THE HISTORY OF HUMAN MARRIAGE

BY

EDWARD WESTERMARCK

PH.D.; HON. LL.D., ABERDEEN
MARTIN WHITE PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY AT THE ACADEMY OF ÅBO (FINLAND)
AUTHOR OF "THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE MORAL IDEAS," "MARRIAGE CEREMONIES IN MOROCCO," ETC.

IN THREE VOLUMES

VOL. 1

FIFTH EDITION REWRITTEN

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED,
ST. MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON
1921

COPYRIGHT

First Edition, 1891.
Second Edition, 1894.
Third Edition, 1901.
Fourth Edition, 1911.
Fifth Edition, 1921.

PREFACE

DURING the thirty years which have passed since the publication of the first edition of the present work the study of marriage and matters connected with it, especially among the lower races, has made such progress that I have found it necessary to reconsider the whole subject. Many new facts have been incorporated, and some old ones have been omitted. Various aspects of marriage, which were previously dealt with very inadequately or hardly touched upon, have been discussed at length. Objections raised by critics have been carefully considered. The old theories have been in some cases strengthened but in other cases modified. New theories set forth by other writers have been scrutinised. The matter has in many points been rearranged; and the book has been rewritten throughout to such an extent that very few sentences of the earlier editions have remained unchanged.

Only some of the changes can be here briefly indicated. A new introductory chapter on method, largely dealing with problems of recent growth, has taken the place of the old one. The statements quoted by certain writers as evidence of peoples living in a state of promiscuity have been more carefully examined, and the customs which have been represented as survivals of such a state in the past have been more fully discussed. Thus the subjects of the *jus primae noctis*, religious prostitution, and the lending or exchange of wives now occupy sixty-nine pages instead of

nine. In the treatment of the classificatory system of relationship the recent contributions to the subject, which largely tend to confirm my old views, have been taken notice of. In the discussion of the marriage age and certain other matters more attention has been paid to the laws of civilised countries. Religious celibacy and sexual modesty have each got a special chapter. The origin of female coyness has been discussed. With reference to the secondary sexual characters a suggestion has been made which, if correct, brings the sexual colours, odours, and sounds of animals into the closest possible analogy with the colours and odours of the flowers of plants. In the chapters on primitive means of attraction the older theories, though in some measure supported by new evidence, have in certain points been modified in accordance with the results of later research. A more thorough investigation of the exogamous rules has confirmed my belief in the substantial accuracy of my earlier theory as to their origin; and I hope that the restatement of it, in which the objections of critics have been taken into consideration, has made it more acceptable. The chapters on marriage by capture and marriage by consideration, together with kindred subjects, contain copious additions and changes.

The extremely defective treatment of marriage rites, which covered thirteen pages only, has been replaced by three chapters of more than twelve times that length; but for a study of the marriage ritual as a sequence I must refer the reader to my book *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco.* In the course of my six years' research in Morocco, and through books like *The Mystic Rose* and *The Golden Bough,* I have become aware of the enormous influence of magical beliefs on marriage rites; whereas the value of these rites for the study of earlier forms of marriage now seems to me to be even less than I thought before. I am grateful to

the distinguished reviewer of the first edition of this work who expressed the belief that if its author had been a student of folk-lore he would in various cases have arrived at different conclusions. It drew my attention to a defect which I have since then endeavoured to remedy; but my conceptions of the earlier history of marriage have not been essentially changed thereby.

In my discussion of monogamy and polygyny, and in many other sections of the book as well, I have considered the influence which economic conditions have exercised upon marriage, a point which was also greatly neglected in the earlier editions. Polyandry, which was dealt with on a few pages, now forms the subject-matter of two whole chapters; and the question of group-marriage, which of late has much occupied the minds of sociologists, has been discussed in a chapter by itself. The treatment of divorce is much more detailed, both as regards the history of the subject and the present legislation on it. The list of authorities quoted has increased from thirty pages to over a hundred; and the work as a whole has been expanded from one volume into three. In short, it is a new work much rather than a new edition.

At the same time, amidst all the changes, the general character, as well as the structure, of the book has remained unchanged. The criticism passed on it has not essentially affected either its method or its fundamental ideas. This may perhaps be due to the fact that, although I opposed many theories in vogue at the time when the book was first written and the method which had led to them, my decision to write it did not spring from a desire for opposition. On the contrary, I commenced my work as a faithful adherent of the theory of primitive promiscuity and tried to discover fresh evidence for it in customs which I thought might be interpreted as survivals from a time when individual marriage

did not exist. I had not proceeded far, however, when I found that I was on the wrong track. I perceived that marriage must primarily be studied in its connection with biological conditions, and that the tendency to interpret all sorts of customs as social survivals, without a careful examination into their existing environment, is apt to lead to the most arbitrary conclusions. Later treatises on the subject have only confirmed this conviction; and the present revival of the old method is not, in my opinion, likely to yield lasting results.

I am indebted to the Press and public both in this country and elsewhere for the encouraging interest they have taken during all these years in the work of my youth; to the earlier translations of it have been added subsequent ones into Spanish and Japanese. I am again under obligation to friends and correspondents for valuable advice and information. The largest part of the material has been collected in the Reading Room of the British Museum, and I take this opportunity to thank its officials for their unfailing courtesy.

E. W.

WOODMAN'S COTTAGE,
BOXHILL, SURREY,
May, 1921.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE TO THE FIRST EDITION

BY ALFRED R. WALLACE

HAVING read the proofs of Mr. Westermarck's book I am asked by the publishers to say a few words by way of introducing the work to English readers. This I have great pleasure in doing, because I have seldom read a more thorough or a more philosophic discussion of some of the most difficult, and at the same time interesting, problems of anthropology.

The origin and development of human marriage have been discussed by such eminent writers as Darwin, Spencer, Morgan, Lubbock, and many others. On some of the more important questions involved in it all these writers are in general accord, and this agreement has led to their opinions being widely accepted as if they were well-established conclusions of science. But on several of these points Mr. Westermarck has arrived at different, and sometimes diametrically opposite, conclusions, and he has done so after a most complete and painstaking investigation of all the available facts.

With such an array of authority on the one side and a hitherto unknown student on the other, it will certainly be thought that all the probabilities are against the latter. Yet I venture to anticipate that the verdict of independent thinkers will, on most of these disputed points, be in favour

of the new comer who has so boldly challenged the conclusions of some of our most esteemed writers. Even those whose views are here opposed, will, I think, acknowledge that Mr. Westermarck is a careful investigator and an acute reasoner, and that his arguments as well as his conclusions are worthy of the most careful consideration.

I would also call attention to his ingenious and philosophical explanation of the repugnance to marriage between near relatives which is so very general both among savage and civilised man, and as to the causes of which there has been great diversity of opinion; and to his valuable suggestions on the general question of sexual selection, in which he furnishes an original argument against Darwin's views on the point, differing somewhat from my own though in general harmony with it.

Every reader of the work will admire its clearness of style, and the wonderful command of what is to the author a foreign language.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

I NEED scarcely say how fully I appreciate the honour of being introduced to English readers by Mr. Alfred R Wallace. I am also greatly obliged for his kindness in reading the proofs, and in giving me the benefit of his advice with regard to various parts of the subject.

It is difficult for me to acknowledge sufficiently my obligations to Mr. James Sime for his assistance in preparing this book for the press. The work, as originally written, naturally contained a good many foreign modes of expression. Mr. Sime has been indefatigable in helping me to improve the form of the text; and, in our discussions on the main lines of the argument, he has made several important suggestions. I am sincerely obliged for the invaluable aid he has given me.

My cordial thanks are due to Mr. Charles J. Cooke, British Vice-Consul at Helsingfors, who most kindly aided me in writing the first part of the book in a tongue which is not my own. I am indebted also to Dr. E. B. Tylor, Professor G. Croom Robertson, Mr. James Sully, and Dr. W. C. Coupland for much encouraging interest; to Mr. Joseph Jacobs for the readiness with which he has placed at my disposal some results of his own researches; and to several gentlemen in different parts of the world who have been so good as to respond to my inquiries as to their personal observation of various classes of phenomena

connected with marriage among savage tribes. The information I have received from them is acknowledged in the passages in which it is used.

A list of authorities is given at the end of the book—between the text and the index,—and it may be well to add that the references in the notes have been carefully verified.

E. W.

LONDON, *May*, 1891.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

IN this new edition of my book I have made no essential changes, but here and there the argument has been strengthened by the addition of facts which have come to my knowledge since the appearance of the first edition. The most important of these new facts will be found in the second chapter.

I take this opportunity of expressing my warm appreciation of the thorough way in which the ideas set forth in this book have been discussed by many critics in England and elsewhere. Translations of the work have appeared, or are about to appear, in German, Swedish, French, Italian, and Russian.

E. W.

LONDON, *January*, 1894.

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION

I MUCH regret that the demand for a new edition of this book should come at a time when circumstances prevent me from undertaking such a revision of the work as I feel to be required. Since the appearance of the Second Edition many important facts bearing upon the subject have been brought to light, new theories have been advanced, and old theories, supported by fresh arguments, have been revived. To all this, however, I can do no justice, as I am at present being engaged in anthropological research in Morocco. This edition is, in consequence, a mere reprint of the second. But I purpose, after my return to Europe, to issue an Appendix, in which the book will be brought more up to date and some criticism will be replied to.

E. W.

MOGADOR (MOROCCO),
August, 1901.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

ON THE METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

The comparative method in sociology, p. 1 *sq.*—The resemblances of culture-phenomena due partly to mental similarity and partly to transmission, p. 2 *sq.*—The difficulty in deciding whether they are due to the one cause or to the other, p. 3 *sq.*—The ethnological method, so unfriendly to the idea of independent origins, has itself independently originated in two different countries, p. 4 *sq.*—The customs of savages subject to spontaneous changes, which may lead to similar results in different cases, p. 5 *sq.*—The investigations of the evolutionary school, which chiefly endeavours to find the psychological and sociological origin of culture-phenomena, and those of the ethnological school, which is concerned with their wanderings, supplement each other, p. 6.—How the comparative method helps the sociologist to find the origin of customs, p. 7 *sq.*—Dr. Rivers' criticism of the endeavour to discover the psychical causes of social phenomena, p. 8 *sq.*—Social survivals, p. 9 *sq.*—Dr. Rivers' distrust in our capacity of learning the motives by which social conduct is determined, p. 10 *sq.*—The field-ethnologist's inquiry into motives, p. 11 *sq.*—The hypothetical character of many explanations of social phenomena, p. 12.—The complaint that the use of the comparative method is hardly compatible with a sufficiently careful scrutiny of authorities and sources, p. 12 *sq.*—The trustworthiness of ethnographical evidence, p. 13 *sq.*—The complaint that the comparative method detaches the cultural phenomenon from the organic whole of which it forms a part and thereby easily represents it in a wrong light, pp. 14–17.—The study of a cultural phenomenon as it is distributed among different races and the study of it which is restricted to a particular ethnic group complement each other, p. 17 *sq.*—The homogeneous elements of the human mind underrated and the homogeneity of the group-mind overrated by the school of Durkheim, pp. 17–19.—An error of method prevalent among the evolutionary school, p. 19 *sq.*—The only condition on which the universal prevalence of a social phenomenon in the past may be assumed, p. 20 *sq.*—Criticism of the method of Durkheim, p. 21.—Biological facts underlying marriage and many particular customs and rules relating to it, p. 22.—The influence which people's ideas and beliefs have exercised upon their marriage customs, *ibid.*—The influence of industrial culture, p. 22 *sq.*—The particular subjects discussed in the present work, p. 23.—The method of dealing with them, pp. 23–25.

