it by speaking of the marriages under (*a*) and (*b*) ['individual' marriages] as 'noa' marriages, but I abandoned this because it was indefinite, in so far as all the marriages are 'noa' marriages. In my *Native Tribes of South-East Australia* I endeavoured to meet this by using the term 'tippa-malku' for [individual marriages], but the term properly applies to 'betrothal,' it is likely to cause misapprehension" ("Australian Group-Relations," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxxvii, p. 279). It will be seen that, since every female infant is 'tippa-malku' (betrothed) from birth, she can scarcely become 'pirrauru' *before* she is 'tippa-malku.' There is nothing, however, to prevent her from becoming 'pirrauru' before she becomes the 'specialised noa' of a man. And that is what Dr. Howitt expressly states ("The Native Tribes of South-East Australia," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxxvii, p. 268); nor is his statement in his book, where he definitely explains that the 'tippa-malku' relation is entered into by tying an emu feather to her *navel-string*, in any contradiction with his later denial of the existence of any such rule as Mr. Thomas imagines.

The confusion illustrates the perils to which I referred of basing far-reaching reasonings on trifling minutiae which are not the subject of any fixed rule in primitive society; and also the profound difference between the European conceptions and the primitive institutions which anti-evolutionist writers seek to adapt and interpret in terms of the former.

[1] N. W. Thomas, *op. cit.*, p. 130. Cf. A. Lang, *The Secret of the Totem*, p. 55.

successive relations in individual life is an indication of their chronological order in the social development of the institutions, we should, on his own showing, be compelled by parity of reasoning to regard both 'tippa-malku' and 'pirrauru' as having been preceded by undifferentiated relations, and as being both modifications of a previously existing state of 'free love.' If that be so 'pirrauru' certainly appears to be evidence of that more pristine state of things; if it is not a survival and adaptation of it to the 'tippa-malku' institution, why should the latter be subject to the very fundamental limitations constituted by 'pirrauru'? 'Pirrauru,' if regarded as evidence of a more pristine state of things, is at one and the same time a survival and modification of that antecedent state. The same is, of course, inevitably the case with any 'survival,' no matter to what sort of institution it refers; for every survival derives from the institution which it has survived, and is at the same time an attenuated modification of it brought about by causes tending in the direction of the abolition of that institution.

Assuming that the allotment at tribal gatherings constitutes the whole basis of the 'pirrauru' relation, Mr. Thomas urges that it cannot be regarded as a survival of unregulated relations, for it is regulated. "It is quite unthinkable," he writes, "that the right of class promiscuity, to use the correct term, should ever have been exercised subject to any restriction."[1] As a matter of fact that is by no means so "unthinkable" as Mr. Thomas supposes; similar 'regulations' or allotments do, in fact, commonly take place in many rites of sexual licence or 'promiscuity.' Thus, for instance, in the 'Nanga' gatherings of Fiji, which were notable for extreme promiscuity and sexual licence, partners in that licence were nevertheless "intentionally coupled."[2] The Babylonian rites of Mylitta were 'promiscuous,' inasmuch as any stranger might have access to any woman, yet a certain formal procedure determined to which man a woman should be allotted. The 'general licence' of Australian tribal gatherings may quite well have been to some extent 'regulated'; it must, for one thing, have been regulated to the extent of preventing the abhorred 'mixing of blood' between members of the same class, and supervised in order to guard against the dreaded danger of such an occurrence. We are, in fact, expressly told that such a supervision in regard to that paramount condition is the chief function in view in allotting 'pirraurus.'[3] But any individual

[1] N. W. Thomas, *Kinship Organisation and Group Marriage in Australia*, p. 137.

[2] L. Fison, "The Nanga, or Sacred Stone Enclosure of Wainimala, Fiji," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xiv, p. 28 n.

[3] A. W. Howitt, "The Diery and other Kindred Tribes of Central Australia," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xx, p. 56.

character of those allotments is far more probably to be viewed as an adaptation to an authority of the older men and to the claims of 'tippa-malku' relations, which were not an original factor in those regulations.[1]

It has become a recognised principle in discussions concerning the more or less promiscuous character of primitive, as compared with civilised, sexual relations, that 'ceremonial' or 'ritual' licence, which often has a semi-religious or magic character, cannot legitimately be adduced as valid evidence concerning normal social relations. That principle is to a large extent justified. But the facts of Australian ethnology are particularly interesting in showing how difficult and deceptive it is to draw a hard-and-fast line between the two social phenomena. The 'pirrauru' relation is undoubtedly, according to our information, primarily a rite of 'ceremonial licence,' such as accompanies almost every ceremony or tribal gathering among the Australian natives; and yet, being permanent and indissoluble, it is at the same time very much a normal social relation. A large proportion of the misconceptions and futile discussions regarding the extent of the actual relations between intermarriage classes in Australia arises from overlooking or ignoring the fact that, owing to unalterable economic conditions, an Australian tribe is never a territorial community forming a single group; it is invariably fragmented into a number

[1] Among the arguments which Mr. Thomas brings forward to endeavour to prove the 'priority' of the 'tippa-malku' relation is the consideration that "'Pirrauru' is created by a ceremony which is performed, not by the head, nor even in the Wakelbura tribe, by a member of the supposed intermarried classes of the earlier period, but by the heads of the totem-kins of the individual men concerned. . . . The ceremony would more naturally fall into the hands of the tribal, phratric, or class authorities than of the heads of totem-kins" (N. W. Thomas, *op. cit.*, p. 137). The argument, granting its premises, would seem to tell in the direction of the exactly opposite conclusion to that which Mr. Thomas intends. For the circumstance that the allotment of individual partners is not made by the authority of the primitive intermarrying groups would appear to indicate that such limitations and individual allotments formed no part of the original institution. The premises are, however, far too flimsy and doubtful to bear the weight of any deduction. For my part I should feel inclined to think that the totemic groups are the oldest and most primitive intermarriage classes, in which case the ceremony of allotting 'pirraurus,' which constitutes from one aspect an assertion of more primitive group rights as against the individual 'tippa-malku' claims, would be, after all, performed by the heads of the original intermarrying groups. Such arguments, however, are an instance of the abuse of dubious details as a basis for wide inferences. We are on much firmer ground when we note that festivals of sexual licence, the celebration of puberty ceremonies and the attendant formation of sexual unions are far more primitive phenomena than the individual bespeaking of infants by contract ('tippa-malku'). No one, as far as I know, has ever suggested that the most primitive form of sexual relations in human society was the bespeaking of an unborn infant by an old man.

of 'camps' or very small communities.[1] So that "class promiscuity" can never, in fact, be other than 'ceremonial,' for it cannot take place except at periodic gatherings of the whole tribe. Dr. Howitt himself very clearly points this out: "I doubt whether, even under an 'undivided commune,'" he says, "there could have been anything more than a limited promiscuity, excepting when the whole community occasionally reunited. The general conditions of savage life on the Australian continent would not permit an entire undivided commune to remain united for any length of time in the same locality. The Dieri practice may show us, in a modified form, what might take place. The common 'pirrauru' right exists, but it cannot be fully exercised excepting when the whole tribe assembles."[2] We thus necessarily have two slightly different varieties of established sexual relations between members of corresponding intermarriage groups: those which take place on the occasion of the gathering of the tribe, and those obtaining in the small groups of close relatives which constitute the 'normal' communities or 'camps.' In the former we find the 'ceremonial' licence which characterises every Australian tribal gathering; in the latter those fraternal-sororal polygamous relations reported from every part of the continent.

All forms of sexual communism among the Australian aborigines at the present day are associated with coexistent individual marriage, and are therefore necessarily modified in relation to it; and the attention of critics of the evolutionary interpretation has been naturally attracted towards those limitations of communal relations rather than towards the equally conspicuous limitations of the individual relation. Yet the latter are, one would suppose, the more fundamental of the two, for it is of the essence of the institution of marriage, as we conceive it, that it establishes exclusive sexual rights to a woman, whereas the Dieri husband enters into that relation "with the fullest knowledge that she is not to be his individual wife as we understand the term."[3] But while the 'tippa-malku' husband puts forward no claims to exclusive possession, what he does from the first show a disposition to claim is that those economic and preferential rights which he acquires shall not be jeopardised or prejudiced by the woman's other sexual unions. There is nothing very extravagant in such a claim, and personal preferences in sexual relations being an element of very little moment in primitive society, that claim

[1] A. W. Howitt, "Australian Group Relations," *Smithsonian Report*, 1883, p. 807 n.

[2] C. Hodgkinson, *Australia from Port Macquarie to Moreton Bay*, p. 222; R. H. Mathews, "Australian Tribe-formation and Government," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xxxviii, pp. 941 sq.

[3] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 179.

does not constitute a very serious limitation of pre-existing freedom as regards the woman's 'noas,' though it does as regards the woman's own liberty of choice. The 'tippa-malku' husband does control the latter absolutely; only exceptionally, we are told, can a woman venture to ask her husband's permission to offer herself to a particular 'noa' of her own choice, and if he refuses she has to submit.[1] But we do not hear of any instance of such refusal in the converse case of a man who is 'noa' to the woman claiming access to her. It is customary law that the husband's consent should be requested if he is present in the camp. That fact has been thought to be indicative of a vested right to the disposal of the woman by the husband according to his pleasure, and to place any communistic relations that take place in the light of voluntary exercises on the part of the husband of his vested authority over the woman. But that interpretation does not accord with the facts. If the licence of access to his wife granted by the husband to other men who are 'noa' to her had its root in the exercise of his vested authority over her, in other words, if it derived from individual marriage, we should expect the exercise of that authority to have a discretionary character, and concessions to be granted or withheld at the husband's sole pleasure. Of any such discretionary character in regulating the claim of other 'noas' to access to the woman, there is not a hint in any of our information. Dr. Howitt says that "the assent of the noa husband is seldom withheld,"[2] that "it is not often that the male noa refuses."[3] Sir W. B. Spencer and Mr. Gillen say that among the Urabunna consent of the husband "is practically never withheld."[4] It would appear, however, that those statements err on the side of caution, for no example is mentioned by anyone of a husband refusing, and Dr. Roth, who goes into the matter in detail, in reference to the Queensland tribes, makes it clear that the husband never in any circumstances refuses.[5] There is no reason for thinking that the position of things in Queensland differs from that obtaining among the Dieri, and there are weighty considerations to show that it does not.[6] The object

[1] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 181.

[2] Id., "The Diery and other Kindred Tribes of Central Australia," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xx, p. 57.

[3] Id., "Australian Group Relations," *Smithsonian Report*, 1883, p. 807.

[4] W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 110.

[5] W. E. Roth, *Ethnological Studies among the North-West-Central Queensland Aborigines*, p. 182.