CHAPTER I

THE ORIGIN OF MARRIAGE

Definition of marriage as a social institution, p. 26 *sq.*—The institution of marriage has probably developed out of a primeval habit, p. 27 *sq.*—The relations between the sexes and parental care among the Invertebrata, p. 28.—Among Fishes, p. 29.—Among Reptiles, *ibid.*—Among Birds, p. 29 *sq.*—Among the lower Mammals, p. 30 *sq.*—Among the Quadrumana, pp. 31–35.—Why in certain species male and female remain together till after the birth of the offspring, p. 35 *sq.*—The need of marital and paternal protection among the man-like apes, p. 36 *sq.*—The family consisting of parents and children, with the father as its protector, in mankind, p. 37 *sq.*—A few cases in which the husband is said not to live with his wife, p. 38 *sq.*—Cases in which the mother's brother is said to have greater rights over a child than the father, p. 40 *sq.*—The elementary paternal duties seem to be universally recognised while the children live in the father's house, pp. 41–43.—Paternal rights among matrilineal peoples, p. 43 *sq.*—Dr. Hartland's hypothesis that the authority of the father and even that of the maternal uncle are the results of later development, pp. 44–46.—That the functions of the husband and father in the family involve the duty of protecting and supporting the wife and children, testified by an array of facts, pp. 46–49.—A man often prohibited from marrying until he has given some proof of his ability to fulfil these duties, pp. 49–53.—A man sometimes obliged to support his *fiancée*, p. 53.—To support his divorced wife, *ibid.*—The duty of marrying the widow of a deceased brother, *ibid.*—The more or less durable union between man and woman and marital and paternal care probably due to instincts once necessary for the preservation of the species, p. 53 *sq.*—The social conditions of savages who know neither cattle-rearing nor agriculture, unless perhaps of the most primitive kind, pp. 54–68.—Unreasonable to suppose that primitive men were more permanently gregarious than many modern savages, p. 68 *sq.*—The family in mankind presumably an inheritance from the parent species out of which the Anthropoids and the Hominides gradually developed, p. 69.—The tendency of habits to become rules of conduct, p. 69 *sq.*—The marital and parental instincts, p. 70 *sq.*—They give rise not only to habits but to rules of custom, or institutions, p. 71.—An alternative definition of the term "marriage," p. 71 *sq.*—Marriage rooted in the family rather than the family in marriage, p. 72.—Cases in which true married life does not begin, or a marriage does not become definite, until a child is born or there are signs of pregnancy, pp. 72–75.—Cases in which the occurrence of pregnancy or child-birth is a preliminary to, or as a general rule leads to, marriage, pp. 75–77.

CHAPTER II

A HUMAN PAIRING SEASON IN PRIMITIVE TIMES

Hypotheses as to the periodicity in the sexual life of animals, p. 78.—The sexual season adapted to the requirements of each species, p. 79 *sq.*—Wild species without a definite pairing season, p. 80 *sq.*—A sexual season among the man-like apes, p. 81.—The pairing of our earliest human or half-human ancestors probably likewise restricted to a certain season of the year, *ibid.*—Peoples who are said to have

an annual pairing time or whose sexual desire seems or is supposed to undergo a periodical increase at a certain time of the year, pp. 81–91.—The doubtful testimony of certain feasts at which sexual licence prevails, pp. 90–92.—The custom of contracting or celebrating marriages at some special time of the year, pp. 92–94.—The conclusion that an annual increase of the sexual desire or of the reproductive power, generally in spring, is of frequent occurrence in mankind, supported by statistical data relating to the distribution of births over the different months of the year, pp. 94–96.—This increase probably a survival of an ancient pairing season, p. 97.—The winter maximum of conceptions, pp. 97–100.—Why man is no longer restricted to any particular season for the procreation, pp. 100–102.—Variations in the sexual life of domesticated animals and of wild animals kept in captivity, p. 101.—The bearing which the hypothesis of a pairing season in primitive times has upon the question of the origin of marriage, p. 102.

CHAPTER III

A CRITICISM OF THE HYPOTHESIS OF PROMISCUITY: ALLEGED INSTANCES OF PEOPLES LIVING IN PROMISCUITY

The hypothesis that the human race originally lived in a state of promiscuity, p. 103 *sq.*—The general nature of the evidence adduced in support of it, p. 104 *sq.*—Traditions of a time when marriage did not exist, p. 105 *sq.*—Greek and Roman statements about tribes living in promiscuity, pp. 106–110.—Promiscuity ascribed by mediæval writers to certain European peoples, pp. 110–112.—Examination of alleged instances of promiscuity mentioned by Lord Avebury, pp. 112–116.—By Bernhöft, p. 116 *sq.*—By Bastian, p. 117 *sq.*—By Garcilasso de la Vega and Admiral Fitzroy, p. 118 *sq.*—By Wilken, pp. 119–123.—By Pleyte, R. Schmidt, and van der Lith, p. 122 *sq.*—By Wilutzky and Giraud-Teulon, p. 123 *sq.*—No known savage people living in promiscuity, p. 124.—The hypothesis of a general stage of promiscuity in any case entirely groundless, *ibid.*—Sexual relations most nearly approaching to promiscuity not found among the very lowest races, but among more advanced peoples, p. 124 *sq.*

CHAPTER IV

A CRITICISM OF THE HYPOTHESIS OF PROMISCUITY: PRE-NUPTIAL UNCHASTITY

The sexual freedom often enjoyed by both sexes among uncivilised peoples previous to marriage regarded as evidence of primitive promiscuity, p. 120.—Many of the facts could not, in any circumstances, be relics of such a state, because they are known to be of later growth, pp. 126–131.—Or because they do not represent promiscuity at all, sexual connections between a boy and a girl very frequently being a preliminary to their marriage, pp. 131–136.—Marriage upon trial, p. 135.—Instances of promiscuity outside marriage, p. 136.—Prostitution among uncivilised peoples, pp. 136–138.—Though of frequent occurrence, pre-nuptial unchastity not anything like a universal characteristic of the lower races, pp. 138–157.—Promiscuity among the unmarried an exception in the customs of unadulterated savages, p. 157.—The standard of pre-nuptial chastity in a tribe not

proportionate to its degree of culture, p. 158 *sq.*—In the lowest tribes chastity apparently more respected than in the higher ones, p. 159 *sq.*—Causes of pre-nuptial unchastity, pp. 159–164.—Why promiscuous pre-nuptial unchastity cannot be regarded as a survival of earlier general promiscuity, pp. 162–164.—Preference given to virgin brides, p. 163.—The taste for variety does not justify the hypothesis of original promiscuity, p. 163 *sq.*—Courtesans sometimes held in greater estimation than married women, p. 164 *sq.*—Cannot be regarded as representatives of "communal wives" in primitive times, p. 165.

CHAPTER V

A CRITICISM OF THE HYPOTHESIS OF PROMISCUITY: THE *Jus Primae Noctis*

The *jus primae noctis* accorded to a priest, king, chief, or nobleman interpreted as expiation for individual marriage, p. 166.—Instances of such a right, or of customary defloration by such a person, pp. 166–174.—The supposed existence of a *droit du seigneur* in feudal Europe and of a similar right accorded to the clergy, pp. 174–180.—A recent instance of the *jus primae noctis* reported from Albania, p. 180.—How the right in question may be explained, pp. 180–196.—Reluctance on the part of the bridegroom to deflower the bride, or to do so in the manner indicated by nature, pp. 180–191.—Artificial defloration by the bridegroom, p. 180 *sq.*—By somebody else, p. 181 *sq.*—Defloration by extra-matrimonial intercourse an operation which the husband is anxious to avoid, pp. 182–189.—The *tali kettu* ceremony of the Nayars presumably a relic of pre-nuptial defloration, pp. 184–187.—Defloration by a foreigner, p. 187 *sq.*—By the father of the girl, p. 188 *sq.*—Why a bridegroom is reluctant to have intercourse with a virgin bride, pp. 189–191.—The fear of defloration closely connected with the fear of hymeneal blood, p. 190 *sq.*—Why defloration is performed by a holy man, pp. 191–193.—The defloration by the king regarded as a duty incumbent on him, p. 193 *sq.*—The *jus primae noctis* as a consequence of might, pp. 194–196.—Why it cannot in any case be regarded as the relic of an ancient communal right, p. 196.—Sexual intercourse with a bride or an unmarried girl, involving defloration, accorded to wedding guests or friends, pp. 196–199.—Girls earning a dowry by prostitution before they marry, p. 200.—Certain defloration customs in Australia, pp. 200–204. In East Africa, pp. 204–206.

CHAPTER VI

A CRITICISM OF THE HYPOTHESIS OF PROMISCUITY: RELIGIOUS PROSTITUTION—THE LENDING AND EXCHANGE OF WIVES—FEASTS

The temporary prostitution of a girl before marriage or of a matron at a temple or in the service of religion, pp. 207–210.—Theories adduced to explain it, pp. 210–213.—The author's theory, pp. 213–218.—The more or less permanent prostitution of women attached to a temple, pp. 219–223.—How it may be explained, p. 223 *sq.*—The custom of lending wives to visitors, pp. 225–230.—The temporary exchange of wives, pp. 230–234.—Promiscuous intercourse indulged in at certain feasts, p. 234 *sq.*

CHAPTER VII

A CRITICISM OF THE HYPOTHESIS OF PROMISCUITY: THE CLASSIFICATORY SYSTEM OF RELATIONSHIP

" Descriptive " and " classificatory systems of relationship," pp. 236–238.—The classificatory systems, p. 238 *sq.*—Conclusions drawn from the classificatory terms of relationship with reference to earlier marriage customs or relations between the sexes, pp. 239–242.—Terms of relationship borrowed from the children's lips, pp. 242–245.—No classificatory term known to refer directly to the act of begetting or to the fact of having been begotten, p. 245 *sq.*—The classificatory terms influenced by sex, p. 246.—By age, pp. 246–249.—By social relations, probably from the beginning combined with vague ideas of consanguinity, pp. 249–257.—The classificatory terms used as terms of address, p. 251 *sq.*—The social factor also presumably felt in the distinction between persons of different sex and of different age, pp. 253–255.—The influence of the habit of living together, p. 255.—The importance of the social factor evident in terms used in addressing strangers, pp. 255–257.—The correlation between the presence of a term of relationship and special social relations or functions associated with it by no means complete, pp. 257–259.—To infer the earlier existence of certain social conditions from certain terms of relationship can in most cases be nothing more than a guess, p. 259 *sq.*—Dr. Rivers' conclusion that certain classificatory terms indicate the earlier existence of cross-cousin marriage, pp. 260–263.—A common nomenclature for persons representing two or more relationships no indication of a certain form of marriage in the past, pp. 263–267.—The classificatory system gives no evidence of the earlier existence of group-marriage or sexual communism, pp. 267–274.

CHAPTER VIII

A CRITICISM OF THE HYPOTHESIS OF PROMISCUITY: MOTHER-RIGHT

Mother-right supposed to be due to uncertain paternity resulting from early promiscuity, p. 275 *sq.*—What the term " mother-right " implies, p. 276 *sq.*—The prevalence of mother-right and of father-right, p. 277 *sq.*—The supposition that mother-right has everywhere preceded father-right, pp. 278–280.—No evidence that mother-right is more primitive than father-right, pp. 280–283.—The uncertainty of fatherhood, pp. 283–285.—No general coincidence of what we consider moral and immoral habits with the prevalence of father- and mother-right among existing savages, p. 284 *sq.*—Ideas regarding the cause of pregnancy or child-birth, pp. 285–294.—The question whether ideas of this sort have influenced the method of counting descent, p. 294 *sq.*—Mother-right as well as father-right depending on social conditions, pp. 295–297.—The tie between mother and child stronger than that which binds the child to its father, p. 295.—The influence of polygyny, p. 295 *sq.*—Of matrilocal marriage, p. 296 *sq.*—The various facts adduced as evidence of the hypothesis of promiscuity no evidence at all, p. 297 *sq.*

CHAPTER IX

A CRITICISM OF THE HYPOTHESIS OF PROMISCUITY: MASCULINE JEALOUSY

Masculine jealousy a bar to promiscuity, p. 299 *sq.*—The supposition that savages are little addicted to jealousy, p. 300.—The connection between jealousy and the sense of ownership, p. 300 *sq.*—The nature of jealousy, p. 301 *sq.*—The prevalence of male jealousy among the lower races, pp. 302–310.—Among civilised nations, p. 310 *sq.*—Customs and laws concerning adultery, pp. 311–316.—Jealousy with reference to the past, p. 316 *sq.*—The demand that a wife shall belong to her husband not only during his lifetime but after his death, pp. 317–328.—Widows killed, pp. 317–320.—Certain duties of widows, p. 320 *sq.*—Widows forbidden to marry again or to remarry for a certain period, pp. 321–325.—The causes of these prohibitions, pp. 325–329.—Certain formalities required before the remarriage of a widow, pp. 327–329.—Widowers compelled to live single for a certain length of time or sometimes for the rest of their lives, p. 329 *sq.*—The causes of these rules, p. 330 *sq.*—Criticism of the inference that certain savage customs prove the lack of jealousy, p. 331 *sq.*—The instances of peoples little addicted to jealousy give no support to the theory of promiscuity, pp. 332–334.—Criticism of the suggestion that man's gregarious way of living made promiscuity a necessity, p. 334.—The peculiar violence of masculine jealousy possibly due to infertility produced by promiscuity, pp. 334–336.—Certain statements relating to polyandrous peoples apparently support the view that intercourse between one woman and several men is unfavourable to reproduction, p. 335 *sq.*—The hypothesis of promiscuity essentially unscientific, p. 336.

CHAPTER X

THE FREQUENCY OF MARRIAGE AND THE MARRIAGE AGE

Among the uncivilised races, as a general rule, nearly every man endeavours to marry when he has reached the age of puberty and practically every woman gets married, pp. 337–343.—Unmarried persons looked upon as unnatural beings or objects of contempt or ridicule, p. 343 *sq.*—Among savages girls married at an earlier age than among the peoples of Western civilisation and the same probably in most cases true of the men, pp. 344–361.—Instances from America, pp. 345–349.—From Asia, pp. 349–352.—From the Indian Archipelago and the islands of the Pacific Ocean, pp. 352–356.—From Australia, pp. 356–358.—From Africa, pp. 358–361.—To most savages marriage seems absolutely indispensable, pp. 361–363.—Little difficulty experienced by savages in supporting a family, p. 363.—Circumstances in savage life which may compel persons to live unmarried for a longer or shorter time, pp. 363–370.—The influence of polygyny on the frequency of marriage, pp. 366–368.—A military life a hindrance to marriage, pp. 368–370.—The causes of infant- or child-betrothal, p. 370 *sq.*—Younger sons or daughters must not marry before the elder ones, pp. 372–374.—Among peoples of archaic culture also, celibacy a great exception and marriage regarded as a duty, pp. 374–387.—Infant-marriage in India, pp. 380–383.—The lowest ages at which marriage is allowed in Christian countries, p. 387 *sq.*—Modern civilisation has proved unfavourable to the frequency of marriage and has raised the average age at which marriages are concluded, pp. 388–390.—The causes of the decline of the marriage-rate and of the rise of the age for marriage in countries of Western civilisation, pp. 390–394.

CHAPTER XI

CELIBACY

Celibacy in extraordinary cases commanding more respect than marriage or even looked upon as a stringent duty, pp. 395–400.—Christian views and rules regarding celibacy, pp. 400–403.—The causes of religious celibacy, pp. 403–417.—The priestess regarded as married to the god whom she is serving, pp. 403–405.—Religious celibacy a means of self-mortification supposed to appease an angry god or intended to raise the spiritual nature of man, p. 405 *sq.*—The idea that sexual intercourse is defiling and in certain circumstances a mysterious cause of evil, pp. 406–413.—The idea of sexual defilement particularly conspicuous in connection with religious observances, pp. 409–413.—The effect of pollution upon holiness, pp. 410–413.—Sexual pollution to be particularly avoided by priests, p. 413 *sq.*—Admission into the priesthood preceded by a period of continence, p. 413.—The notion that celibacy is more pleasing to God than marriage, p. 414 *sq.*—Why sexual intercourse is looked upon as defiling, pp. 415–417.

CHAPTER XII

SEXUAL MODESTY

The nature of sexual modesty, p. 418 *sq.*—Some degree of sexual modesty probably universal in mankind, pp. 419–424.—It shows itself in various ways in the preliminaries to, or the conclusion of, a marriage, pp. 424–429.—Various hypotheses as to the origin of sexual modesty, pp. 429–432.—The coyness of the female when courted by the male one root of it in mankind, p. 432 *sq.*—Sexual modesty also closely connected with the aversion to incest, as appears from the fact that it is especially strongly developed in relations between members of the same family circle or kin, pp. 433–439.—The taboos imposed on the intercourse between a married man and his parents-in-law or other members of his wife's family, pp. 439–442.—Criticism of various theories on the origin of such taboos, pp. 442–452.—The tendency in persons to feel sexual shame particularly in the presence of members of the family circles of their mates and in the presence of members of their own family circles an offshoot of the aversion to sexual intercourse between persons who have grown up in the same home, p. 453 *sq.*

CHAPTER XIII

COURTSHIP

The male generally plays a more active and the female a more passive part in courtship, p. 455 *sq.*—The comparative strength of the sexual impulse in males and in females, p. 456.—Females making the first advances among some birds, *ibid.*—Among not a few uncivilised peoples the women said to be the courters or to make proposals of marriage, pp. 456–462.—The males fighting for females among the lower animals, p. 462.—Among men, pp. 462–466.—The rivalry of the suitors taking less violent and more playful forms, pp. 466–469.—Peaceful methods of courtship among men, pp. 469–471.—Among the

lower animals, p. 471 *sq.*—Where the male is the courter the female does not remain completely passive, pp. 472–475.—The coyness of the female, pp. 473–475.—The choice exercised by the female, p. 475.—The fighting of the males acts as a sexual stimulant, *ibid.*

CHAPTER XIV

SECONDARY SEXUAL CHARACTERS IN ANIMALS—FEMALE COYNESS

Darwin's theory of sexual selection, p. 477 *sq.*—The contradiction between the theories of natural and sexual selection, p. 478 *sq.*—The colours of flowers, p. 479.—Wallace's theory of the sexual colours of animals, p. 479 *sq.*—The sexual colours of animals seem to have been developed because they make it easier for the sexes to find each other during the pairing time, p. 481.—They occur exactly in those species whose habits make these colours most visible, pp. 481–483.—The odours of flowers, p. 483.—Sexual odours and sounds among animals, p. 483 *sq.*—The sexual colours, odours, and sounds of animals complementary to each other in the way that is best suited to make the animals easily discoverable, pp. 484–486.—The untenableness of Darwin's theory, p. 486.—The secondary sexual characters due to natural selection, p. 486 *sq.*—Wallace's views, p. 487 *sq.*—Sexual colours, sounds, and odours useful to the species not only because they facilitate reproduction by making it easier for the sexes to find each other, but probably also because they tend to prevent in-breeding by attracting individuals from a distance, p. 488 *sq.*—Animal "ornaments," p. 489.—The great variability of the secondary sexual characters in different species, p. 489 *sq.*—Secondary sexual characters as sexual stimulants, p. 490 *sq.*—The part played by secondary sexual characters in courtship, p. 491.—The origin of feminine coyness, pp. 492–496.

CHAPTER XV

PRIMITIVE MEANS OF ATTRACTION

The desire for self-decoration, p. 497 *sq.*—The things which people attach to their bodies not all ornaments, p. 498 *sq.*—The ornamentation of savages largely a sexual allurement, pp. 499–502.—Operations for the purpose of attaching objects to the body, pp. 502–505.—Ill-treatment of the teeth, pp. 505–507.—The hair-dress, pp. 507–510.—Savage delight in showy colours, p. 510.—The painting of the body, pp. 510–514.—The practice of tattooing, pp. 514–525.—The practice of scarification, pp. 525–527.—The motives for these various practices, pp. 527–529.—Savage women less decorated than savage men, pp. 529–532.—The sexual instinct of women more discriminating than that of men, p. 532 *sq.*

CHAPTER XVI

PRIMITIVE MEANS OF ATTRACTION

(*Concluded*)

Various motives for clothing, p. 534 *sq.*—The covering of the sexual organs partly due to the desire of protection, pp. 535–538.—Among various peoples only the married women cover themselves, p. 537 *sq.*—The fear of causing disgust as a motive for covering the sexual centre,

p. 538 *sq.*—The theory that clothing owes its origin to shame, p. 539 *sq.*—Savages who go naked without showing a trace of shame or who, when they dress themselves, are utterly neglectful of what we consider the first requirements of decency, pp. 540–546.—Sexual modesty among such savages, p. 546.—Nakedness not alluring, pp. 546–548.—Naked savages who are ashamed to cover themselves, p. 548.—The sort of covering savages often use, pp. 548–551.—Covering used as a means of embellishment, pp. 551–553.—Every reason to believe that in many cases at least the pubic covering was originally adopted as a sexual lure, pp. 553–558.—Naked savages covering themselves only at dances or festivals, p. 555 *sq.*—Peoples among whom only the marriageable girls cover their nakedness, p. 556 *sq.*—Covering resorted to at the age of puberty, p. 557.—Used only by harlots, p. 558.—Said to be more common among savage men than women, *ibid.*—The tattooing of the pubic region, p. 558 *sq.*—The sexual organs subject to mutilations or other practices, the purpose of which may have been to make the person more attractive to the opposite sex, pp. 559–561.—Circumcision, pp. 561–564.—The tying up of the prepuce, p. 564.—Mutilations and other transformations of the sexual organs of girls, *ibid.*—Certain attitudes exhibited by women among naked tribes, p. 565.—The connection between covering and the feeling of shame, pp. 565–569.—The tendency to look for superstitious origins of savage customs, p. 569 *sq.*—Consideration of an argument brought against the theory here advocated, p. 570 *sq.*

THE HISTORY OF HUMAN MARRIAGE

INTRODUCTION

ON THE METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

THE method followed in the present work is the comparative method, which for half a century has been dominant among British students of social anthropology. When applied to the study of human civilisation, this method starts from the fact that there are great similarities between the products of culture—such as implements, weapons, objects of art, customs, institutions, and beliefs—among different peoples in different countries. Weapons, for example, are classed under spear, club, sling, bow and arrow, and so forth. Myths are divided under such headings as myths of sunrise and sunset, eclipse-myths, earthquake-myths, and local myths which account for the names of places by some fanciful tale. Under religious beliefs and practices there are animism, totemism, ancestor-worship, polytheism, monotheism. Under institutions occur, for instance, marriage, clanship, chieftainship, slavery; and under each heading there are sub-headings, like marriage by consideration, monogamy, polygyny, polyandry, group-marriage. These classifications of the various details of culture, as Tylor remarks, may be compared with the species of plants and animals as studied

by the naturalist. "To the ethnographer, the bow and arrow is a species, the habit of flattening children's skulls is a species, the practice of reckoning numbers by tens is a species. The geographical distribution of these things, and their transmission from region to region, have to be studied as the naturalist studies the geography of his botanical and zoological species." [1] And the same is true of social institutions and their various aspects.

But the task of comparative sociology is not restricted to that of classifying the different phenomena of culture with a view to making out their distribution in geography and history. Its ultimate object is, of course, the same as that of every other science, namely, to explain the facts with which it is concerned, to give an answer to the question, Why? Hence, when similar customs, beliefs, legends, or arts, are found among different peoples, the question arises how the similarity is to be accounted for. In answer to this question Tylor made the following general statement:— "Sometimes it may be ascribed to the like working of men's minds under like conditions, and sometimes it is a proof of blood relationship or of intercourse, direct or indirect, between the races among whom it is found." [2] Sir James G. Frazer likewise speaks of "the essential similarity in the working of the less developed human mind among all races, which corresponds to the essential similarity in their bodily frame revealed by comparative anatomy. But," he adds, "while this general mental similarity may, I believe, be taken as established, we must always be on our guard against tracing to it a multitude of particular resemblances which may be and often are due to simple diffusion, since nothing is more certain than that the various races of men have borrowed from each other many of their arts and crafts, their ideas, customs, and institutions." [3] I quote these statements in reply to the charge made in a Presidential Address to the Anthropological Section of the British Association a few years ago, that where similarities are found in different

[1] Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, i. 7 *sq.*
[2] *Idem, Researches into the Early History of Mankind*, p. 5.
[3] Frazer, *Balder the Beautiful*, vol. i. p. vi. *sq.*

parts of the world it is assumed by the leading school of British anthropologists, " almost as an axiom, that they are due to independent origin and development."[1] So little is this charge in accordance with facts that Tylor, in his pioneer work ' Researches into the Early History of Mankind,' found it hard to account for the occurrence in so many distant times and places of customs like the cure by sucking and the couvade, and of superstitions like those connected with sneezing, " on any other hypothesis than that of deep-lying connections by blood or intercourse, among races which history, and even philology, only know as isolated sections of the population of the world."[2]

It is, no doubt, true that the question whether a certain custom or institution has sprung up spontaneously among the people or tribe practising it, or whether it has been introduced from some other people or tribe, is seldom discussed in comparative treatises. But this by no means implies the assumption of independent origins; on the contrary, when the custom or institution occurs among related or neighbouring peoples, there is, at least in many cases, a tendency almost to take for granted that it has been derived from a common source in the different cases—that its prevalence is due either to a common descent or to social intercourse. One reason why the question of transmission is not more frequently discussed is the lack of evidence in the case of peoples whose history is unknown to us. Tylor justly spoke of " the constant difficulty in deciding whether any particular development is due to independent invention, or to transmission from some other people to those among whom it is found "; [3] and this difficulty has certainly not been removed by later investigations. Dr. Graebner lays down two main criteria which, he thinks, enable us to trace similar culture-phenomena to a common source: first, the criterion of form, as he calls it, that is, correspondence of qualities not inherent to the nature of the object, and secondly, that of

[1] Rivers, *British Association for the Advancement of Science. Portsmouth*, 1911. *Address to the Anthropological Section*, p. 2.