[6] Dr. Roth offers as explanations of that invariable assent of the husband the fact that he regards the request as a high compliment, and the suggestion that he would incur the risk of witchcraft being used against him if he refused. Dr. Howitt says that the husband would be "liable to have the refusal

of the formal permission which is required is, as all ethnological facts bearing upon the subject go to show, not to give the husband an opportunity of exercising discretionary powers which he does not in fact exercise, but to assure him on the only point which primitively constitutes the ground of his claims, fears, or 'jealousy,' namely, lest his wife should be permanently taken from him. As Mr. Thomas himself very justly remarks in a slightly different connection—in reference to the duty of the 'pirrauru' to protect the wife during the absence of her husband—"clearly this is a sort of insurance against the too bold suitor or too fickle wife."[1] The same fundamental consideration is manifested in the expressly noted proviso that a 'pirrauru' shall not remove the wife from the camp,[2] except when acting in an official capacity as diplomatic envoy, when he is accompanied by the wives of other men who are his 'pirraurus,' and whom he, in turn, lends out to members of the tribe which he is visiting, for the purpose of promoting the success of the negotiations.[3] The required notification to the husband, "to use the proper term," does not therefore afford any support or furnish any argument for the hypothesis of the derivation of communal relations with other 'noas' from vested authority conferred on the husband by individual marriage, but very much the reverse.

It is customary for a 'noa' having access to a man's wife to offer him some trifling present. The circumstance has been adduced as indicating that the claim to access is not a lawful right, and that the transaction is of the character of a prostitution of his wife by the husband. It might as well be said that marriage is an unlawful transaction because the bridegroom offers presents to the wife's relatives. With the Australian aborigines the offer of presents is an habitual practice on all and sundry occasions. Any manifestation of friendliness, whether between tribal-brothers or strangers, is accompanied by the bestowal of presents. There is, on the other hand, in native Australia no notion whatever of

retorted upon himself" (*Smithsonian Report*, 1883, *loc. cit.*). Sir W. B. Spencer and Mr. Gillen say that "he is bound to lend her," though this applies only to "certain occasions." But they add, what is of more general application, that "in this matter everything is regulated by custom" (W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 133). If occasions were known of such a refusal we should almost certainly have some specific reference to such an occurrence.

[1] N. W. Thomas, *op. cit.*, p. 139.

[2] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 184.

[3] Id., "Australian Group Relations," *Smithsonian Report*, 1883, p. 807; Id., "On the Organisation of Australian Tribes," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Victoria* (New Series), i, Part 2, p. 126; W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 98; Id., *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 139.

regular traffic, no standard of economic exchange.[1] There is no ground for regarding presents, bestowed and accepted in connection with relations of sexual communism as having a significance which they do not possess in any other transaction. Their usual significance is that of an assurance of friendliness; and that is their manifest function in this particular case, a function therefore identical with that of the husband's assent, that is, serving as an assurance that no ulterior intentions of abduction exist. So little is the receipt of those presents mercenary that they are, we are told, commonly given away again by the husband to his friends.[2] Even a widower offers small presents to his own brothers on participating in their wives' favours.[3] On the other hand, a stranger may be offered a woman of the proper intermarriage class, who is married to another man, even though he has no presents to offer.[4]

While an evolution or transition from exclusive individual sexual rights to any form of sexual communism is a process exceedingly difficult to conceive, and one which is not illustrated or indicated by any Australian evidence, the whole of that evidence is furrowed with the traces of the converse course of events. The formal limitations on sexual communism between marriage classes, which naturally result from the coexistence of individual marriage, do not as a matter of fact appear, in such tribes as the Dieri, to constitute a bar to the access of a male to any of his female 'noas.' They, however, clearly pave the way to such restrictions. The formal control of the economic and preferential husband over the sexual life of his wife constitutes a natural transition to its reality, and to the restriction of his 'complaisance' to his own immediate associates and relatives. The equality of rights of access between all 'noas' would thus tend to become restricted to a group of brothers and sisters, and to pass from class group-marriage to sororal polygyny and fraternal polyandry, or, as Mr. Thomas calls it, "bilateral adelphic polygamy." There is no justification for drawing any sharp and fundamental distinction between the two. Mr. Thomas goes so far as to class the one under the rubric of 'promiscuity,' and the other under that of regular marriage. Such a proceeding is unwarrantable; the one is as much group-marriage as is the other. If any sharp line of demarcation is anywhere to be drawn, it is not between class group-marriage and familial group-marriage, but between polygyny and polyandry, which Mr. Thomas places in one and the same class. For both polygyny and monogamy are alike individualistic marriage institutions, in which the exclusive claims

[1] Cf. below, vol. ii, pp. 213, 214.
[2] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 185.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 181.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 235.

of the male are asserted and maintained, and which are entirely governed by his individualistic instincts and proprietary claims; whereas in polyandry, however limited, those individualistic impulses are in abeyance and are subordinated to communistic principles, whether the polyandry be fraternal or tribal.

This brings us to the consideration of the second controversial aspect of the Australian organisations. In the collective connubial relations of Australia the associates are very commonly 'own' brothers, and community of wives between 'own' brothers or 'near relatives,' appears to be in many tribes assumed as a matter of course. Yet there is nothing in Australian institutions that can suggest, or has suggested, anything resembling the fundamentally fraternal polyandrous organisations of Tibet or of the Todas. The circumstance that 'own' brothers are preferentially co-partners in collective sexual groupings or relations is a consequence, not the foundation, of Australian sexual collectivism; it is the existence of economic and preferential individual associations, or individual marriage, which creates such a fraternal family within the clan, superimposes relations of 'actual' kinship upon the traditional relations of clan-kinship, and establishes a somewhat closer connection between 'own' than between tribal brothers in general. Had Australian social organisation developed out of individual family institutions, we should expect the exact reverse of such an evolution and of those relations. Strictly fraternal polyandry would be the form of sexual communism to which the individual family group would naturally give rise, on the hypothesis that "the Urabunna custom may very well have developed out of ordinary individual marriage,"[1] if from any cause the surrender of individual claims became necessary. That fraternal polyandry might conceivably become extended so as to include other members of the clan; but the fraternal or family-group would remain the foundation of the collective sexual organisation. Of any such evolution there is not the slightest trace or indication; on the contrary, Australian organisation remains conspicuously one of collective classes; the fraternal group, the family itself, remains an unrecognised and, indeed, nameless accretion within the collective marriage-class organisation. What determines eligibility to communal sexual relations is not the 'actual' fraternal relationship, but the marriage-class relation.

As I have remarked, the 'pirrauru' and similar institutions constitute one item only in the all-pervading difference which marks in Australian aboriginal society the relation between members of corresponding intermarrying groups and individuals who are not so related; it is that difference, and not the 'pirrauru'

[1] E. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*, vol. ii, p. 395.

and corresponding institutions, which constitutes the significant feature of those social organisations. Relations between males and females belonging to the same marriage-group are invariably prohibited under the most severe penalties, whether the female be married or unmarried. Thus such relations with an unmarried girl, even with her full consent, are in Queensland, as elsewhere in Australia, punished with death. On the other hand, if a man forcibly rapes an unprotected girl who belongs to the class into which he may marry, " no one bothers himself about the matter." [1] Similarly, with regard to the sexual hospitality which it is customary to offer to a visitor; a man habitually lends his wife to a visitor who belongs to the same, or to an homonymous, marriage class as himself, but he will not lend her unless she belongs to the marriage-class into which the visitor might marry.[2] As regards the right of access at ordinary times, it is, among the north-central Queensland tribes, open at any time not only to blood-brothers, not only to members of any ' pirrauru ' group, but to any man who belongs to the corresponding marriage-class with whom the woman may marry. " If any aboriginal requires a woman temporarily for venery, he borrows a wife from her husband for a night or two in exchange for boomerangs, a shield, food, etc. The husband

[1] W. E. Roth, *Ethnological Studies among the North-West-Central Queensland Aborigines*, p. 182.

[2] W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 74 sq., 101, 106 sq.; Id., *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 140 sq. As Sir W. B. Spencer and Mr. Gillen point out, it is obviously difficult to distinguish in such cases between a claim to access and ordinary savage hospitality, since a man could not be offered a woman of the same class as himself. Mr. Thomas naturally dwells upon the ambiguity: " Clearly, if intercourse is permitted only between certain persons before marriage and only certain persons are allowed to marry, we can hardly be surprised to find that these latter are restricted in the choice of men to whom they may lend their wives after marriage. The surprising thing would be if it were otherwise " (N. W. Thomas, *op. cit.*, p. 147). But that is not quite what our information tells us. Although the member of a given marriage-class is restricted from intercourse within the group, and is normally married to a woman of the corresponding marriage-class, there does not exist any bar or restriction to his intercourse with females of quite different groups. Yet in the exercise of hospitality not only is a man not offered a woman who belongs to the one group with which he is forbidden to marry, but he is assigned a woman of that particular group with which his own normally intermarries. Thus, when " a stranger arrives at a Dieri encampment from some neighbouring tribe, the first question put to him is, ' What is your totem ? ' This being ascertained, his totemic brethren take charge of him, protect him, and treat him with hospitality, even to the extent of providing him with a temporary wife of that totem with which his own intermarries " (A. W. Howitt, " Australian Group Relations," *Smithsonian Report*, 1883, pp. 803 sq.; cf. W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 74 sq.).

looks upon it as a point of honour to oblige his friend, the greatest compliment that can be paid to him, provided that permission is previously asked." [1]

The relations between members of corresponding marriage classes are thus entirely different from those between other men and women. The former are called 'spouses' (husband or wife), in the language of the central tribes of the Fincke river, 'noa.' "'Noa,' means spouse or partner; 'noa iltja,' real spouse, with whom a person cohabits. Ordinarily they leave out the word 'iltja,' and do not use it, because they all know among themselves who is personally related." [2] The term, and the corresponding terms by which the relation between individuals of the opposite sex belonging to corresponding marriage-classes, are denoted in Australia, and wherever the 'classificatory' system is in use, mean equally 'spouse'—'husband' or 'wife.' There is among the central Australian tribes no special term for 'actual wife' or for 'actual husband'; the term 'noa' among the Dieri tribes, and the corresponding terms, such as 'nupa' among the Urabunna, 'abaija' among the Kunandaburi, apply equally to all members of the opposite sex in corresponding marriage-classes. Those terms are commonly interpreted in English by the terms 'potential' wife or 'potential' husband. Dr. Howitt himself thus translates the term 'noa.' [3] But that translation is an inaccurate makeshift and is apt to be profoundly misleading; and, in fact, much of the controversial disputations concerning Australian group-relations turn upon the misconceptions created by the misleading expression 'potential' wife. By 'potential' wife we most naturally understand a woman whom a man would be at liberty to marry; all the unmarried women in England, with the exception of the few within the prohibited degrees, are juridically the 'potential' wives of any unmarried man. The term 'noa' and the corresponding terms mean that relation, but they also mean, as we have just seen, a great deal more. For an Englishman to ravish an unmarried girl who is his 'potential wife' is a very serious criminal offence; for the Australian the relationship of 'noa' gives him an acknowledged right to do so with impunity. A woman in England ceases to be a man's 'potential wife' when she marries another; among Australian tribes she does not. The fact that a woman is the 'potential wife' of an Englishman does not give him any right

[1] W. E. Roth, *Ethnological Studies among the North-West-Central Queensland Aborigines*, p. 182.

[2] L. Schulze, "The Aborigines of the Upper and Middle Fincke River; their Habits and Customs," *Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Society of South Australia*, xiv, p. 224. Cf. A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 165; S. Gason, *The Dieyerie Tribe of Australian Aborigines*, p. 45.

[3] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 165.

of access to her unless he marries her; the fact that a woman is 'noa' to him gives an Australian native a recognised claim to sexual access whether he marries, or contemplates marrying, the woman or not, as well as whether the woman is already married or not. There are, to be sure, certain limitations and restrictions on those rights of access of a man to any woman who is 'noa' to him, in particular the claims of the individual husband to whom she may be married. But since, as we have seen, there are no restrictions before her marriage, and the only restriction afterwards is the need to obtain her husband's consent, which "is seldom withheld," it does not appear that in any instance they constitute a very serious bar. The claim to access rests, and is conditional, upon the 'noa' relationship.

"If intercourse has been with a woman who belongs to the class from which his wife comes, he is called 'atna nylkna' (which, literally translated, is vulva-thief); if with one with whom it is unlawful for him to have intercourse, then he is called 'iturka,' the most opprobrious term in the Arunta tongue. In the one case he has merely stolen property, in the other he has offended against tribal law."[1] The accurate and juridic definition of the relationship as at present existing in Australian tribes is, thus, not at all covered by the term 'potential wife.' It would be more accurately rendered by the term 'facultative' wife; and it might be defined by the fact that in no circumstances do sexual relations with a woman who is 'noa' constitute a juridic offence or a breach of tribal law. Such relations may no doubt be greatly resented by the husband of the woman, if previous consent has not been obtained; but we hear of no instance in which such a grievance is regarded as a justifiable ground for action upheld by tribal law.[2] We have, as far as I am aware, no definite statement on that point as regards Australian tribes. But we may, I think, judge fairly of the juridic position by reference to Melanesian society in which exactly the same relationship is the foundation of social organisation. Dr. Codrington, as will be remembered, defines with admirable clearness that relationship: "Speaking generally it may be said that to a Melanesian man all women of his own generation at least, are either sisters or wives, to the Melanesian woman all men are either brothers or husbands. . . . It must not be understood that a Melanesian regards all women

[1] W. P. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 99.

[2] There exists here, as in a large proportion of ethnological evidence, an ambiguity, which we shall have to consider elsewhere, between 'adultery' and 'abduction.' Abduction of a man's wife is a juridic offence, with certain limits, even if the abductor is 'noa' to the woman. But there is no evidence that adultery is.

who are not of his own division as, in fact, his wives, or conceives himself to have rights which he may exercise in regard to those women of them who are unmarried; but the women who may be his wives by marriage and those who cannot possibly be so, stand in a widely different relation to him."[1] Dr. Codrington, it will be seen, although believing that the Melanesian organisation points very strongly to a past social state in which the relationship represented an unrestricted and recognised right of access between members of the corresponding marriage-classes, regards the relation as it exists at the present day as corresponding to the conception of 'potential' spouseship by which the corresponding Australian relation has been defined. The terms 'husband' and 'wife,' which are applied in Melanesian society to all members of the corresponding marriage-classes were understood by Dr. Codrington to mean at the present day, whatever they may have meant in the past, no more than the relation of a European man to any of the women whom he might legally marry. But it would appear that even in Melanesian society at the present day, although exclusive individual marriage rights are far more firmly consolidated there than anywhere in Australia, the "widely different relation" is not accurately covered by that definition. That "widely different relation" still differs entirely from any distinction existing in European society between the relation of a man to the women he may marry and to those he may not. A native of the New Hebrides, who had been imported as a labourer into Fiji, under that detestable system of kidnapping, which is still in force in Melanesia, and which is a disgrace to British rule, was charged before a European court of law with the murder of a woman with whom he had been cohabiting. "The prisoner," says the stipendiary magistrate, "after being duly cautioned, made a voluntary statement to the effect that he was *bound* to kill the woman, because she had admitted men whom the law of their land forbade her. If she had intercourse with a dozen men of the same clan as himself, he could have no objection."[2]

Our reports justify us, I think, in assuming that the 'noa' and equivalent relationships in Australian tribes are, to say the least, not regarded more severely than in the New Hebrides. Some of those reports, and by no means the least reliable and authoritative, go so far as to state expressly that in tribes like the Ucumble or the Aldolinga no restrictions of any kind exist in the relations between individuals who are in the relation of 'noa' to one another.[3] When, therefore, Mr. Thomas writes: "This 'noa' relationship is sometimes cited as a proof of group marriage. As

[1] R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians*, pp. 22 sq.
[2] L. Fison and A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, p. 65.
[3] See above, p. 737.

a matter of fact it is no more evidence of group marriage than the fact that a man is 'noa' to all the unmarried women of England except a few is proof of the existence of group marriage in England,"[1] one is tempted to regret one's ignorance of a convenient Australian substitute for the plain English designation for such a remark. Mr. Thomas himself finds that he is obliged to use the word 'noa,' not being able to discover any word in the English language by which to translate it. There is no word in English to denote the women whom an Englishman may marry, and to distinguish them from the few whom he is by birth restricted from marrying. And the reason of that deficiency in the English language is that restrictions on marriage are not established in England by birth into a marriage class, but are subsequently established by the exclusive rights of individual marriage of the woman or of the man. Between the English and the Dieri social organisation and nomenclature there is the trifling difference that in the former a woman ceases to be 'noa' to a man when she marries another, while among the Dieri she does not; and no attempt to draw a parallel between the two organisations could possibly be more unfortunate for Mr. Thomas's purpose, or could have more clearly brought out the distinction which he is concerned with explaining away.

If it is by such criticisms that the elucidation of the evolution of social institutions in Australia is thought to have been damaged, it may be hoped with some confidence that the damage is not more serious than that wrought by Mr. Thomas's ill-advised appeal to zoologists on the subject of the operation of maternal instincts and on collective motherhood, which has been already noticed.[2] Sir W. B. Spencer, who is no less distinguished as a zoologist than as an anthropologist, perceives no biological difficulty in the relation of group motherhood. "It is absolutely essential in dealing with these people," he and Mr. Gillen write, "to lay aside all ideas of relationships as we understand them. He does not, for example, discriminate between his actual father and mother and the men and women who belong to the group, each member of which might have lawfully been either his father or his mother, as the case

[1] N. W. Thomas, *Kinship Organisations and Group Marriage in Australia*, p. 129. Dr. Westermarck has been inspired by that argument to imitate it. "Like Fison and Howitt, Spencer and Gillen are only too apt to confound present marriageability with actual marriage in the past, and, as Dr. Malinowski puts it, 'describe the facts of sexual life to-day in terms of hypothetical assumptions.' They constantly apply the term 'lawful husbands' to men for whom it is merely lawful to marry a certain woman. If this is a correct use of the term, we may say that an English girl has millions of lawful husbands" (E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. iii, pp. 259 sq.).

[2] See above, p. 593 sqq.

may be. Any wrong done to his actual father or mother, or to his actual father-in-law or mother-in-law, counts for nothing whatever more than any wrong which he may have done to any man or woman who is a member of a group of individuals, any one of whom might have been his father or mother, his father-in-law or mother-in-law."[1] As the late Dr. Rivers justly pointed out, the survival of a vivid functional relation of group-motherhood, as for instance in the Banks Islands, corresponding to the nomenclature of that relationship, even though the similar functional reality of group-wifehood has, as far as we know, now disappeared there, is a very strong confirmation that the latter relation was regarded as no less actual than the former.[2] 'Classificatory motherhood,' Mr. Thomas takes the trouble to explain, refers to a social relation. So does 'classificatory' wifehood.

Amid so many futile expressions of opinion from theorists concerning the evidential value of terms of relationship in Australia, it is only fair that the view of an Australian native on that question should be given a place. In South Australia, says the Rev. J. Bulmer, "according to the way a black reckons relationship, a brother's wife is not a sister-in-law, but a 'preppa woorkat,' i.e., 'another wife.'" Mr. Bulmer, like Mr. Thomas and the 'anti-groupmarriagers,' assumed that this could, of course, hold "only in name." He, however, was considerably troubled in mind about the matter, and for a long time repeatedly expostulated with various natives about the absurdity and unsuitableness of their system of nomenclature. Australian natives are, like all savages, notorious for the civility with which they will agree with their interlocutors, and accommodate their answers to their views. Mr. Bulmer, however, came at last upon a native of unusual spirit and outspoken independence of mind. On the reverend gentleman pointing out to him the absurdity of the native 'classificatory' system, this exceptional native turned round on his interlocutor and declared that it was the European system which was absurd. "Why should I be so foolish," he said, "as to call my wife's sister, 'sister?' She is *not* my sister, and she *is* my wife."[3]

It is usually represented by writers who are anxious to discredit

[1] W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 95 sq.

[2] W. H. R. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society*, vol. ii, pp. 137, 139.

[3] J. Bulmer, "Some Account of the Aborigines of the Lower Murray, Wimmera, Gippsland, and Maneroo," *Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society of Australasia* (*Victoria Branch*), v, part i, pp. 23 sq. I have adapted the words of my authority, as their grammatical construction is unsuitable; lest I should be thought to have taken any undue liberty in editing them, I here give them as they stand: "One man pointed out the folly of calling a wife's sister a sister, because, says he, she is not. She is your wife."

the results of Australian ethnology, and the conclusions to which they have led those who have investigated them, that those conclusions are based not so much upon the actual usages and social organisation found among Australian tribes, as upon the names in use to denote relationship, and that it is to these 'classificatory' terms that "the hypothesis of Australian group-marriage practically owes its origin."[1] But it may be pointed out that the essential facts of the sexual organisation obtaining at the present day among Australian tribes, namely, the recognised accessibility of any female belonging to a given marriage class to males of the corresponding class, independently of the circumstance of individual marriage, was noted and described exactly thirty-nine years before the so-called 'classificatory' system was made known to the scientific world by L. H. Morgan, and nearly fifty years before Mr. Fison put forward his memorable exposition of his views on Australian group-marriage.[2] As Dr. Howitt justly states, it is, on the contrary, by the rules regulating the relations between the sexes at the present day among Australian tribes that the significance of the 'classificatory' terms of relationship, which are found elsewhere more or less dissociated from those rules and usages, is elucidated.[3] The evidential value of the terms of relationship, if it were isolated and unsupported by any proof of their correspondence with actual relations, would have to be regarded as affording no more than a presumption or probability, and I am disposed to distrust profoundly conclusions that are based upon linguistic evidence alone. But nowhere is the 'classificatory' or tribal system of nomenclature found to be a hollow linguistic fact; everywhere, on the contrary, it corresponds to the deepest and most fundamental facts of the social organisation of the people who employ it. As Sir George Grey remarked very clearly in reference to the natives of Western Australia, "their laws are principally made up of sets of obligations due from members of the same great family towards one another, which obligations of family names are much stronger than those of blood."[4] That correspondence between the nomenclature of relationship and social facts varies in extent among the uncultured peoples who employ that nomenclature. With many, while the tribal nomenclature of relations survives, tribal

[1] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. iii, p. 258.