[2] Tylor, *Researches, etc.*, p. 378 *sq.*

[3] *Ibid.* p. 373.

quantitative correspondence, that is, the coincidence of several phenomena between which there is no necessary and intrinsic connection.[1] But when customs are concerned, it may be doubted whether either criterion is, generally, sufficient to save the conclusion from being much more than a mere guess, unless the peoples in question belong to the same race or may on linguistic, historical, or geographical grounds be supposed to have had contact with each other. And even in such cases it may often be difficult or impossible to decide with certainty whether similar customs have a common origin or not. Dr. Graebner himself admits that it is possible, although not proved, that identical customs grow up independently among peoples in different parts of the world; if so, it is obviously also possible that identical customs grow up independently among peoples who are of the same stock or have come into contact with one another. Indeed, the more similar two peoples are, the greater is the probability that also new details in their culture should resemble each other; from seeds of the same kind very similar plants spring up. If the custom of providing a bride with a marriage portion is found among different Indo-European peoples, we are not therefore entitled to assume that this custom is either an inheritance from the primitive Indo-European period or has in historical times been adopted by one people from the other. And if marriage by purchase is found among two unrelated neighbouring tribes, it is by no means certain that one of them has borrowed this custom from the other, however many coincidences there may be in their culture.

It is strange that the method of the modern German school, which is so unfriendly to the idea of independent origins and "in every case where British anthropologists see evolution, either in the forms of material objects or in social and religious institutions, . . . sees only the evidence of mixture of cultures"—that this very method should itself have independently originated in two countries the peoples of which are partly of the same race and have had culture-contact also in later days. Dr. Rivers says, "I

[1] Graebner, *Methode der Ethnologie*, p. 108 *sqq.*

have been led quite independently to much the same general position as that of the German school by the results of my own work in Oceania."[1] If customs and institutions and ideas could speak, they might also perhaps be justified in defending themselves against the suspicion of being mere borrowings. To this Dr. Graebner would say, as he has indeed said in a general way, that in cases of parallelism we must not apply European evidence to savages, who almost entirely lack " the conscious endeavour after further development."[2] It seems as though he regarded the customs of savages as almost unchangeable, unless subject to influences from without. But there is sufficient proof that they are not so.

Among the Central Australians, for instance, changes in aboriginal custom take place from time to time, and Messrs. Spencer and Gillen are of opinion that these changes are in part due to the influence of individuals of superior ability. They write, " After carefully watching the natives during the performance of their ceremonies and endeavouring as best as we could to enter into their feelings, to think as they did, and to become for the time being one of themselves, we came to the conclusion that if one or two of the most powerful men settled upon the advisability of introducing some change, even an important one, it would be quite possible for this to be agreed upon and carried out."[3] Dr. Landtman tells me that during his stay among the Kiwai-speaking people of New Guinea he was struck by the fluctuations of their habits and customs independently of all foreign influence. The funeral customs, for instance, have greatly changed within the memory of the present generation in a manner which, partly at least, excludes the possibility of influence either from neighbouring tribes or from the whites. Indeed, do not the frequent variations of custom in neighbouring related tribes, or within the same tribe, by themselves show that the customs of a people are subject to spontaneous changes also at the lower stages of culture ?

[1] Rivers, *op. cit.* p. 3.
[2] Graebner, *op. cit.* p. 114.
[3] Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 12 *sqq.*

And if this is the case, it is only natural that the changes often should lead to similar results in different instances. For the possibilities in cultural development are always limited, and often limited in a very high degree. For example, it is necessary that the bodies of the dead should be disposed of in some way or other, and there are not many methods to choose between; hence the same method *must* be in use among different peoples, quite independently of any culture-contact.

For my own part, I cannot find that there is any reasonable ground for quarrelling between the ethnological school, which particularly studies the influence that one people has exercised upon another owing to contact of their cultures, and the evolutionary school; their subjects of investigation differ, and therefore also their methods. Both schools deal with resemblances of culture-phenomena, but whilst the evolutionary school chiefly endeavours to find the psychological and sociological origin of these phenomena, the ethnological school is concerned with their wanderings. The two kinds of investigation supplement each other, and their results should exercise a wholesome influence on each other; but they cannot replace each other. To regard the ethnological analysis of culture-relations as the chief task of the history of civilisation—as some German scholars do[1] —is to deprive this science of its loftiest aims and also to disregard many of its most important achievements. It should be remembered that even when the historical connection between customs found among different peoples has been well-established, the real origin of the customs has not been explained thereby. It is not a sufficient explanation of a custom to say that it has been derived from ancestors or borrowed from neighbours. This only raises the question how it originated among those who first practised it; for a custom must have had a beginning. It is with questions of this sort that the evolutionary school of sociologists have pre-eminently occupied

[1] Graebner, *op. cit.* p. 107: "So bleibt denn als erstes und Grundproblem der Ethnologie wie der ganzen Kulturgeschichte die Herausarbeitung der Kulturbeziehungen."

themselves. And their comparative method has greatly helped them in their task.

The simultaneous occurrence of certain social phenomena in many different groups of people may prove that there is a causal connection between them, though no such connection is proved by their simultaneous occurrence in a single group. It was this fact that led Tylor to his statistical method of investigating the development of institutions.[1] Moreover, a comparison of the circumstances in which a custom is practised by different peoples may lead to the discovery of the motive underlying it. For example, a comparative study of the practice of human sacrifice shows that human victims are frequently offered in war, before a battle, or during a siege; for the purpose of stopping or preventing epidemics; in order to put an end to a devastating famine; when the earth fails to supply the people with water; with a view to averting perils arising from the sea or from rivers; and for the purpose of preventing the death of some particular individual, especially a chief or a king. And from these facts we are justified in drawing the conclusion that human sacrifice is, largely at least, a method of life-insurance, based upon the idea of substitution; whilst the famine-sacrifice and the principle underlying it lead to the supposition that the frequent custom of securing good crops by means of such a sacrifice, even when there is no famine, may also be traced to the same principle, especially as there are obvious links between this custom and the actual famine-sacrifice.[2] Very frequently the knowledge of the cause of a certain custom found among one people helps us to understand the meaning of the same, or more or less similar, customs among other peoples. Little details which by themselves would hardly attract our attention may, when viewed in the light of the comparative method, become conclusive evidence or, in other cases, lead to valuable suggestions, some of which may be within

[1] Tylor, 'On a Method of investigating the Development of Institutions,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xviii. 245 *sqq.*

[2] See Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, i. 440 *sqq.*

the range of future confirmation. In this way the customs and institutions of savages have thrown rays of light on the early history of civilised nations.

The endeavour of the evolutionary school to discover the psychical causes of social phenomena, however, has of late been subject to criticism. Dr. Rivers writes, "The proper task of the sociologist is the study of the correlation of social phenomena with other social phenomena, and the reference of the facts of social life to social antecedents, and only when this has been done, or at any rate when this process has made far greater advances than at present, will it be profitable to endeavour to explain the course of social life by psychological processes."[1] At present sociology and social psychology should, so far as possible, be treated as if they were independent disciplines, because each of them is liable to make assumptions, belonging to the other science, which are readily mistaken for explanations. But through "pure" sociology we may ultimately hope to attain knowledge of social psychology, though this channel must be long and tortuous. The question why such a course should be necessary, and why we cannot follow the more obvious way of inquiring directly into the motives which actuate the conduct of men as members of society, is answered by Dr. Rivers as follows:—"Among the people whose social conduct has been the special object of my own investigations, there is no more difficult task than that of discovering the motives which lead them to perform social actions. There is no more depressing and apparently hopeless task than that of trying to discover why people perform rites and ceremonies and conform to the social customs of their community." Moreover, it has been gradually recognised "that social conduct is not directed by intellectual motives, but, predominantly, often it would seem exclusively, by sentiments or even instincts," and "no mental states are more difficult to introspect than emotions and sentiments, to say nothing of instincts."[2]

[1] Rivers, 'Survival in Sociology,' in *Sociological Review*, vi. 304.

[2] *Idem*, 'Sociology and Psychology,' in *Sociological Review*, ix. 3, 10 *sq.*

For the present, then, we should, on this principle, carefully refrain from assuming, for example, that courtship and marriage have anything to do with the sexual instinct, that the retaliation of adultery springs from jealousy and revenge,[1] that the secrecy observed in the performance of the sexual function is connected with sexual modesty. We should refrain from trying to find any motives for the practice of polygyny, the prohibition of incest, the various marriage rites, and so forth. We should only correlate these phenomena with other social phenomena or refer them to social antecedents. Dr. Rivers says, in fact, that it would be possible "to write volumes on that group of social processes which we sum up under the term 'marriage,' without the use of a single psychological term referring to instincts, emotions, sentiments, ideas or beliefs," and that such a treatment of marriage would nevertheless be "capable of producing valuable contributions to our knowledge."[2] After those volumes had been written we might perhaps be allowed to consider that people not only marry but fall in love, and that the marriage customs are not merely muscular movements standing in relations to other muscular movements, but that they are actuated by intentions and motives. I should not be surprised, however, if social psychology, when at last permitted to speak, should raise violent objections to many of the classifications and conclusions made by "pure" sociology. For it seems to me that "pure" sociology is liable to commit the most fatal mistakes by detaching social phenomena from their motive powers and treating them as mechanical processes, just as if men as members of society were a sort of automata.

From Dr. Rivers' own constructive works and his article on 'Survival in Sociology' it appears that he thinks of the study of organised social processes in their relations in time largely as a study of social survivals. But what knowledge of the past can be expected from the interpretation of a social process as a survival, if no notice is taken of the mental

[1] Dr. Rivers actually blames me for assuming that the blood-feud is due to the feeling of revenge (*ibid.* p. 4 *sqq.*).

[2] *Ibid.* p. 2.

aspect of social conduct? Dr. Rivers regards a custom as a survival "if its nature cannot be explained by its present utility but only becomes intelligible through its past history." [1] I presume that utility here means supposed utility, since a custom can be quite intelligible through existing conditions if it is merely regarded as useful by those who practise it. Before a custom is pronounced a survival it is thus necessary to examine whether it can be explained by present conditions or not, and to these conditions obviously belong the feelings and ideas of those who practise it. It is just the neglect of making such an examination that is responsible for many of those arbitrary and unscientific conclusions in which the study of early history abounds. Customs have been interpreted as surviving traces of other, hypothetical, customs in the past, simply because there is some external resemblance, often of the most superficial character, between them, or because they seem to be possible ingredients or consequences of such customs. The reader will find numerous instances of this in the present work, for example in the chapters on the theory of promiscuity, sexual modesty, and marriage by capture. I had hoped that such purely sociological interpretations were, on the whole, things of the past, and find it truly alarming to hear from one who may almost be regarded as the leader of a new school in sociology in this country that social phenomena should be referred to social antecedents before any attempt is made to examine the psychological processes underlying them.