[2] Scott Nind's investigations among the natives of Western Australia were carried out in 1829 and published by the Royal Geographical Society in 1832; L. H. Morgan's monumental work on *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family* was published in 1871, and Mr. L. Fison's work on Australian group marriage in 1880.

[3] A. W. Howitt, "Australian Group-Relationship," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxxvii, p. 284.

[4] G. Grey, *Journals of Two Expeditions of Discovery in North-West and Western Australia*, vol. ii, pp. 230 sq.

social relations and organisations have to a large extent yielded to family relationship and organisation. In that transition the actual relations between facultative spouses, that is, members of intermarriage groups, have doubtless been the first to become modified under the influence of individual economic association, and of the group of blood-relations consequently formed within the clan. With a number of uncultured races who retain tribal terms of relationship, those terms which have reference to marriage relationship have to a large extent, though seldom wholly, become nominal and formal. That may perhaps be the case among some Australian tribes. Among the majority they represent a relation which is neither nominal, formal, nor 'potential.'[1]

The distinctions which we have noticed in the juridic relations, as regards sexual accessibility, between persons who stand in the 'noa' relation and those who do not does not refer to any hypothetical condition in the past, but to the relations as they are understood to exist at the present day. Of actual 'group marriage' relations in the sense of regular, recognised and habitual sexual cohabitation, we have evidence only in the 'pirrauru' and similar institutions, and in the communism of wives between brothers and of husbands between sisters prevalent among

[1] In the discussion of so keenly controverted a question we are bound to confine ourselves to the actual data furnished by the reports which constitute the evidence. I have, however, little doubt that the correspondence between the terms denoting facultative spouseship and the sexual relations actually obtaining in the majority of Australian tribes is considerably greater than has been claimed even by Dr. Howitt. That conclusion is founded upon the following considerations. The intrinsic difficulties of the enquiry render it almost impossible to obtain a definite statement that may serve to justify a scientific affirmation. It is notorious that the Australian natives will invariably adapt their answers to what they suppose to be the views or standards of the enquirer (S. Gason, *The Dieyerie Tribe of Australian Aborigines*, p. 12); and since European condemnation of sexual licence is known to all natives, any information derived from them must necessarily tend to deny rather than reveal its extent. The utmost confusion arises from observers not drawing any distinction between 'adultery' and 'abduction' (see below, vol. ii, pp. 100 sq.); there is no evidence that the former is resented apart from the risk of the latter, and there is much evidence to show that it never is. We have, finally, reliable statements from observers having the best opportunity of accurate knowledge and no theories to uphold definitely asserting that every female of an associated marriage class is accessible to a male of the corresponding class (above, p. 737; cf. below, vol. ii, pp. 60 sqq.). Taking the above facts into consideration, there can be little doubt that the 'noa relation' represents even at the present day far more than a 'potential' or 'facultative' one, and that the claim which it expresses may be said to be in every instance actually exercised. Dr. Krefft states that before contracting individual associations every female "has connexion with every member of the tribe" (see below, vol. ii, p. 60). There is no evidence that those relations are substantially altered by individual marriage.

Australian tribes in every region of the continent. But it is not on any system of fraternal-sororal polygamy, in the sense of the family terms of relationship, that Australian social organisations and established usages are founded. The marriage-classes, and not the fraternal family, are the foundation of Australian native society. And it would require very strong and conclusive evidence to render it even probable that the existing distinctions which mark the relation between members of the intermarriage-classes have resulted from an original organisation of individual marriage that has left no trace in the clan organisation and that has no name, but which, it is suggested, has degenerated into a class communism manifested in the entirely different relations between members and non-members of the same intermarriage-class, and which is embodied in the whole structure of every existing Australian tribe. The particular interest and significance presented by the Australian social organisations lies, in truth, in the fact that from the moment it is recognised that they cannot have developed out of a system of individual marriage carrying with it exclusive sexual rights, but must from the first have been collective and polyandrous, there is no alternative but to conclude that the collective marriage groups were originally coextensive with the intermarriage classes at present existing, and corresponded to the relations indicated by the nomenclature of relationship in those groups. For there is a total absence of any indication of groups or relationships of any other kind, apart from those created by the relation of individual marriage, but not as yet registered in the language or in the usages of the aborigines.

Interesting and highly important as the Australian evidence undoubtedly is, it would be quite incorrect to regard the interpretation of the development of marriage institutions in other parts of the world as depending upon it. Yet, curiously enough, both Mr. Thomas, after preconising the importance of monographic studies as a foundation for conclusions of general applicability, and Dr. Westermarck, after virtually declining to take that evidence into account, conclude by uttering warnings against drawing general conclusions from it, even should it not, after all, have, as they assert, fallen to the ground. "Even suppose, however," says Dr. Westermarck, "that group marriage really was once common in Australia, would that prove that it was once common among mankind at large? Mr. Howitt's supposition that the practice of group marriage 'will be ultimately accepted as one of the primitive conditions of mankind' is no doubt shared by a host of anthropologists. The group marriage theory will probably for some time to come remain the residuary legatee of the old theory of promiscuity; the important works which have lately been published on the Australian aborigines

have made people inclined to view the early history of mankind through Australian spectacles. But even the most ardent advocate of Australian group marriage should remember that the existence of kangaroos in Australia does not prove that there were once kangaroos in England."[1] Dr. Westermarck's jocular admonition is, like most of his excursions into the domain of biology, extremely unfortunate. To the truly scientific mind the discovery of the strange marsupial fauna of Australia, differing as it does so profoundly from the mammalian faunas of other parts of the world, would most certainly suggest that, in spite of that apparent singularity, even the mammals existing at the present day in England may not be altogether unrelated to the marsupials found in Australia, and that possibly animals similar to the Australian kangaroo may even have existed in England. And that surmise, which presented itself to the mind of several biologists when the fauna of Australia became known to them, has proved in the event to be entirely justified. For, as Dr. Westermarck would appear to be unaware, no less than twenty-three different species of marsupial mammals have actually been found in the Oligocene deposits of the south of England and northern France.[2] Similarly, the existence of group-marriage in Australia does suggest that like institutions may have preceded the forms of marriage contract now existing in England, and that even in England forms of the institution resembling those found among the Australian aborigines may once have existed. And, in fact, if we turn to the first account ever published of the marriage usages of the inhabitants of Britain, by no less distinguished a reporter than Julius Caesar, we come upon an account of them which bears a close resemblance to that given of the usages of the Australian tribes by modern investigators. "In their domestic life," says Caesar of the aborigines of Great Britain, "they practise a form of community of wives, ten or twelve men combining in groups, especially brothers with brothers, and fathers with sons."[3]

The foregoing survey shows that, however rare collective sexual organisations may be at the present day, they are by no means so rare as might be supposed, and that there is scarcely a portion of the habitable globe where those forms of sexual association or the evidence of their recent existence are not to be found. That those institutions are not more commonly met with at the

[1] E. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of Moral Idea*, vol. ii, p. 396.

[2] E. Ray Lankester, art. "Marsupials," in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. xvii, p. 783.

[3] Caesar, *De Bello Gallico*, v. 14. Cf. above, pp. 695 sq.

present day is, of course, no argument against their having been once general. It would be as legitimate to urge that, since the use of flint implements is now very rare and that of Sheffield cutlery very general, primitive humanity must have used Sheffield cutlery. The remarkable fact is not that collective sexual organisations are now rare, but that they have survived at all down to the present time. Those organisations cannot, in the great majority of instances, be interpreted as sporadic and adventitious aberrations, for they are intimately bound up with the whole social organisation of the peoples among whom they obtain. The only favouring factor which appears to be common to all is the comparative isolation and segregation of the peoples among whom they survive. Those institutions are often met with among mountain and highland populations, who are less subject to the influence of social and political changes than the peoples of the plains. "Civilisation is a daughter of the plains; the mountains seem to impart something of their immutability to the populations that dwell therein."[1] And it is certainly not among hill peoples that we should look for aberrations, innovations, eccentricities, or abnormalities.

But the recognition of the collective claims of all the males of a group, familial or tribal, to the sexual partners of their fellow-members, is far more general than actual polyandrous organisation. That sexual relations between a man and his brothers' wives or his wife's sisters do not constitute adultery, or, even where they are condemned, disallowed, and resented, do not constitute so grave a misdemeanour as the adultery of a stranger, may be said to be the general rule rather than the exception in uncultured societies. The stranger himself who, as an accepted guest, is assimilated to a tribal brother, is commonly regarded as entitled to sexual hospitality. Taken together all such facts go to confirm the conclusion which we reached on other grounds that the regulation of collective sexual relations between given groups has everywhere preceded any regulation of those relations between individual members of those groups.

The Levirate.

The indications of the universality of those principles and organisations are far wider in their distribution than is their actual observance at the present day; for if the rule of fraternal succession to a deceased brother's widow, or 'levirate' custom, "proved to be a survival of polyandry, we should certainly be compelled to conclude that this form of marriage was at one time

[1] G. Bonvalot, *En Asie Centrale: Du Kohistan à la Caspienne*, p. 35.

very common." [1] The custom is, indeed, wellnigh universal in its distribution.[2]

[1] E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. iii, pp. 208 sq. There appears to be some slight inconsistency between the remark and the same writer's assertion that "even if the various customs which—in my opinion without sufficient reason—have been represented as relics of group-marriage really were so, its former universality would still have to be proved" (*ibid.*, vol. iii, p. 266). Polyandry is not necessarily group-marriage, but the levirate has certainly been represented as a survival of it.