It is strange that this extraordinary faith in sociological explanations should be coupled with an equally extreme distrust in our capacity of learning the motives by which social conduct is determined. The mental constitution of men is, in spite of all racial and individual differences, essentially similar everywhere. This is implied in the fact that they are members of the human species and is confirmed by their external behaviour. It is true that the more different people are from ourselves, and the less we know them, the more difficult it is for us to know the motives for their actions; and to understand them in every detail is beyond

[1] Rivers, in *Sociological Review*, vi. 295.

our power. But the mental facts that lead to the customs of peoples are not of a very subtle character. They are general instincts, sentiments, or emotions, or particular ideas, which, if still prevailing, ought to be accessible to a penetrating inquiry. Dr. Rivers maintains that the apparently hopeless task of trying to discover why people perform rites and ceremonies is partly due to the abstract nature of such inquiries: "directly one approaches the underlying meaning of rite or custom . . . one meets only with uncertainty and vagueness unless, as is most frequently the case, the people are wholly satisfied with the position that they are acting as their fathers have done before them."[1] So far as my own experience goes, this is true of some cases but not of others, in which most valuable information has been obtained from the natives themselves.[2] Their explanations are not always alike, and the reason for this is probably that the real origin of the rite has been partly or wholly forgotten and a new interpretation substituted for the idea from which it rose. This, however, should not make the field-ethnologist less eager to find out the present meaning attached to the facts he records; for whether or no it be the original meaning, it gives us in any case some insight into the ideas of existing people, and these are by themselves important subjects of inquiry. But the direct inquiry into motives is not the only way in which they may be ascertained: excellent information may be obtained from the words by which ceremonies are accompanied,[3]

[1] *Idem*, in *Sociological Review*, ix. 10.

[2] See my *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco; Ceremonies and Beliefs connected with Agriculture, certain Dates of the Solar Year, and the Weather in Morocco* (*Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens Förhandlingar. Bd. LIV.* 1911–1912. *Afd. B. N:o* 1); *The Moorish Conception of Holiness* (*Baraka*) (*Öfversigt, etc. Bd. LVIII.* 1915–1916. *Afd. B. N:o* 1); *The Belief in Spirits in Morocco* (*Acta Academiae Aboensis. Humaniora, I:1*); 'The Popular Ritual of the Great Feast in Morocco,' in *Folk-Lore*, xxii.

[3] It was, for example, partly in this way that I found the meaning attached to the fire-ceremonies at Midsummer or on other occasions in Morocco ('Midsummer Customs in Morocco,' in *Folk-Lore*, xvi; *Ceremonies and Beliefs connected with Agriculture, etc.*), which led Frazer to revise his views on the European fire-festivals (see his

and from comparisons between the circumstances in which more or less similar rites or practices are performed, combined with a solid knowledge of native ways of thinking. Such a knowledge, however, presupposes a protracted stay among the people whose customs are investigated and familiarity with their language. To acknowledge and emphasise the need of field-ethnologists who fulfil these requirements would, in my opinion, be of greater service to sociology than to give up as hopeless the endeavour to discover the sources of social action. Even where the meaning of a custom is obscure or lost, the field-ethnologist's knowledge of the native mind and its modes of thinking and feeling ought to enable him to make valuable conjectures. Hence I thoroughly disagree with the principle which I once heard expressed by the reader of a paper on some savage tribes at a meeting of the Royal Anthropological Institute, that the field-anthropologist should only aim at collecting facts and leave it to the anthropologists at home to explain them.

Many of the psychological explanations of social phenomena must of course be more or less hypothetical; but this is no reason why they should not be sought for. Hypotheses are no more foreign to the ethnological school, which is concerned with the mixture of cultures, than to the evolutionary school; I know of no work which is more profuse of conjectures than Dr. Rivers' 'History of Melanesian Society.' It is in innumerable instances much easier to find the psychological origin of a custom or rite than to decide if and how it has come into existence as the result of the contact or blending of peoples. Who would doubt that water-ceremonies performed for the purpose of producing rain are due to the law of association of ideas by similarity? But who would dare to trace their wanderings?

An objection frequently offered to the comparative method is that the use of this method is hardly compatible with a sufficiently careful scrutiny of authorities and sources. There is undoubtedly some truth in this. Every sociologist who has made use of it on a large scale has good reason to cry *peccavi*, and even he who merely deals with some special

group of kindred phenomena has rarely the same opportunity as the writer of a monograph on a certain people to subject his facts to a searching criticism. In the earlier editions of the present work I emphasised that, "as the sociologist is in many cases unable to distinguish falsehood from truth, he must be prepared to admit the inaccuracy of some of the statements he quotes"; and I cannot possibly conceive how Dr. Graebner has been able to construe this admission into an attempt on my part to make a virtue of necessity.[1] In fact, I think that a similar admission might be reasonably expected also from sociologists of other schools. It is often simply impossible for the most scrutinising critic to decide whether a certain statement is accurate or not, and it may even be difficult to form a just idea of the general trustworthiness of an ethnographical author. Dr.. Graebner, for example, considers Curr's 'The Australian Race' to be so worthless a book that he blames me for quoting it;[2] whereas Dr. Malinowski, who in his monograph 'The Family among the Australian Aborigines' has sifted his material with the greatest possible care, maintains that Curr had especially good opportunities for observation,[3] and often refers to him.

Generally speaking, I must confess that I have become more distrustful of ethnographical evidence the longer I have myself been in the field. In my own field-work I made it long ago a stringent rule never to accept information given by anybody but a native of the country, because I found that the statements of European residents are very frequently lacking in accuracy. I further made it a rule never to use information given me about a tribe by members of other tribes, without specially mentioning the more or less unauthoritative character of the statement. I am also somewhat suspicious of that, fortunately insignificant, portion of my material which I collected before I could freely converse with the natives without the aid of an

[1] Graebner, *op. cit.* p. 38 n. 2.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 38 n. 2.

[3] Malinowski, *The Family among the Australian Aborigines*, p. 22 *sq.*

consummation of the marriage (on account of the fragility of their shells), sometimes to facilitate delivery; and it is quite possible that all these various interpretations represent original motives or parts of a mixed motive. Instances of mistaken classification might no doubt be quoted from my own writings (and will probably be found in the present work also); but as it is more agreeable to find fault with others than with one's self, I shall choose an example from the investigations of an esteemed colleague.

In his book 'Primitive Paternity,' Dr. Hartland shows that in various countries bathing is practised as a method of obtaining children, and he traces this practice to an ancient belief "that pregnancy was caused otherwise than by sexual intercourse." In support of this view he quotes, besides many other facts, a statement of mine referring to a tribe in Southern Morocco.[1] It is there the custom for a married woman who is anxious to know if she will be blessed with a child or not to go to the sea-shore on Midsummer Day, and on the two following days as well, and let seven waves go over her body; then she knows that if she does not get a child soon she will have none at all. In this case magic has dwindled into divination, as is obvious from a similar custom practised in another tribe in Morocco, where the young wife goes to the sea on the fortieth day after her arrival at her new home, and, while the seven waves are going over her body, says to the sea, "O my uncle the Sea, I am troubled with spirits, give me children and health." Now these facts can by no means serve as evidence for a theory of primitive paternity. In Morocco, at least, the effect which water is held to have upon fecundity is only indirect, that is, it is supposed to remove the evil influences which cause sterility, as appears from the idea that an infertile woman or animal is troubled with evil spirits and from the fact that the very same procedure as is adopted as a cure for barrenness is also supposed to remove or prevent sickness or misfortune in general. But in extenuation of Dr. Hartland's guilt it should be added that, in the article of mine from which he made his quotation, I had not expressly

[1] Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, i. 80.

mentioned the Moorish view of sterility. This case may be considered typical. The mistakes made by sociologists of the school following the comparative method, when they detach facts from their environment and interpret them in their own ways, are largely due to the incompleteness of their sources. Hence one of the chief defects of their method may be considerably reduced by the strenuous efforts of field-workers to collect not only external facts but to enter into the thoughts and feelings of the people they investigate, as also by monographs of the kind already mentioned.

There is no real opposition between the study of a cultural phenomenon as it is distributed among different races and the study of it which is restricted to a particular ethnic group. Here again the methods differ simply because the subjects differ. But the two kinds of investigation complement each other. Whilst the student of a custom or institution in its generality must be grateful to the specialist who provides him with the results of his detailed research, the comparative treatment, which in the first place bears out general resemblances, often helps the specialist to explain facts which he could hardly understand in full if his knowledge were restricted to a limited area. It is easy to criticise the comparative method in the point we are now considering, but it is impossible for any modern student of human civilisation to ignore its results. The writings of Professor Durkheim and his disciples are thoroughly pervaded by the teachings of the very school whose method they have so severely criticised. Does not this show that there must be exaggeration in their criticism? They have not sufficiently considered an extremely simple but extremely important fact, namely, that all the different ethnic groups belong to the same animal species and therefore must present resemblances which have a deeper foundation than all differences which are the effects of the social environment. How could we disclose these resemblances in any other way than by comparison? How could we otherwise distinguish that which is local from that which is general? Nay, how could we fully explain the social environment itself without

taking into account the mental characteristics of the human species? I think there is sufficient evidence to show that innumerable customs and beliefs are not so closely interwoven with the social tissue that they cannot, with due precaution, be abstracted from it for the sake of comparison. And in any case we may expect to find a specifically human element mingled with local peculiarities.

But if the French sociologists—I except of course M. van Gennep, who does not belong to the school of Durkheim—have underrated the homogeneous elements of the human mind, I think they have, on the other hand, somewhat overrated the homogeneity of the group-mind. That the minds of the people are profoundly influenced by the fact that they live and act together is a truth which nobody doubts. We implicitly recognise this when we speak of the customs, beliefs, or religion of a people—expressions which are much older than Bastian's *Völkergedanke*. But we must not forget that the homogeneity of thoughts and actions inside a society is not absolute. This is true not only of civilised men but, in some degree, also of savages. Dr. K. Donner points out that among the Samoyed the religious beliefs and the ideas relating to the soul's fate after death vary considerably in different individuals;[1] and, with special reference to ideas of the latter kind, he tells me that this is the case even in a small tribe consisting of some five or six hundred individuals. One man gave him a minute description of the other world which was based upon his own experience of it in a dream. Dr. Landtman, again, informs me that the Kiwai-speaking Papuans often drew his attention to the differences of habits, not only within different groups of the same tribe or village, but even in the case of different individuals. A native said to him, for instance, "One man has one method of catching the dugong, another man has another method." Among their ceremonies there are such as are common to the whole tribe, but there are many others, referring to agriculture, hunting, or other occupations, that are practised only by

[1] Donner, *Bland Samojeder i Sibirien*, p. 119 *sq.*

members of the same family or by single individuals who have directly or indirectly learnt them from some spirit or ghost appearing in a dream. Dr. Landtman maintains that it is hardly possible to distinguish in every case between practices and beliefs which are general and such as are individual. Considering that distinctions of this sort are not generally found in anthropological books, the ethnologist of the study must be warned against making too liberal a use of the term " collective ideas," or that favourite expression of the French sociologists, " représentations collectives."

An error of method which was very prevalent among the evolutionary school in those days when the first edition of this work was written, and which is still committed by certain writers, is the practice of inferring, without sufficient reason, from the prevalence of a custom or institution among some savage peoples, or from facts interpreted as survivals of it, that this custom or institution is a relic from a stage of development which the whole human race once went through. Thus the assumption that primitive men lived in tribes or hordes all the men of which had promiscuous intercourse with all the women, where no individual marriage existed, and the children were the common property of the tribe, is founded, in the first place, on the statements of some travellers and ancient writers as to peoples among whom this custom is said actually to prevail, or to have prevailed, and, in the second place, on certain supposed survivals of that custom. Dr. Post went still further in his book ' Die Geschlechtsgenossenschaft der Urzeit und die Entstehung der Ehe.' Without adducing any satisfactory reason for his opinion, he considered it probable that " monogamous marriage originally emerged everywhere from pure communism in women, through the intermediate stages of limited communism in women, polyandry, and polygyny " ; [1] but he subsequently revised his views.[2] Lewis H. Morgan, in his ' Systems of Con-

[1] Post, *Die Geschlechtsgenossenschaft der Urzeit*, p. 17.

[2] *Idem*, *Studien zur Entwickelungsgeschichte des Familienrechts*, p. 58.

sanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family,' suggested no fewer than fifteen normal stages in the evolution of marriage and the family, assuming the existence and general prevalence of a series of customs and institutions "which must of necessity have preceded a knowledge of marriage between single pairs, and of the family itself, in the modern sense of the term." [1] Marriage by capture has been regarded as the primitive and once universal method of acquiring a wife; and to this day we hear of an early stage of group-marriage and of a stage of mother-right preceding father-right.