[2] NORTH AMERICA: H. W. Klutschak, *Als Eskimo unter den Eskimo*, p. 234; I. Petroff, "Report on the Population, etc., of Alaska," *Tenth Census of the United States*, vol. viii, p. 158 (Aleuts); *ibid.*, p. 69; H. J. Holmberg, "Ethnographische Skizzen über die Volker des russischen Amerika," *Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae*, iv, p. 316; A. Krause, *Die Tlinkit Indianen*, p. 221; G. M. Dawson, "On the Haida Indians of the Queen Charlotte Islands," *Geological Survey of Canada: Reports of Exploration and Surveys*, 1878–79, p. 134B; C. Hill Tout, "Report on the Ethnology of the Stlatlumh of British Columbia," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxv, p. 133; F. Boas, "Second Report on the Indians of British Columbia," *Report of the Sixtieth Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science* (Leeds, 1890), pp. 24, 91; J. Teit, *The Thompson Indians of British Columbia*, pp. 326, 591; H. H. Bancroft, *The Native Races of the Pacific States of North America*, vol. i, pp. 169, 591; M. Venegas, *A Natural and Civil History of California*, vol. i, p. 82; F. X. Clavigero, *Storia della California*, vol. i, p. 131; S. Powers, *Tribes of California*, p. 256; R. B. Dixon, "The Northern Maidu," *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*, xvii, part iii, pp. 239, 241; Id., "The Shasta," *ibid.*, xviii, Part v, p. 463; Id., *The Chimariko Indians*, p. 301; P. Steadman Sparkman, *The Culture of the Luiseño Indians*, p. 214; A. G. Morice, "The Western Dené, their Manners and Customs," *Proceedings of the Canadian Institute, Toronto*, iii[d] Series, vii, p. 122; D. Cameron, in L. R. Masson, *Les Bourgeois de la Compagnie du Nord-Ouest*, vol. ii, p. 252; N. Perrot, *Mémoire sur les coutumes*, etc., *des Sauvages*, p. 27; W. H. Keating, *Narrative of an Expedition to the Source of St. Peter's River*, vol. ii, pp. 166 sq. G. Heriot, *Travels through the Canadas*, p. 330; G. B. Grinell, *Blackfoot Lodge Tales*, p. 218; W. Jones, "The Central Algonkin," *American Archaeological Report, Toronto*, 1906, p. 325; T. Ashe, *Travels in America*, p. 250; T. Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, vol. iii, p. 110 (Algonkin tribes); J.-B. Lafitau, *Moeurs des sauvages amériquains*, vol. i, p. 560; F. X. de Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, vol. v, p. 419; R. H. Lowie, "The Assiniboine," *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History*, iv, Part i, p. 41; J. O. Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," *Third Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, pp. 243 sq., 261; Id., "Siouan Sociology," *ibid.*, *Fifteenth Report*, p. 244; J. Mooney, *The Siouan Tribes of the East*, pp. 14 sqq.; E. James, *Account of an Expedition to the Rocky Mountains*, vol. i, pp. 116, 243; W. Matthews, *Ethnology and Philology of the Hidatsa Indians*, p. 53; G. A. Dorsey, "Organisation of the Skidi Pawnee," *Compte-Rendu du Congrès International des Américanistes*, xve Session, vol. ii, p. 73; J. Adair, *History of the American Indians*, pp. 189 sq.; J. Gregg, *Commerce of the Prairies*, vol. ii, p. 248; A. C. Fletcher and F. La Flesche, "The Omaha Tribe," *Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology*, p. 313; J. R. Swanton, "Indian Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley," *American Bureau of Ethnology*, Bulletin 43, p. 95 (Siouan Tribes); G. Gibbs, *Tribes of Western Washington and North-Western Oregon*, p. 199; A. L. Kroeber, "The Arapaho," *Bulletin*

The connection of the levirate custom with fraternal polyandry is not a theoretical conjecture, for the former is invariably continuous

of the American Museum of Natural History, xviii, p. 14; J. G. Bourke, "Notes on the Gentile Organisation of the Apaches of Arizona," *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, iii, p. 118; F. Russell, "The Pima Indians," *Twenty-Sixth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology*, p. 184.

CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA: G. de Mendieta, *Historia ecclesiastica indiana*, vol. ii, p. 29; J. de Torquemada, *Veinte y un libros rituales y Monarchia Indiana*, vol. ii, pp. 377 sq., 380, 388; M. Veytia, *Historia antigua de Mejico*, vol. iii, p. 224; E. C. Brasseur de Bourbourg, *Histoire des nations civilisées du Mexique*, vol. ii, pp. 571 sq.; H. H. Bancroft, *The Native Races of the Pacific States*, vol. i, p. 730 (Mosquito Indians); F. S. Gilii, *Saggio di storia americana*, vol. i, p. 251; R. Schomburgh, *Reisen in Britisch-Guiana*, vol. ii, p. 447; H. Coudreau, *Chez nos Indiens*, p. 128; F. A. A. Simons, "An Exploration of the Goajira Peninsula," *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society*, N.S., vii, p. 792; R. E. Latcham, "Ethnology of the Araucanos," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxxix, p. 360; O. Stoll, "Die Ethnologie der Indianerstämme von Guatemala," *Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, i, Supplement, p. 7; R. Karsten, *Contributions to the Sociology of the Indian Tribes of Ecuador*, p. 75; R. Southey, *History of Brazil*, vol. i, p. 241; vol. ii, p. 669; J. Chantre y Herrera, *Historia de las misiones de la Compañía de Jesús en el Marañon español*, p. 73; M. Schmidt, "Über das Recht der tropische Naturvölker Südamerikas," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*, xiii, p. 299; C. F. Ph. von Martius, *Beiträge zur Ethnologie und Sprachenkunde Amerikas*, vol. i, pp. 117, 353, 393, 691; J. B. von Spix and C. F. Ph. von Martius, *Reise in Brasilien*, vol. iii, p. 1339 (Mundrucu); S. de Vasconcellos, *Noticias curiosas dos cousas do Brazil*, p. 134; N. de Techo, "The History of the Provinces of Paraguay, Tucuman, Rio de la Plata, Parana, Guaira and Urvaica," in Churchill, *Collection of Voyages and Travels*, vol. iv, p. 721; A. Ruiz de Montoya, *Conquista espiritual en las provincias de Paraguay, Parana, Uruguay y Tape*, p. 13; J. M. Cooper, "Analytical and Critical Bibliography of the Tribes of Tierra del Fuego and Adjacent Territory," *Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin No.* 63, p. 165; C. R. Gallardo, *Los Onas*, p. 214.

AFRICA: M. Kranz, *Natur- und Kulturleben der Zulus*, p. 105; D. Kidd, *The Essential Kafir*, p. 226; J. Shooter, *The Kafirs of Natal*, pp. 46, 86; E. Casalis, *The Basutos*, p. 190; J. Macdonald, "Manners, Customs, and Religions of South African Tribes," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xix, p. 272; C. R. Conder, "The Present Condition of the Native Tribes of Bechuanaland," *ibid.*, xvi, p. 85; D. Livingstone, *Missionary Travels and Researches*, p. 185; H. A. Junod, *The Life of a South African Tribe*, vol. i, pp. 236, 248; E. Dannert, *Zum Rechte der Herero*, p. 38; A. Werner, *The Natives of British Central Africa*, p. 133; G. A. Fischer, "Das Wapokomo-Land und seine Bewohner," *Mitteilungen der geographischen Gesellschaft zu Hamburg*, 1879, p. 28; J. Macdonald, *Africana*, vol. i, p. 135; J. Roscoe, *The Soul of Central Africa*, p. 89; Id., *The Northern Bantu*, p. 114; Id., *The Banyankole*, p. 152; J. Cunningham, *Uganda and its Peoples*, p. 322; W. E. H. Barrett, "Notes on the Customs and Beliefs of the Wa-Giriamas, etc., of British East Africa," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xli, p. 31; G. Lindblom, *The Akamba*, p. 84; K. R. Dundas, "The Wawanga and other Tribes of the Elgin District, British East Africa," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii, p. 56; J. H. Weeks, *Among a Primitive People, the Bakongo*, p. 148; R. P. van Wing, *Études Bakongo*, p. 189; Delhaise, *Les Wabemba*, p. 19; R. P. Colle, *Les Baluba*, pp. 415 sq.;

with the latter usage wherever this is practised. The observance of the levirate is, in fact, particularly uniform and rigorous, whether

R. Schmitz, *Les Baholoholo*, pp. 225 sq.; F. Gaud, *Les Mandja*, p. 309; C. van Overbergh, *Les Basonge*, p. 303; Id., *Les Mangbetu*, p. 363; C. Delhaise, *Les Warega*, p. 203; J. van den Plas, *Les Kuku*, p. 263; J. Halkin, *Les Ababua*, p. 323; A. Hutereau, *Notes sur la vie familiale et juridique de quelques populations du Congo Belge*, p. 6; R. H. Nassau, *Fetichism in West Africa*, p. 6; A. B. Ellis, *The Ewe-Speaking Peoples*, p. 205; Id., *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples*, p. 116; G. Zündel, "Land und Volk de Eween auf der Sclavenküste in Westafrika," *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin*, xii, p. 390; H. O'Sullivan, "Dinka Laws and Customs," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl, p. 184; S. Johnson, *The History of the Yoruba*, p. 116; W. Reade, *Savage Africa*, p. 455; Bérenger-Ferraud, *Les peuples de la Sénégambie*, p. 43; A. Arcin, *La Guinée française*, p. 351; O. Temple, *Notes on the Tribes of the Northern Provinces of Nigeria* pp. 169, 185, 204, 227, 229, 241, 246, 250, 252, 290; P. A. Talbot, "The Bahuma of Lake Chad," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xli, p. 248; W. Munzinger, *Ostafrikanische Studien*, p. 488; R. F. Burton, *First Footsteps in East Africa*, p. 120; G. Nachtigal, *Sahara und Sudan*, vol. ii, p. 375 (Kuri); J. W. Crowfoot, "Customs of the Rubatab," *Sudan Notes and Records*, i, p. 124; Count von Gleichen, *The Anglo-Egyptian Sudan*, p. 147; J. Bruce, *Travels to Discover the Sources of the Nile*, vol. ii, p. 225.

Asia: W. Bogoras, *The Chukchee*, p. 607; G. W. Steller, *Beschreibung von dem Lande Kamtschatka*, p. 347; W. Jochelson, *The Koryak*, p. 748; P. S. Pallas, *Reise durch verschiedene Provinzen des russichen Reichs*, vol. iii, p. 51; N. Seeland, "Die Ghiliaken," *Russische Revue*, xxi, p. 127; M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, p. 106 (Tungus), 120 (Buryat); B. Laufer, "Preliminary Notes on Exploration among the Amoor Tribes," *The American Anthropologist*, N.S., ii, p. 322; M. A. Castrén *Ethnologische Vorlesungen über die altaischen Völker*, p. 119; P. S. Pallas, *op. cit.*, vol. iii, p. 51 (Ostiak); J. M. Dixon, "The Tsuishikari Ainos," *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, xi, Part i, p. 44; L. Dubeux and Valmont, *Tartarie*, p. 289; L. Koslow, "Das Gewohnheitsrecht der Kirghissen," *Russische Revue* xxi, p. 470; J. G. Georgi, *Description de toutes les nations de l'Empire de Russie*, vol. i, p. 6; F. Grenard, *Tibet*, p. 253 (Turkoman Tartars); J. de Guignes, *Histoire des Huns, etc.*, vol. i, Part ii, p. 16; A. C. Borheck, *Erdbeschreibung von Asien*, vol. ii, p. 47; H. W. Bellew, *Journal of a Mission to Afghanistan*, p. 27; Xavier Raymond, *Afghanistan*, p. 38; A. von Haxthausen, *Transcaucasia*, p. 403 (Ossetes); L. Dubeux and Valmont, *Tartarie*, p. 369 (Baluchis); H. Pottinger, *Travels in Beloochistan and Sinhe*, pp. 68, 70; A. H. Savage Landor, *In the Forbidden Land*, vol. ii, p. 64; C. A. Sherring, *Western Tibet and the British Borderland*, p. 88; A. H. Diack, *Gazetteer of the Kangra District*, part ii, pp. 82 sq.; J. Biddulph, *Tribes of the Hindoo-Koosh*, p. 76; G. S. Robertson, *The Káfirs of Hindu Kush*, p. 535; T. Shaw, "On the Inhabitants of the Hills near Rajamahall," *Asiatick Researches*, iv, pp. 50 sq.; S. Rendle, *The Kacharis*, p. 29; J. E. Friend-Pereira, "The Rabhas," in *Census of India*, 1911, vol. iii, "Assam," p. 143; E. T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal*, p. 273; J. Wise, *Notes on the Races, Castes and Tribes of Eastern Bengal*, p. 125; E. A. Gait, in *Census of India*, 1911, vol. i, "India," pp. 247 sq.; W. Crooke, *The Tribes and Castes of the North-West Provinces and Oudh*, vol. iv, p. 224; R. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, vol. ii, p. 27; vol. iii, pp. 80, 89 sq., 393, 559, vol. v, p. 366; J. Forsyth, *The Highlands of Central India*, p. 150; E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*,