Now, it seems obvious that we have no right to assume the universal prevalence of a social phenomenon in the past unless we may assume that the cause or causes to which it is due have been universally operating. If speculating on such problems, we have therefore first to find out the causes of the social phenomena; then, from the prevalence of the causes, we may infer the prevalence of the phenomena themselves, if the former may be assumed to have operated without being checked by other causes. In this way we may conclude with absolute certainty that there were always intimate relations between a mother and her young child, since the causes of these relations must always have operated in a mammalian species, like man. A similar way of reasoning has also led me to the hypothesis that the family, consisting of father, mother, and children, existed already in primeval times and probably among our pre-human ancestors, owing to the offspring's need of care and protection and to the economic obstacles in the way of a permanent living in hordes; but this conclusion has a less solid foundation than the former one, because the necessity of paternal care is not so certain as that of maternal care. On the other hand, the causes, or hypothetical causes, to which marriage by capture, group-marriage, and mother-right may be traced are not such as to justify the belief in the universal prevalence of any of these customs at any stage of human civilisation—to say nothing of promiscuity, the existence of which as the exclusive form of the relations between

[1] Morgan, *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity*, p. 479.

the sexes even among a single people is extremely doubtful.

The comparative method and the manner in which it has been applied are thus by no means above criticism. But the defects from which it suffers, and the errors to which it has led, hardly justify the air of superiority with which it has not infrequently been treated by the advocates of other methods. Its weaknesses and pitfalls are easy to detect, because it has been applied on a large scale in the course of half a century; but I also think that the many important results achieved through it bear ample testimony to its merits. In order to form a just appreciation of a method it must be sufficiently put to the test, and this cannot be said to have been the case either with the sociological method of the French school or the ethnological method, which as yet have been in a greater degree subjects of theoretical discussion than of practical application. As for the French method, I cannot help saying that there are disquieting signs of a tendency to expansion beyond its legitimate limits. Its followers have not always been satisfied with restricting their conclusions to social phenomena belonging to the same area, but have regarded their method as a direct means of arriving at results of a much wider scope. Thus Professor Durkheim, in his book on the totemic system in Australia with the significant title 'Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse,' confidently asserts that this system contains "all the great ideas and all the principal ritual attitudes which are at the bottom even of the most advanced religions"; and he then proceeds to a discussion of religion in general, in the belief that if you have carefully studied the religion of one people only, you are better able to lay down the main principles of the religious life than if you follow the comparative method of a Tylor or Frazer.[1] It almost seems as though some kind of sociological intuition were to take the place of comparative induction. When properly applied, however, the different methods have their special problems to solve; and this should exclude every rivalry between them. All of them are beset with difficulties.

[1] Durkheim, *Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse*, p. 593 *sqq.*

For the problems are often complicated, and the material at our disposal is defective.

With reference to the particular subject-matter of the present work, it should be added that the investigator often must go beyond the psychological causes of the phenomena with which he deals and try to find their biological foundation. Marriage, so far as I can see, is rooted in instincts which can only be explained by biological facts—either peculiar to mankind and its nearest relatives, or of a more general character—and so are many particular customs and rules relating to marriage. Such instincts have been formed in accordance with the need of the species, which again depends upon anatomical and physiological factors of various kinds. This is true both of the sexual instinct with its peculiarities and of other instincts by which marriage is determined. It was a great defect of the earlier treatises on marriage that the biological aspect of the problem was entirely ignored, and even now it is not sufficiently recognised. In a review of the first edition of this work, Tylor pointed out that its distinguishing character was its "effort to work the biology-side and the culture-side of anthropology into one connected system"; and he added that "there can be no doubt of the value of the resulting discussions, which will develop further as the inquiry goes on in this direction."[1] In the present edition discussions of this kind occupy an even more prominent place than before. There is no question here of biological analogies applied to the explanation of social evolution—as has been mistakenly said—but we are concerned with biological *facts* underlying psychical and social phenomena. At the same time careful attention must also be given to the influence which people's ideas and beliefs have exercised upon their marriage customs, a subject on which much light has been thrown in the course of the last twenty years.[2] And another factor of importance

[1] Tylor, in *Academy*, October 3, 1891. *Cf.* Steinmetz, 'Die neueren Forschungen zur Geschichte der menschlichen Familie,' in *Zeitschrift für Socialwissenschaft*, ii. 811.

[2] See, especially, the works of Frazer and *The Mystic Rose* by Crawley.

is the influence of industrial culture.[1] Marriage is not a mere sex-relation, but an economic institution as well, and is consequently more or less influenced by the sources of subsistence.

I do not propose to discuss marriage in all its aspects, but shall, in the main, restrict myself to the following subjects :— the origin of marriage and questions connected with it, such as sexual periodicity, the various groups of facts which have been regarded as evidence of primitive promiscuity (alleged instances of peoples living in promiscuity, pre-nuptial unchastity, the *jus primae noctis*, religious prostitution, the lending and exchange of wives, feasts at which promiscuous intercourse is indulged in, the classificatory system of relationship, mother-right), and masculine jealousy; the frequency of marriage and the marriage age; celibacy; sexual modesty, which has a bearing both on celibacy and on some marriage customs; courtship and its various features; primitive means of attraction; sexual selection as influenced both by preferences and aversions, and the endogamous and exogamous rules which are rooted in the latter; the methods of contracting a marriage, such as capture, consent, and the giving of a consideration for the wife either in the form of the exchange of bride for bride, or of service, or of true purchase, or of gifts, or of the exchange of presents; the marriage portion; marriage rites; monogamy, polygyny, polyandry, and group-marriage and other group-relations; the duration of marriage and the rules relating to its dissolution.

I shall discuss each of these questions separately, and in doing so I shall consider the customs or laws of peoples at all stages of civilisation. I shall not, however, enter into all the details of the marriage laws of modern civilised peoples, which are of comparatively little theoretical interest and,

[1] The importance of this factor was emphasised by Grosse, in *Die Formen der Familie und die Formen der Wirthschaft*, and by Hildebrand, in *Recht und Sitte auf den verschiedenen wirthschaftlichen Kulturstufen*. But the most valuable contribution to the subject is, on account of the wealth of its material and its statistical method, *The Material Culture and Social Institutions of the Simpler Peoples*, by Hobhouse, Wheeler, and Ginsberg.

besides, can easily be found in legal treatises. Whenever it is possible, I shall group together peoples of the same stock or living in the same area, but in other cases I shall not hesitate to mention even in the same paragraph peoples belonging to different races, living far away from each other, and standing on different levels of culture, but whose customs or beliefs invite comparison. This will in certain quarters be called bad method; but I beg to refer to Darwin and others who, in dealing with some particular biological phenomenon, speak in the same breath even of different species of animals, and nevertheless have succeeded in reaching conclusions of some importance.

When the subject allows it, I shall make it a rule first to give a descriptive account of the phenomenon I am discussing, as it occurs among different peoples, and afterwards try to find its cause or causes—whether biological, psychological, or sociological. I am, of course, fully aware that the explanation may be incomplete, that it may refer to some cases but not to all, and that it may be partly or wholly conjectural. If I do not discuss the question of a common origin, either through the peoples' descent from the same ancestors or through culture-contact, that must by no means be interpreted as an assumption on my part that there is no common origin. When I speak of phenomena which I regard as specific characters—such as the sexual instinct, masculine jealousy, female coyness, or the family—I assume, on the contrary, *eo ipso* that they have a common source; and when I speak, for example, of identical marriage rites among the peoples of the Indo-European group, I never think of independent origins in each case. But to seek for the homestead of the various marriage customs would in most cases be a most unprofitable task.

The method I am following often necessitates long enumerations of facts. These are not meant merely to illustrate some particular theory of the author—as has been alleged by certain critics—but they form the basis on which the theory is built, and cannot, therefore, be avoided, however much they may tax the patience of the reader. The general public will also, perhaps, object to being told

certain facts which hurt its sense of modesty. But the concealment of truth is the only indecorum known to science; and to keep anything secret within its cold and passionless expanses would be as prudish as to throw a cloth round a naked statue.

CHAPTER I

THE ORIGIN OF MARRIAGE

MARRIAGE is generally used as a term for a social institution. As such it may be defined as a relation of one or more men to one or more women which is recognised by custom or law and involves certain rights and duties both in the case of the parties entering the union and in the case of the children born of it. These rights and duties vary among different peoples, and cannot therefore all be included in a general definition; but there must, of course, be something which they have in common. Marriage always implies the right of sexual intercourse: society holds such intercourse allowable in the case of husband and wife, and, generally speaking, even regards it as their duty to gratify in some measure the other partner's desire.[1] But the right to sexual intercourse is not necessarily exclusive. It can hardly be said to be so, from the legal point of view, unless adultery is regarded as an offence which entitles the other partner to dissolve the marriage union, and this, as we know, is by no means always the case.

At the same time, marriage is something more than a regulated sexual relation. It is an economic institution, which may in various ways affect the proprietary rights of the parties. It is the husband's duty, so far as it is possible and necessary, to support his wife and children, but it may also be their duty to work for him. As a general

[1] For the conception of a "right," see my *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, i. 139 *sqq.*

rule he has some power over them, although his power over the children is generally of limited duration. Very often marriage determines the place which a newly-born individual is to take in the social structure of the community to which he or she belongs; but this cannot, as has been maintained,[1] be regarded as the chief and primary function of marriage, considering how frequently illegitimate children are treated exactly like legitimate ones with regard to descent, inheritance, and succession.[2] It is, finally, necessary that the union, to be recognised as a marriage, should be concluded in accordance with the rules laid down by custom or law, whatever these rules may be. They may require the consent of the parties themselves or of their parents, or of the parties as well as of their parents. They may compel the man to pay a price for his bride, or the parents of the latter to provide her with a dowry. They may prescribe the performance of a particular marriage ceremony of one kind or other. And no man and woman are regarded as husband and wife unless the conditions stipulated by custom or law are complied with.

As for the origin of the institution of marriage, I consider it probable that it has developed out of a primeval habit. It was, I believe, even in primitive times, the habit for a man and a woman (or several women) to live together,

[1] Rivers, *History of Melanesian Society*, ii. 145.

[2] See, *e.g.*, Solberg, 'Gebräuche der Mittelmesa-Hopi (Moqui) bei Namengebung, Heirat und Tod,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xxxvii. 629; Bogoras, *Chukchee*, p. 572; Gurdon, *Khasis*, p. 77 (War country); Kohler, 'Das Recht der Marschallinsulaner,' in *Zeitschr. vergl. Rechtswiss.* xiv. 423; Torday and Joyce, 'Notes on the Ethnography of the Ba-Huana,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxvi. 285; Ploss-Renz, *Das Kind*, ii. 689; Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, i. 277, 319, 320, and ii. 105, 178, 226. In China all sons born in the household have an equal share in the inheritance, whether the mother be the principal wife or a concubine or a domestic slave; and according to Muhammadan law no distinction in point of inheritance is made between the child of a wife and that borne by a slave to her master, if the master acknowledge the child to be his own (Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. 48). See also Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie*, p. 114.

to have sexual relations with one another, and to rear their offspring in common, the man being the protector and supporter of his family and the woman being his helpmate and the nurse of their children. This habit was sanctioned by custom, and afterwards by law, and was thus transformed into a social institution. In order to trace marriage in its legal sense to its ultimate source, we must therefore try to find out the origin of the habit from which it sprang.

Our task is much facilitated by the fact that similar habits are found among many other species of the animal kingdom. Not, however, among the very lowest. In the great sub-kingdom of the Invertebrata the relations between the sexes are generally of the most fugitive nature, and even the mothers are exempted from nearly all anxiety as regards their offspring. In the highest order, the Insects, the eggs are hatched by the heat of the sun, and the mother, in most cases, does not even see her young, her care being generally limited to seeking out an appropriate place for laying the eggs, and to fastening them to some proper object and covering them, if this be necessary for their preservation.[1] Yet there are several species in which the mother prepares board and lodging for her offspring,[2] and among some beetles the male also takes part in the work, and, together with the female, even guards the eggs.[3] The Spanish Copris, for instance, digs a burrow under a heap of sheep's dung and gathers there victuals from the heap; and Fabre also suspects "the husband of lending a hand to his partner with the harvesting and the storing. . . . But, once the house is well supplied, he retires discreetly, returns to the surface and goes and settles down elsewhere, leaving the mother to her delicate functions. His part in the family-mansion is ended."[4]

[1] Brehm, *Thierleben*, ix. 16. Fabre, *Life and Love of the Insect*, p. 2.