as a claim or as an obligation, among those peoples with whom the custom of fraternal or clan-polyandry also obtains. Thus

p. 113; T. H. Lewin, *The Wild Races of South-East India*, p. 234; L. K. Anantha Krisha Iyer, *The Cochin Tribes and Castes*, vol. i, p. 148; F. Fawcett, "On the Saroas," *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Bombay*, i, p. 234; C. G. and B. Z. Seligman, *The Veddas*, p. 69; J. Anderson, *Report of an Expedition to Yunan*, p. 128; J. G. Scott and J. P. Hardiman, *Gazetteer of Upper Burma*, part i, vol. i, pp. 405, 407, 467; T. C. Hodson, *The Naga Tribes of Manipur*, p. 95; G. Watt, "The Aboriginal Tribes of Manipur," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xvi, p. 355; H. Baudesson, *Indo-China and its Primitive Peoples*, p. 86; A. Gautier, "Voyage au pays des Moïs," *Cochinchine Française: Excursions et Reconnaissances*, No. 14, p. 293; Bonifacy, "Études sur les coutumes et la langue des La-Ti," *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, vi, p. 272; W. Strzoda, "Die Li auf Hainan," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xliii, p. 203; W. W. Skeat and C. O. Blagden, *Pagan Races of the Malay Peninsula*, vol. ii, p. 88; H. V. Stevens, "Mittheilungen aus dem Frauen leben der Orang Belendas, etc.," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xxviii, p. 177; J. P. Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins and Wahábys*, p. 64.

INDONESIA: W. Marsden, *The History of Sumatra*, pp. 228 sq., 260 sq.; A. L. van Hasselt, *Volksbeschrijving van Midden-Sumatra*, p. 291; A. G. Wilken, *De verspreide geschriften*, vol. i, pp. 349 sqq.; J. C. van Eerde, "Een huwelijk bij de Minangkabausche Maleiers," *Tijdschrift voor Indische taal-, land- en volkenkunde*, xliv, p. 394; F. Junghuhn, *Die Battalander auf Sumatra*, vol. ii, p. 131; E. Modigliani, *Fra i Batacchi indipendenti*, p. 28; W. Ködding, "Die Batakken auf Sumatra," *Globus*, liii, p. 91; J. von Brenner, *Besuch bei den Kannibalen Sumatras*, p. 250; J. J. Willer, "Verzameling der Battasche wetten en instelling en in Mandhelingen Pertibie," *Tijdschrift van Neêrlands Indië*, viii, Part i, p. 174; J. B. Neumann, "Het Pane- en Bila-stroomgebeid op het eiland Sumatra," *Tijdschrift van het Nederlandsch Aadrijkskundig Genootschap*, Ser. ii, iii, pp. 240 sq.; H. F. C. Ten Kate, "Verslag eener reis in de Timor-groep en Polynesia," *ibid.*, xi, pp. 242, 343; A. G. Wilken, *op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. 341, 346 (Nias, Nufur, Ceram, Timor, Kei Islands); J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua*, pp. 41 sq. (Ambon, Ulias), 71, 96 (Ceram), 278, 280 (Timorlaut), 370, 405, 433; E. Modigliani, *L'isola delle donne* (Engano), pp. 139, 553; H. C. B. von Rosemberg, *Der Malaysche Archipel*, pp. 199 (Mentawei), 212 (Engano); Id., in *Tijdschrift voor indische taal-, land- en volkenkunde*, xiv, pp. 103 sq.; A. C. Kruijt, "De Timoriezen," *ibid.*, xix, p. 353; J. Crisp, "An Account of the Poggi Islands," *Asiatick Researches*, vi, pp. 87 sq.; C. F. Sachse, *Ceram*, p. 105; P. Drabbe, "Het heidensch huwelijk op Tanimbar," *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, lxxix, p. 552; G. W. W. C. van Hoëvell, *Ambon en meer bepaaldelijk de Oeliassers*, pp. 126 sqq.; C. F. H. Campen, "De Alfoeren van Halmahera," *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch Indië*, i, p. 284; C. M. van Schwaner, "Aanteekenigen betreffende eenige maatschappelijke instelligen en gebruiken der Dajaks van Doesson, Moerong en Siang," *Tijdschrift voor Indische taal-, land en volkenkunde*, i, p. 217; P. J. Veth, *Borneo's Western Afdeeling*, vol. ii, pp. 251, 382 sq.; M. T. H. Perelaer, *Ethnographische beschrijving der Dajaks*, p. 59; H. Low, *Sarawak*, pp. 195, 197, 335; H. Ling Roth, *The Natives of Sarawak and British North Borneo*, vol. ii, p. cxcvii; S. St. John, "Wild Tribes of the North-West Coast of Borneo," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society*, N.S., ii, p. 237; C. Hose and W. McDougall, *The Pagan Tribes of Borneo*, vol. ii, pp. 170, 183; A. W. Nieuwenhuis, *In Central Borneo*, vol. i, p. 72; O. Rutter, *British North Borneo*, p. 307.

among some Australian tribes a woman is compelled by tribal law

NEW GUINEA: P. J. B. C. Robidé van der Aa, *Reizen naar Nederlandsch Nieuw-Guinea*, p. 149; J. B. van Hasselt, in *Allgemeiner Missionszeitschrift*, iv, p. 313; A. Goudsward, *De Papoewas van de Geelvinkbai*, p. 68; C. Keysser, in R. Neuhauss, *Deutsch Neu-Guinea*, vol. iii, p. 90; F. Volmann, "Zur Psychologie, Religion, Sociologie und Geschichte der Monumbo-Papua, Deutsch Neu-Guinea," *Anthropos*, v, p. 413; R. W. Williamson, "Some unrecorded Customs of the Mekeo People of British New Guinea," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii, p. 277; C. G. Seligman, *The Melanesians of British New Guinea*, pp. 738 sq.

MELANESIA: R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians*, p. 244; R. Parkinson, *Im Bismarck-Archipel*, p. 7; H. H. Romilly, "The Islands of the New Britain Group," *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society*, N.S., ix, p. 9; D. Macdonald, *Oceania*, p. 182; F. Speiser, *Two Years with the Natives of the Western Pacific*, p. 236; A. Hagen and A. Pineau, "Les Nouvelles Hébrides," *Revue d'Ethnographie*, vii, pp. 330 sq.; W. H. R. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society*, vol. i, pp. 48, 206 (Banks Islands, Pentecost); V. de Rochas, *La Nouvelle Calédonie et ses habitants*, p. 232; T. H. Hood, *Notes of a Cruise of H.M.S. 'Fawn' in the Western Pacific*, p. 45; M. A. Legrand, *Au pays des Canaques*, p. 118; L. Moncelon, "Réponse . . . pour les Néo-Calédoniens au questionnaire de sociologie," *Bulletin de la Société d'Anthropologie*, 3e Série, ix, p. 367; B. H. Thomson, *The Fijians*, p. 186.

MICRONESIA: K. Scherzer, *Narrative of the Journey of the Novara*, vol. ii, p. 581 (Caroline Islands); P. D. Erdland, *Die Marshall Insularen*, p. 123; A. Brandeis, "Ethnographische Beobachtungen über die Narau-Insularen," *Globus*, xci, p. 77; R. Parkinson, "Beiträge zu Ethnologie der Gilbert Insularen," *Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, ii, p. 39.

POLYNESIA: W. Gunn, *The Gospel in Futuna*, p. 206; G. Turner, *Samoa*, pp. 98, 276; G. Brown, *Melanesians and Polynesians*, p. 124; W. Colenso, *On the Maori Races of New Zealand*, p. 26.

AUSTRALIA: R. Salvado, *Mémoires historiques sur l'Australie*, p. 278; A. W. Howitt, "On the Organisation of the Australian Tribes," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Victoria*, i, part ii, p. 118; Id., *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, pp. 193, 224, 227, 236, 248, 255, 266; J. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, p. 27; T. B. Wilson, *Narrative of a Voyage round the World*, p. 144; *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxiv, pp. 170, 194; G. Taplin, *The Folklore, Manners, Customs, and Languages of the South Australian Aborigines*, p. 50; L. Schulze, "The Aborigines of the Upper and Middle Finke River, their Manners and Customs," *Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Society of South Australia*, xiv, p. 241; W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 509 sq.; S. Newland, "The Parkengees, or Aboriginal Tribes on the Darling River," *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society of Australasia: South Australian Branch*, ii, p. 241; C. Lumholtz, *Among Cannibals*, pp. 160, 164; W. E. Roth, "North Queensland Ethnography, Bulletin No. 10," *Records of the Australian Museum*, vii, p. 8; G. Grey, *Journals of Two Expeditions of Discovery in North-West and Western Australia*, vol. ii, p. 230; G. F. Moore, *A Descriptive Vocabulary of the Language in common use among the Aborigines of Western Australia*, p. 57; E. M. Clerke, "On the Aborigines of Western Australia," *Report of the Sixty-first Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science* (Cardiff, 1891), p. 717; A. R. Brown, "Three Tribes of Western Australia," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii p. 158; Id., *Native Tribes of the Northern Territory of Australia*, pp. 51 sqq.; F. Bonney, "On some Customs of the Aborigines of the River Darling,

to marry her deceased husband's brother.[1] In Tibet the right of the eldest surviving brother to marry his deceased brother's wife is a legal claim which cannot be disputed. "A very painful case came before the court of the Jong Pen at Taklakot," says Mr. Savage Landor; "the husband of a Tibetan lady had died and she, being enamoured of a handsome youth some twenty years younger than herself, married him. Her husband's brother, however, came all the way from Lhasa after her, and claimed her as his wife, though he had already a better half and a large family." She strenuously endeavoured to resist the claim, but the law was against her, and the court decided that she undoubtedly belonged to her brother-in-law.[2] In Ladakh a woman has the option of being relieved from the obligation to marry her deceased husband's brothers, but in order to do so she must go through a ceremony of divorce with the deceased husband's corpse.[3] Among the Aleuts [4] and the Eskimo [5] marriage with a deceased brother's wife is regarded as an imperative obligation; and among the Tlinkit neglect to perform that duty is said to have even caused tribal feuds.[6] In all those instances the surviving brother is already the sexual associate of the woman, and the obligation to replace his late brother as her economic associate also follows naturally from that relation.[7]

The observance of the custom of fraternal succession to a brother's

New South Wales," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xiii, p. 135; E. Palmer, "Notes on some Australian Tribes," *ibid.*, p. 298.

[1] G. Taplin, *The Folklore, Manners, Customs, and Languages of the South Australian Aborigines*, p. 50; B. H. Purcell, "The Aborigines of Australia," *Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie*, 1893, p. 287.

[2] A. H. Savage Landor, *In the Forbidden Land*, vol. ii, p. 64.

[3] E. F. Knight, *Where Three Empires Meet*, p. 140.

[4] I. Petroff, "Report on the Population, Industries, and Resources of Alaska," *Tenth Census of the United States*, vol. viii, p. 158.

[5] H. W. Klutschak, *Als Eskimo unter Eskimos*, p. 234.

[6] W. H. Dall, *Alaska and its Resources*, p. 416.

[7] "The law requiring a man to take care of his sister-in-law," remarks Dr. Westermarck, "is analogous to other duties devolving on kinsfolk, such as 'vendetta,' etc.," and he cites the Tlinkits, Aleuts, Eskimo, some Australian tribes, the Gonds, the Santals in support of the statement (E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, 4th ed., p. 512. The passage is not reproduced in the 5th ed., but the same examples are cited in the like connection). The examples are certainly very extraordinary ones to quote in disputing the derivation of the levirate from fraternal polyandry, seeing that the former custom is in those cases directly continuous with the latter. Dr. Westermarck refers to the humanitarian desire that the widow should not be left unprovided for. But, although the levirate may be regarded as an obligation, that does not prevent it from being also regarded as a right. The Gonds are mentioned by Dr. Westermarck, on the authority of Mr. Forsyth, as regarding it as a pious obligation; but, according to Mr. Russell, it is so much a right that the brother can claim compensation if that right is waived (R. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, vol. ii, pp. 80 sq.).

widow bears exactly the same relation to the fraternal right of access to his wife during his lifetime as the corresponding rule of sororal succession does to a man's claim to the sisters of his wife. Thus in the same manner as, when a man marries his wife's sister no new ceremony or contract is necessary, so when a man dies leaving a widow, "the eldest brother of the deceased takes her to wife without any ceremony."[1] The rule that, in fraternal polyandry, while the younger brothers have sexual rights over the wives of their elder brothers, the latter have no recognised rights over the wives of younger brothers holds equally as regards the levirate; a younger brother may, or must, marry the widow of his elder brother, but an elder brother may not marry the widow of a younger brother.[2] But, on the other hand, in purely tribal society, where no impartite fraternal family exists, the widow may go indifferently to an older or to a younger brother.[3] Among the Shuswap, the widow is kept a prisoner until she marries her husband's brother, in the same manner as a man is kept under lock and key until he marries his deceased wife's sister.[4] The two reciprocal customs frequently coexist among the same people and are treated in precisely the same manner. With most tribes of North America the marriage of a deceased brother's wife and that of a deceased wife's sister are equally customary. Thus among the Iroquois and Hurons, "the husband, if the wife dies first, is bound to marry her sister, or, failing one, the woman whom the wife's family offer him; the wife, on the other hand, should her husband die, is obliged to do the same thing in regard to the brothers or the relatives of the husband."[5] Similarly, among the Kirghis Tartars, if a man's wife dies, her parents are bound by law to furnish another sister, or, failing one, another kinswoman; if the husband dies, his brother is in duty bound to marry the widow.[6] In fact, among the numerous peoples who observe the custom of the levirate it would be difficult, I think, to find many instances in which the custom is not associated either with the actual practice of sororal

[1] E. James, *Account of an Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains*, vol. i, p. 116. Cf. S. Johnson, *History of the Yorubas*, p. 116.

[2] W. Crooke, *The Tribes and Castes of the North-West Provinces and Oudh*, vol. i, p. cxci; C. Hayavadana Rao, "The Gonds of the Eastern Ghauts, India," *Anthropos*, v, p. 795; W. Jochelson, *The Koryak*, p. 751; W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 510; C. A. Soppitt, *A Short Account of the Kuki-Lushai Tribes of the North-East Frontier*, pp. 15 sq.

[3] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 236.

[4] F. Boas, "Second General Report on the Indians of British Columbia," *Report of the Sixtieth Meeting of the British Association*, 1890, p. 91.

[5] Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, vol. v, p. 419.

[6] L. Koslow, "Das Gewohnheitsrecht der Kirghisen," *Russische Revue*, xxi, pp. 463, 470.

polygyny or with its residual form as the right or obligation to marry a deceased wife's sister. The relation between the claim to a brother's wife after his decease and during his lifetime is thus in every respect identical with the relation between the claim to a wife's sister during the life or after the death of the former; and the custom of levirate marriage would thus appear to be as directly connected with the custom of fraternal polyandry as the custom of sororal succession with that of sororal polygyny.

Exactly parallel as are the two sets of customs, there is, nevertheless, a fundamental difference between the two situations; for women tend in certain phases of society to be regarded by the men as acquired possessions, and are, in fact, 'purchased,' whereas, save in exceptional instances, men are not 'purchased' by women and are not regarded in the same light as other proprietary belongings. The woman who has become transferred to her husband's family or clan, especially if such transfer has been effected by the payment of a consideration, is commonly regarded as permanently acquired so long as the amount of the bride-price paid for her is not refunded, and she is not released by the death of her husband, but still continues as a possession of the clan or family who have acquired her. As Dr. Lindblom very clearly observes in speaking of the Akamba of East Africa, "a man's inheritance of his brother's widow is founded, in the first place, on the conception that a woman is property for which the family has made a large outlay and from which it wishes to derive as much benefit as possible." [1] Or as an educated Yoruba explains in speaking of the custom of his own people, "women are never really married twice. . . . Once married they are attached for ever to the house and family of the deceased husband; hence it is more usual for widows to choose another husband from the same family." [2] There can be no doubt that this is the way in which the matter presents itself to a large number of the people who observe the levirate custom. But the view according to which the woman is regarded as acquired property in which not the husband alone, but his surviving brothers also have a vested interest is, after all, so closely allied to that which regards the brothers as having such a vested interest and claim on the woman even during the first husband's lifetime, as to be originally indistinguishable from it. It is a pointed comment on the interpretation of the levirate succession so lucidly set forth by Dr. Lindblom in regard to the Akamba that fraternal succession is with them, in fact, a sequel to recognised rights of access to brothers' wives during the lifetime of the former.[3]

[1] G. Lindblom, *The Akamba*, p. 163.
[2] S. Johnson, *The History of the Yoruba*, p. 116.
[3] See above, p. 717.

Juridic notions of property and of its legal transmission by inheritance are comparatively late and advanced ideas. Unless we suppose that the levirate custom did not come into use until the development of private property and of the ideas connected with it, we are compelled to conclude that the social causes which gave rise to the custom were anterior to the view of the transaction. The view taken by an Australian native of his claim to his deceased brother's wife is doubtless somewhat similar to that taken by the Yoruba. The woman has, in the first instance, been acquired to the group to which he belongs by exchange with another woman; the decease of her husband does not annul the transaction. But with the Australian natives the commercial aspect of the juridic situation cannot be, as with the Yoruba, the fundamental aspect, for no conception of barter, of commercial transactions, of acquired rights of property, and of juridic inheritance exists among the Australian aborigines. The widow remains a collective property of the group because she has never been anything else; the death of the first husband cannot, according to Australian ideas, be regarded as releasing her, as it would had the contract been a purely individual one. Even where the right of succession is founded upon the conception of permanently acquired property and of its transmission by ordinary inheritance, that view of the custom must, therefore, if we go back far enough, imply a claim anterior to any conception of acquired property and its transfer. And if the wife be assimilated to property and the levirate right to the inheritance of that property, such property in the woman must, by parity of reasoning, be regarded as having been originally communal, as is all other clan property in the most primitive stages of society, and not, unlike it, individual. The levirate custom was particularly general and was very regularly observed among the North American Indians; yet not only were conceptions of commercial transactions and of individual property as foreign to them as to the Australian aborigines, but the acquisition of a wife was not even, as among the latter, founded upon any exchange either of goods or of another female. Indeed, in an essentially matriarchal condition of society the woman enjoyed a high degree of independence, marriage was usually matrilocal, and the wife was at liberty to leave her husband and terminate the association whenever she pleased. The levirate custom cannot therefore be regarded as having been amongst them a special case of the transmission of acquired property.

But even where the custom of the levirate appears to be most readily interpretable as ordinary inheritance of property, further enquiry will show that its observance is not purely and simply governed by the laws of inheritance, and that it presents features which indicate a significance in the custom over and above that of

the transfer of property. It is mostly from Africa that examples may be drawn in support of the interpretation that the levirate custom owes its origin to the assimilation of a wife to inheritable property, that is, from the region where the acquisition of a wife has become most completely assimilated to the purchase of a slave. Yet even within the African continent the usages governing the transfer of property and the levirate custom do not accord with that interpretation. It is a very general usage among the more advanced African tribes for a man to inherit his father's wives, with the exception of his actual mother. In those instances, therefore, the laws of inheritance, instead of giving rise to or enforcing the levirate custom, have, on the contrary, abolished it. Under the matriarchal law of succession, a man's heir is not his son, but his sister's son or his brother, and the levirate rule would, in the latter instance, coincide with the rules of inheritance of property. But the manner in which the rules of inheritance and the rules of the levirate are observed in Africa itself clearly shows that the latter is not merely a special application of the former. In several instances one rule applies to the inheritance of property and another to the disposal of widows. Thus, among the Koro of northern Nigeria, "a man's property passes to his sons; his widows go to his younger brothers." [1] Or again, among the natives of Mashonaland, if a man dies during his father's lifetime, leaving no sons, it is the father who inherits all his son's property; but he cannot inherit his wives, these must go to the deceased's brothers or to his cousins.[2]

Thus the property may go one way and the widows another. Again, we find in Africa that rules are observed as regards the disposal of the widows, which have no reference to any consideration as to the juridic transmission of the deceased man's property. Thus, for example, among the Banyankole of East Africa, if a man has already as many wives as he can manage to keep, he may decline to take charge of his deceased brother's widows and permit them to marry whomsoever they choose; but he, nevertheless, retains the recognised right—which he possessed during his brother's lifetime—of access to them, and is, in fact, expected to visit them now and again as their husband, and their children are reckoned as his.[3] So, again, among the Gwari, a widow is at liberty to return to her own people and to marry whom she likes; but she is under the obligation of cohabiting, if only for three days, with the brother of her deceased husband, and the children which she subsequently bears are accounted as his.[4] Similarly in the Congo, among the

[1] O. Temple, *Notes on the Tribes, Provinces, Emirates, and States of the Northern Provinces of Nigeria*, p. 241.

[2] W. S. Taberer, "Mashonaland Natives," *Journal of the African Society*, iv, p. 329.

[3] J. Roscoe, *The Northern Bantu*, p. 114; Id., *The Banyankole*, p. 152.