[2] Reuter, *Lebensgewohnheiten und Instinkte der Insekten*, pp. 204, 205, 208 *sqq*. Fabre, *op. cit.* p. 1 *sq*.

[3] Reuter, *op. cit.* p. 227 *sqq*.

[4] Fabre, *op. cit.* p. 67 *sq*.

In the lowest classes of the Vertebrata parental care is likewise almost unheard of. In the immense majority of species, young fishes are hatched without the assistance of their parents, and have, from the outset, to help themselves. Many Teleostei, however, form an exception; and in these cases it is the male on which the parental duty generally devolves. In some instances he constructs a nest, and jealously guards the ova deposited in it by the female; while the male of certain species of Arius carries the ova about with him in his capacious pharynx.[1] Most of the Reptiles place their eggs in a convenient and sunny spot between moss and leaves, and take no further trouble about them. But several of the larger serpents have a curious fashion of laying them in a heap, and then coiling themselves around them in a great hollow cone.[2] And female crocodiles, as also certain aquatic snakes of Cochin China, observed by Dr. Morice, carry with them even their young.[3]

Among the lower Vertebrata, it rarely happens that both parents jointly take care of their progeny. Milne Edwards states that in the Pipa, or Toad of Surinam, the male helps the female to disburthen herself of her eggs;[4] and concerning some Chelonia M. Espinas observes, "La femelle vient sur les plages sablonneuses au moment de la ponte, accompagnée du mâle, et construit un nid en forme de four où la chaleur du soleil fait éclore les œufs."[5] But it may be regarded as an almost universal rule that the relations of the sexes are utterly fickle. The male and female come together in the pairing time; but having satisfied their sexual instincts they part again, and have nothing more to do with one another.

The case is very different with the large majority of Birds. Among them male and female keep together not only during the breeding season, but also after it, and the

[1] Guenther, *Introduction to the Study of Fishes*, p. 163.

[2] Wood, *Illustrated Natural History*, iii. 3.

[3] Espinas, *Des sociétés animales*, p. 416.

[4] Milne Edwards, *Leçons sur la physiologie et l'anatomie comparée*, viii. 496.

[5] Espinas, *op. cit.* p. 417.

parental instinct has reached a high degree of intensity on the father's side as well as on the mother's. The two birds help each other to build the nest, the male generally bringing the materials and the female doing the work. In fulfilling the numberless duties of the breeding season both birds take a share. Incubation rests principally with the mother,[1] but the father, as a rule, helps his companion, taking her place when she wants to leave the nest for a moment, or providing her with food and protecting her from every danger. During the first few days after hatching most birds rarely leave their young for long, and then only to procure food for themselves and their family; and in cases of danger both parents bravely defend their offspring. As soon as the first period of helplessness is over and the young have grown somewhat, they are carefully taught to shift for themselves; and it is only when they are perfectly capable of so doing that they leave the nest and the parents.

There are, it is true, a few birds that from the first day of their ultra-oval existence lack all parental care; and in some species, as the ducks, it frequently happens that the male leaves family duties wholly to the female. But as a general rule both share prosperity and adversity. Brehm believes that most birds, with the exception of those belonging to the Gallinaceous family and some other species, when pairing, do so once for all till either one or the other dies. He is so filled with admiration for their exemplary family life, that he enthusiastically declares that "real genuine marriage can only be found among birds."[2]

The same cannot be said of most of the Mammals. The mother is, no doubt, very ardently concerned for the welfare of her young, generally nursing them with the utmost affection, but in the majority of species the relations between the sexes are restricted to the pairing season,

[1] The ostrich, however, forms a curious exception, the male—not the female—sitting on the eggs and bringing up the young birds (Brehm, *Bird-Life*, p. 324).

[2] *Ibid.* p. 285. The statements concerning birds are taken from Brehm's *Thierleben*, vol. iv., the same author's *Bird-Life*, and Hermann Müller's *Am Neste*.

and sometimes the male even acts as an enemy to his own progeny. Yet there are various species in which the union between male and female is of a more durable character. This is the case with whales,[1] seals,[2] the hippopotamus,[3] the *Cervus campestris*,[4] gazelles,[5] the *Neotragus Hemprichii* and other small antelopes,[6] rein-deer,[7] the *Myopotamus bonariensis* (a South American aquatic rodent),[8] squirrels,[9] moles,[10] the ichneumon,[11] and some carnivorous animals, as a few cats and martens,[12] the yaguarundi in South America,[13] the *Canis Azaræ*,[14] and possibly also the wolf.[15] Among all these animals the sexes are said to remain together even after the birth of the young, the male being the protector of the family.

This is frequently the case among the Quadrumana. The natives of Madagascar assert that in some species of the Prosimii male and female nurse their young in common[16]—a statement, however, the accuracy of which remains to be proved. The mirikina (*Nyctipithecus trivirgatus*) seems, according to Rengger, to live in pairs throughout the whole year, for, whatever the season, a male and a female have always been found together.[17] Of the *Mycetes Caraya*, *Cebus Azaræ*,[18] and *Ateles paniscus*,[19] single individuals are very seldom or never seen, whole families being generally met with. Among the Arctopitheci, the male parent is expressly said to assist the female in taking care of the young ones.[20]

[1] Brehm, *Thierleben*, iii. 679.
[2] *Ibid.* iii. 593, 594, 599.
[3] *Ibid.* iii. 578.
[4] Rengger, *Naturgeschichte der Säugethiere von Paraguay*, p. 354.
[5] Brehm, *Thierleben*, iii. 206.
[6] *Ibid.* iii. 256. Espinas, *op. cit.* p. 447.
[7] Brehm, *Thierleben*, iii. 124.
[8] Rengger, *op. cit.* p. 240.
[9] Brehm, *Thierleben*, ii. 270.
[10] *Ibid.* ii. 263.
[11] *Ibid.* ii. 39.
[12] *Ibid.* i. 347.
[13] *Ibid.* i. 387.
[14] Rengger, *op. cit.* p. 147 *sq.*
[15] Brehm, *Thierleben*, i. 535.
[16] *Ibid.* i. 244.
[17] Rengger, *op. cit.* p. 62.
[18] *Ibid.* pp. 20, 38.
[19] Schomburgk, *Reisen in Britisch-Guiana*, iii. 767.
[20] Brehm, *Thierleben*, i. 228.

In a recent work on his travels in Sumatra, Moszkowski states that the higher monkeys or apes usually live in families consisting of father, mother, and one or two young; he says that he has often witnessed this himself, but, unfortunately, does not mention the name of any particular species.[1] Diard was told by the Malays, and found it afterwards to be true, that the young siamangs, when in their helpless state, are carried about by their parents, the males by the father, the females by the mother.[2] C. de Crespigny, who was wandering in the northern part of Borneo in 1870, gives the following description of the orang-utan:—"They live in families—the male, female, and a young one. On one occasion I found a family in which were two young ones, one of them much larger than the other, and I took this as a proof that the family tie had existed for at least two seasons. They build commodious nests in the trees which form their feeding-ground, and, so far as I could observe, the nests, which are well lined with dry leaves, are only occupied by the female and young, the male passing the night in the fork of the same or another tree in the vicinity. The nests are very numerous all over the forest, for they are not occupied above a few nights, the mias (or orang-utan) leading a roving life."[3] According to Rajah Brooke, these apes "are never found in numbers together, in general only single, though occasionally the male and female are in company."[4] Mohnike says that the old males generally live with the females during the rutting season only.[5] Hornaday writes:—"The orang is quite solitary in his habits, the old males always being found alone; nor are two adult females ever found together. On two occasions I found three individuals together, but

[1] Moszkowski, *Auf neuen Wegen durch Sumatra*, p. 246.

[2] Brehm, *Thierleben*, i. 97.

[3] de Crespigny, 'On Northern Borneo,' in *Proceed. Roy. Geo. Soc.* xvi. 177.

[4] Brooke, *Narrative of Events in Borneo and Celebes from the Journals of James Brooke*, i. 227.

[5] Mohnike, 'Die Affen auf den indischen Inseln,' in *Das Ausland*, xlv. 850. See also Hartmann, *Die menschenähnlichen Affen*, p. 230.

one was an old female with a nursing infant, and the third was her next oldest offspring, apparently about a year and a half old, who had not yet left his mother's side to shift for himself." From this our informant draws the conclusion that the young one does not leave its mother until nearly two years of age [1]—an assumption which well agrees with Rajah Brooke's statement referring to an adult female with a young one at her breast and "a second a year or two old (probably her former offspring) in company."[2] Nor did Wallace ever see two full-grown animals together; but he sometimes found females and at other times males accompanied by half-grown young ones.[3] It thus seems that the offspring of the orang-utan are not devoid of all paternal care.

More unanimous in this respect are the statements we have regarding the gorilla. According to Savage, these apes live in bands, but all his informants agreed in the assertion that but one adult male is found in every band. "It is said that when the male is first seen he gives a terrific yell that resounds far and wide through the forest. . . . The females and young at the first cry quickly disappear; he then approaches the enemy in great fury, pouring out his horrid cries in quick succession."[4] Schweinfurth says that the gorillas are not found in herds, but either in pairs or even quite alone, and that it is only the young that occasionally may be seen in groups.[5] Du Chaillu found "almost always one male with one female, though sometimes the old male wanders companionless";[6] and Winwood Reade states likewise that the gorilla goes "sometimes alone, sometimes accompanied by his female and young one."[7] The same traveller was told that when a family of these apes ascend a tree and eat a certain fruit, the old father

[1] Hornaday, *Two Years in the Jungle*, p. 402 *sq.*
[2] Brooke, *op. cit.* i. 221.
[3] Wallace, *Malay Archipelago*, i. 93.
[4] Savage, *Description of Troglodytes Gorilla*, p. 9 *sq.*
[5] Schweinfurth, *Heart of Africa*, i. 522.
[6] Du Chaillu, *Explorations and Adventures in Equatorial Africa*, p. 349.
[7] Reade, *Savage Africa*, p. 214.

remains seated at the foot of the tree. And when the female is pregnant he builds a rude nest, usually about fifteen or twenty feet from the ground; here she is delivered, and the nest is then abandoned.[1] According to von Koppenfels, the male spends the night crouching at the foot of the tree, against which he places his back, and thus protects the female and their young, which are in the nest above, from the nocturnal attacks of leopards. Once he observed a male and a female with two young ones of different ages, the elder being perhaps about six years old, the younger about one year.[2]

A somewhat different account of the habits of the gorilla was given to Mr. Guthrie in Kamerun by natives of the Bulu tribe. According to this account, "the gorillas of Kamerun 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 members would probably have two adult males. As the younger members grow up they take, or rather keep, their places in the company. When the old male becomes cross, or 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." When a gorilla's family is threatened by natives, he will attack them. Mr. Guthrie relates:—"In one instance a band of gorillas was attacked by two Bulu men. The old gorilla of the band first got his family out of danger, and then returned to the encounter."[3]

From these accounts it appears that the gorilla lives in family groups, consisting of one adult male (according to

[1] *Ibid.* pp. 218, 214.

[2] v. Koppenfels, 'Meine Jagden auf Gorillas,' in *Die Gartenlaube*, 1877, p. 418 *sq.*

[3] Jenks, 'Bulu knowledge of the Gorilla and Chimpanzee,' in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. xiii. 56, 58.

one account sometimes two), one or more females, and one or more young ones of different ages, and that the adult male, or father, guards, warns, and protects his family, and, apparently, builds a nest for them. The habits of the chimpanzee are said to be very similar. Schweinfurth states that this ape also is found either in pairs or even quite alone, only the young occasionally being seen in groups.[1] According to Savage, " it is seldom that more than one or two nests are seen upon the same tree or in the same neighbourhood; five have been found, but it was an unusual circumstance. They do not live in ' villages.' . . . They are more often seen in pairs than in gangs." He also tells us that " it is not unusual to see ' the old folks ' sitting under a tree regaling themselves with fruit and friendly chat, while ' their children ' are leaping around them and swinging from branch to branch in boisterous merriment."[2] Von Koppenfels says that the chimpanzee, like the gorilla, builds a nest for the young and female on a forked branch, and that the male himself spends the night lower down in the tree.[3] Mr. Guthrie was told by his native informants that the chimpanzee in Kamerun lives in bands, as does the gorilla; but " the old males eventually become solitary, though the young on maturing are believed to remain in the kinship group."[4]

If we ask why in certain animal species male and female remain together not only during the pairing season but till after the birth of the offspring, I think that there can be no doubt as regards the true answer. They are induced to do so by an instinct which has been acquired through the process of natural selection because it has a tendency to preserve the next generation and thereby the species. This is shown by the fact that in such cases the male not only stays with the female and young but also takes care of them. Marital and paternal instincts, like maternal

[1] Schweinfurth, *op. cit.* i. 522.