[4] O. Temple, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

Baluba, a widow may be permitted to marry as she chooses, but she must first have sexual intercourse with her deceased husband's brother.[1] Among the natives of Theraka, in East Africa, a man's widows usually pass, as in many African tribes, to his sons. It is customary for the father to allot the wives to his several sons before he dies. Should he, however, die intestate, the matter is decided by a council of the chiefs and elders of the tribe, who then allot the wives to the various sons. But the decision of the court cannot take effect before a certain condition has been complied with: the brother of the deceased must first cohabit with the dead man's widow. Until that condition is fulfilled no allotment of the wives can take place, and if the rule be not observed the most terrible consequences are believed to be inevitable.[2] It is thus clear that, even where succession to a man's widow is apparently most closely assimilated to an act of inheritance, that does not constitute the whole of the conceptions that are associated with the practice.[3]

As is well known the ancient Hebrews regarded the obligation to marry a deceased brother's widow as fulfilling the purpose of 'raising seed' unto him, or of "building up the brother's house."[4] The same interpretation is given by several other peoples, both savage and cultured.[5] There is in reality no fundamental difference between that conception of the usage and the economic view which regards the woman as a permanent collective acquisition of the husband's group. Thus, for example, the Ossetes of the Caucasus hold very definitely to the latter view of the transaction. "A woman who has borne children cannot, after the death of her husband, marry again out of the family: she has been purchased, and is their property. The father or brother of the deceased may marry her, which, indeed, the Ossetes consider a matter of duty, a point of honour: they look upon it as a continuation of the first marriage, which is indissoluble."

[1] R. P. Colle, *Les Baluba*, pp. 415 sq.

[2] C. Dundas, "The History of Kitui," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii, p. 548.

[3] Dr. Lindblom, who, as we have seen, sets forth the economic interpretation of the levirate, nevertheless remarks: "Even if the boundaries seem vague, there is reason to maintain that a form of levirate exists among the Akamba side by side with the custom for the brother to take over a dead man's widow on purely practical and economic grounds" (G. Lindblom, *The Akamba*, p. 86).

[4] *Deuteronomy*, xxv. 5 sqq.

[5] E.g., A. B. Ellis, *The Yoruba-Speaking Peoples*, p. 186; J. Sibree, *The Great African Island*, p. 246; W. Crooke, *The Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh*, vol. i, p. cxc; M. Winternitz, "Notes on the 'Mahâbhârata,'" *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1897, pp. 716 sqq. Father Charlevoix ascribes the same notion to the Iroquois (*Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, vol. v, p. 419); but this is probably merely an assumption from assimilation with the Hebrew usage rather than an interpretation derived from information.

The children are reckoned as the offspring of the deceased; they bear his name and legally inherit his property. "This idea is carried out still further. If the deceased husband has left no brother or father surviving, and the widow is thus obliged to remain unmarried, she is not on that account prevented from living with other men; and any children which may result from such connections are considered the legitimate offspring of the first marriage. We had," continues Baron von Haxthausen, "an example before us: our hostess was a widow, and had three daughters by her deceased husband; he had been dead five years, but she was nursing a child less than twelve months old. This boy was the heir to the farm, bore the husband's name, and supplanted in the inheritance the daughters born in wedlock, who received nothing of their father's property, but would be eventually sold for the profit of this bastard."[1] The notion of 'raising seed' to the dead man is thus indissolubly connected in the mind of the Ossetes with the view that a woman on marriage is permanently acquired by the husband's family and that the transaction is not affected by his individual demise. The unusual, but not singular, feature in their mode of observing the levirate custom, by which the widow passes as often as not to the father of the deceased rather than to his brother, is elucidated by another usage of those people. "A father, when his son is at the age of six or eight, sometimes purchases for him, as a wife, a girl of fourteen or sixteen, and cohabits with his so-called daughter-in-law; she becomes perhaps the mother of a son, for whom, when about six years old, the nominal father again purchases a wife, and in turn lives with her."[2] Thus the Ossete father, that is, the head of the family, not only 'raises seed' unto his son after the latter's decease, but during his lifetime also; and the former usage is, in fact, a sequel to the latter. The Ossetes, with whom, as with the ancient 'Aryans' of Central Asia, the undivided fraternal household in which all property is in common is the foundation of the social order, are known beyond doubt to be the same people who in the third century were called by the Romans Alani.[3] These in turn were a tribe of the great Getae, or Massagetae.[4] Since with the latter the wives of brothers were not only regarded as their collective property from a juridic, but also from a sexual, point of view, the levirate custom is in this instance traceable, both in the economic and the Hebraic form of its interpretation, to its original source in the practice of fraternal sexual communism or polyandry.

[1] A. von Haxthausen, *Transcaucasia*, pp. 403 sq.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 402 sq.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 394; H. J. von Klaproth, *Voyage au mont Caucase et en Géorgie*, vol. ii, pp. 213 sqq.; Id., *Tableaux historiques de l'Asie*, p. 268.

[4] See above, p. 356.

Among the Dinkas the theory of raising seed to a deceased man is carried out with even greater thoroughness than by the ancient Hebrews or the Ossetes. A widow passes to her deceased husband's brother, and the children born to her are reckoned as the offspring of the dead man. If, however, the widow is barren or past the childbearing age, it is incumbent upon her to furnish a young girl to the brother or the nearest relative of the deceased, in order that he may still be able to raise seed unto her deceased husband. Further, should it happen that there is no near male relative, the widow must not only provide a girl, but also a man to act as husband to the girl, and the children are still accounted as the offspring of the deceased husband. As the substitute herself is legally regarded as occupying the position of the real widow, and as she in turn incurs also all the obligations of the latter, it is quite possible, with reasonable luck, for a man to go on procreating a family for fifty years or more after his death.[1] But that view of the function of the levirate is manifestly a speculative accretion that has grown round an immemorially established usage. No inkling of it exists among countless people who observe the custom, but do not foist the issue upon the deceased man. It is obviously not any imperative need to 'raise seed unto him' which renders it obligatory among many peoples for the widow to wait, if her late husband's brother is still an infant, for the latter to grow up, so that it is not uncommon for a boy to become, by levirate custom, the husband of a mature woman old enough to be his mother.[2] We know that fraternal polyandry was familiar to the ancient Semites.[3] In India, where the semi-religious interpretation of the levirate custom is similarly set down in Sacred Books,[4] the idea is nevertheless "entirely foreign to the custom of widow marriage as it now obtains in India. The woman is regarded as the permanent wife of the second husband, whoever he may be, and the children are held to be his."[5] The usage is, in India, certainly far more directly accountable as a relic of the customs which we have seen to have so extensively prevailed there than as derived from religious conceptions which are, on the principle of the impartite primitive Hindu family, strongly opposed to widow-

[1] H. O'Sullivan, "Dinka Laws and Customs," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl, p. 164.

[2] J. Biddulph, *Tribes of Hindoo-Koosh*, p. 76; R. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, vol. iv, p. 548; J. B. Neumann, "Het Pane- en Bila-stroomgebied," *Tijdschrift van het Nederlandsch Aardrijskundig Genootschap*, 2e Serie, Part iii, p. 488; F. Fawcett, "On the Saoras (or Savaras)," *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Bombay*, i, p. 231; J. W. Crowfoot, "Customs of the Rubatab," *Sudan Notes and Records*, i, p. 124; C. van Overbergh, *Les Basonge*, p. 303.

[3] See above, p. 714 sq.

[4] *The Laws of Manu*, ix. 59. 145.

[5] E. A. Gait, in *Census of India*, 1911, vol. i, "India," p. 247.

marriage. Those semi-religious views of the levirate custom, such as the obligation which we have noted in various parts of Africa for the widow to have sexual connection with her deceased husband's brother before she marries another man, are often interpreted, by the natives themselves, as a sort of purificatory rite, which in some way is calculated to avert the anger of the deceased's ghost. But that beneficial effect, like many others ascribed to the observance of ancient customs, most probably results from the very fact that the traditional custom is observed, if only in a ritual manner. Such formal modes of observing the levirate custom are exactly analogous to those we have noted as regards sororal succession where ritual intercourse with the deceased wife's sister is regarded as obligatory ;[1] it can scarcely be doubted in those cases that the obligation arises from the immemorial usage and duty of marrying that sister. A mode of observing the levirate usage which is intermediate between the regular inheritance of the widows and the ritual forms which we have noted, is presented by the manner in which the custom is observed by the Baronga of South Africa. When a man dies leaving a substantial harem, the various wives are allotted to his surviving brothers in order of seniority, the eldest receiving the ' chief ' or oldest wife, the second the next, and so forth, the youngest wives, if there be some over, being assigned to the deceased's sons. But the allotment holds good for one year only, after which the whole arrangement is revised, and the partners who have not proved suitable during the trial year have an opportunity to make new arrangements, the women being free to leave the deceased man's brothers and marry whom they please.[2]

The custom of regarding the children of a widow by the brother of her deceased husband as the latter's offspring, appears to be analogous to the custom of regarding all the children of an undivided polyandrous family as the offspring of the head of the family even during his lifetime.[3] Similarly, when a man inherits his father's wives the sons which he has by them are not called his sons, but his brothers ;[4] and the sons of a man by his brother's widow do not call him ' father,' but ' uncle.'[5]

The modes of regarding the observance of the levirate custom as special cases of the inheritance of property, or as semi-religious observances for the purpose of ' raising seed ' to the deceased or of averting the anger of his ghost, reduce themselves, it will be seen,

[1] See above, p. 623.

[2] H. A. Junod, " The Fate of the Widows among the Ba-Ronga," *Report of the South African Association for the Advancement of Science, Sixth Meeting* (1908), pp. 368 sqq.

[3] Cf. J. F. McLennan, *Studies in Ancient History*, p. 113.

[4] D. Livingstone, *Missionary Travels and Researches*, p. 185.

[5] G. Lindblom, *The Akamba*, pp. 85 sq.

to but slight variations of interpretation placed on the established usage of succession to the wives of the fraternal group. As alternative interpretations of the original significance of the custom, neither those views nor any that have been suggested, however plausible they may appear in particular isolated instances, will bear examination as general accounts of the origin of the custom. The derivation of that custom which actually obtains in all the more primitive instances of its observance, as a sequel to fraternal sexual communism, is also the only one which is applicable in all cases; and it is highly improbable that a usage so universal in its distribution and so deeply rooted should owe its rise in the first instance to the adventitious operation of a multiplicity of diverse local causes and conditions. It is, of course, more than probable that the survival of the usage after the conditions which first gave rise to it had entirely passed away, has been favoured by various causes and by diverse interpretations of it, such as the assimilation of the widow to inheritable property. But a custom which is observed by the Australian aborigines, by the Fuegians, by the Veddahs, cannot be regarded as a product of advanced stages of culture. On the contrary, it invariably tends to disappear in the highest cultural stages. With the development of individualistic conceptions, with the development of private property and the strict rules according to which it is transmitted, the levirate usage, far from being regarded as a special case of that transmission, tends, like all relics of primitive forms of marriage, to fall into disuse and disappear.