[2] Savage, ' On *Troglodytes niger*,' in *Boston Journal of Natural History*, iv. 384 *sq.* See also Du Chaillu, *op. cit.* p. 358; Hartmann, *op. cit.* p. 221.

[3] v. Koppenfels, *loc. cit.* p. 418. [4] Jenks, *loc. cit.* p. 61.

affection, are necessary for the existence of certain species, although there are many other means by which a species may be enabled to subsist. Where parental care is lacking, we may be sure to find compensation for it in some other way. Among the Invertebrata, Fishes, and Reptiles, both parents are generally quite indifferent as to their progeny. An immense proportion of the latter therefore succumb before reaching maturity; but the number of eggs laid is proportionate to the number of those lost, and the species is preserved nevertheless. If every grain of roe spawned by the female fishes were fecundated and hatched, the sea would not be large enough to hold all the creatures resulting from them. The eggs of Reptiles need no maternal care, the embryo being developed by the heat of the sun; and their young are from the outset able to help themselves, leading the same life as the adults. Among Birds, on the other hand, parental care is an absolute necessity. Equal and continual warmth is the first requirement for the development of the embryo and the preservation of the young ones. For this the mother almost always wants the assistance of the father, who provides her with necessaries, and sometimes relieves her of the brooding. Among Mammals, the young can never do without the mother at the tenderest age, but the father's aid is generally by no means indispensable. In some species, as the walrus,[1] the elephant,[2] the *Bos americanus*,[3] and the bat,[4] there seems to be a rather curious substitute for paternal protection, the females, together with their young ones, collecting in large herds or flocks apart from the males.

In the case of the man-like apes there are some obvious facts which might account for the need of marital and paternal protection. One is the small number of young; the female brings forth but one at a birth.[5] Another is the long period of infancy; the orang-utan is said to be full-grown only at the age of fifteen.[6] If the family life of this

[1] Brehm, *Thierleben*, iii. 649.
[2] *Ibid.* iii. 479.
[3] *Ibid.* iii. 400.
[4] *Ibid.* i. 299.
[5] Jenks, *loc. cit.* pp. 57, 61 (gorilla, chimpanzee). Hornaday, *op. cit.* p. 403 (orang-utan).
[6] Mohnike, *loc. cit.* p. 850.

ape, nevertheless, is more defective than that of the gorilla and chimpanzee, the reason may perhaps be that it is exposed to fewer dangers. "Except man," says Mohnike, "the orang-utan in Borneo has no enemy of equal strength";[1] and on account of his great strength, says Rajah Brooke, "an old male might attack a single man if provoked."[2] Finally, as we have seen, none of these apes can be called gregarious animals. In this respect they differ from the smaller monkeys; and the reason for this is probably just their larger size, which, on the one hand, makes the protection afforded by gregariousness less necessary, and, on the other hand, makes it more difficult to live in larger herds owing to the greater quantities of food required. It is said that the gorilla hardly ever spends two nights in the same place, each family roaming about in the bush from place to place in search of food.[3] Savage tells us that the chimpanzees are more numerous in the season when the greatest number of fruits come to maturity,[4] which seems to indicate that the solitary life in separate family groups generally led by this ape is due chiefly to the difficulty it experiences in getting food at other times of the year. And the comparatively greater sociability attributed to it by the natives of Kamerun may perhaps have something to do with the fact that "the immense forests furnish an abundance of varied food, so the chimpanzee usually experiences little trouble in satisfying its hunger."[5]

When we from the highest monkeys pass to man, we meet with the same phenomenon. Among the lowest savages, as well as the most civilised races of men, we find the family consisting of parents and children, and the father as its protector and supporter. There are, it is true, statements according to which certain peoples live or have lived in a state of promiscuity without any family ties; there are various customs which have been interpreted as survivals of

[1] *Ibid.* p. 894.
[2] Brooke, *op. cit.* i. 225.
[3] Jenks, *loc. cit.* p. 57.
[4] Savage, in *Boston Journal of Natural History*, iv. 384. *Cf.* von Koppenfels, *loc. cit.* p. 419.
[5] Jenks, *loc. cit.* p. 61.

such a state in the past; and the hypothesis has been set forth that promiscuity prevailed universally among primitive men. I shall, in subsequent chapters, try to show that most of the statements in question are obviously inaccurate, and none of them can be proved to be, or is even likely to be, true; that the so-called survivals of earlier promiscuity may be interpreted in a much more satisfactory manner otherwise; and that the hypothesis of a primitive stage of promiscuity not only lacks all foundation in fact, but is utterly opposed to the most probable inference we are able to make as regards the early condition of man. On the other hand, there are undoubtedly peoples among whom a child stands in a more intimate relation to its maternal uncle than to its father.

In a few exceptional cases it is said to be the custom for the husband not to live with his wife at all, but merely to pay her visits in the place where she dwells with her maternal relatives; and the children she bears then remain with her. Of the Orang Mamaq in Sumatra, who are divided into a number of exogamous matrilineal clans, we are told that man and wife generally continue to live each with his or her own clan, though it sometimes happens that the husband moves to his wife's home. The head of the family is the eldest brother of the wife, whereas the husband and father is not considered to belong to it at all. Yet their marriages are said to be not only monogamous but indissoluble save by death.[1] Among the kindred Malays of the Padang Highlands in the same island there is a similar institution. Married life, we are told, reveals itself merely in the form of visits which the husband pays to his wife; in the beginning, at least, he comes by day, helps her in her work in the rice-fields and takes his midday meal with her, but later he generally comes privately in the evening to his wife's house and stays there, if he be a faithful husband, until the following morning. As a rule, he does not sufficiently provide

[1] Graafland, 'De verbreiding van het matriarchaat in het landschap Indragiri,' in *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, ser. v. vol. v. (vol. xxxix.) p. 43 *sq.* Hagen, *Die Orang Kubu auf Sumatra*, p. 164.

for his wife and children ; here, too, it is the maternal uncle (*mamaq*) of the latter that is their father, so far as duties and rights are concerned, and the head of the family in the narrower sense of the term, the so-called *sa-mandei*.[1] Among the Syntengs of the Jaintia Hills in Assam, the husband likewise only visits his wife at her mother's house ; " in Jowai," says Major Gurdon, " some people admitted to me that the husband came to his mother-in-law's house only after dark, and that he did not eat, smoke, or even partake of betel-nut there, the idea being that because none of his earnings go to support this house, therefore it is not etiquette for him to partake of food or other refreshment there."[2] Among the Nayars of Malabar, who practised a sort of polyandry, the woman lived apart from her husbands, or lovers, who cohabited with her by agreement among themselves. They contributed to maintain her, and according to several authorities the children as well ; but in some accounts all paternal duties are said to be ignored, the children being brought up by their maternal uncle. Even to this day, when polyandry has almost entirely ceased to exist among the Nayars, it frequently happens that the wife remains in her own *tarwad* (the common residence of the children of the same maternal ancestor), and that the husband only visits her in her house in the night and goes home the next morning ;[3] nay, from the strictly legal point of view, wife and children possess no privilege of claiming maintenance from the husband and father.[4] These cases, however, are certainly rare exceptions to a well-nigh universal rule, and must by no means be regarded as anything like representative of the relations between man and woman among peoples with matrilineal descent. As for the Nayars, it seems that their peculiar customs were closely connected with their military organisation.[5]

[1] Pistorius, *Studien over de inlandsche huishouding in de Padangsche Bovenlanden*, p. 42 *sqq.* van Hasselt, *Volksbeschrijving van Midden-Sumatra*, p. 245 *sq.*

[2] Gurdon, *Khasis*, p. 76.

[3] *Infra*, on Polyandry.

[4] Gopal Panikkar, *Malabar and its Folk*, p. 22.

[5] *Infra*, on Polyandry.

More frequently it is said that the mother's brother has greater rights over a child than the father, or that the latter's authority is very slight or even *nil*, although the children live with their parents, at least in earlier years. This is reported of various African peoples mentioned by Dr. Hartland—the Alladians on the Ivory Coast, the people of Loango, the Igalwas of the Lower Congo, the Kimbunda, the Ewhe of Anglo in Upper Guinea, the Kunâma of Northern Abyssinia, the Suahili, the Wanyika in the hinterland of Mombasa—and of the Melanesians of the Gazelle Peninsula of New Britain.[1] *Yet it is hard to believe that the father really is devoid of all power over his children while they remain in his house.* Among the Bambala, according to Mr. Torday, the children of a "betrothed" wife belong to their maternal uncle, although those of a purchased wife belong to their father, and after the age of seven or eight the children of the former class may go to the uncle; but we are expressly told that "as long as children remain with the father he is supreme."[2] Perhaps something like might be said of various other Congo natives, as well as of the coast people of the Gazelle Peninsula, among whom the children or boys move to the village of their maternal uncle when they reach a certain age.[3] On the Lower Congo, according to Mr. Weeks, when the lad is about fourteen or fifteen years old his maternal uncle brings a calabash of palm wine to the father and claims the lad. "The father has no power to withhold him from going with his uncle, but the lad himself can refuse to go, and thus elect to remain under the tutelage of his father as long as he likes."[4]

Generally speaking, I think it is necessary to receive with some caution statements which attribute unqualified power

[1] Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, i. 277, 281, 282, 284, 285, 287, 288, 290.

[2] Torday, *Camp and Tramp in African Wilds*, p. 95.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 134 (Bayaka). Torday and Joyce, 'Notes on the Ethnography of the Ba-Huana,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxvi. 285 *sq.* Johnston, *George Grenfell and the Congo*, ii. 673 (natives of South Congoland). Burger, *Die Küsten- und Bergvölker der Gazellehalbinsel*, p. 30.

[4] Weeks, *Among the Primitive Bakongo*, p. 119.

to the maternal uncle to the exclusion of the father. Travellers are naturally impressed by the difference between the European family system and that of the people they visit, and are therefore liable to emphasise this difference somewhat more than is justified by the actual facts. In this way we may explain certain inconsistencies occasionally found in their accounts. Dr. Ruelle, for instance, states that among the Lobi in French West Africa the children belong to their uncle, although they live with their parents; but on the next page we read, "Il n'existe aucune autre autorité que celle du père de famille qui l'exerce réellement, soutenu, au besoin, par les membres qui la constituent." Nay, in case of divorce all children from six years of age upwards remain with the father.[1] Concerning the Ewhe-speaking peoples on the Slave Coast, Major Ellis tells us in one place that "the eldest brother is the head of the family," but speaks in another place of the father as the "owner or master of the household," and says that when a man wants to marry a certain girl the negotiations are made with her parents; whilst in the case of betrothals between children a present is made by the parents of the male child to those of the female child.[2] Magyar informs us that among the Kimbunda the father has no power over his sons even during their minority; but, nevertheless, we hear that "the grown-up son leaves his parents' house as soon as he is marriageable, and establishes himself in an independent position," and that the daughters are given away in marriage by their parents.[3] With reference to the same people, it is of interest to note that, although no rights over the sons are attributed to the father, they are said to be under his guardianship (*Obhut*).[4]

The elementary paternal duties seem to be recognised universally while the children live in the father's house,

[1] Ruelle, 'Notes anthropologiques, ethnographiques et sociologiques sur quelques populations noires du 2° territoire militaire de l'Afrique occidentale française,' in *L'Anthropologie*, xv. 661 *sq.*

[2] Ellis, *Ewe-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast*, pp. 207, 211, 155, 201.

[3] Magyar, *Reisen in Süd-Afrika*, pp. 284, 281 *sq.* [4] *Ibid.* p. 284.

however limited be his rights over them. The Ewhe of Anglo, among whom the maternal uncle is said to have greater power than the father, consider it to be incumbent upon the latter to take care of the boys when they grow older, whilst the education of the girls devolves on the mother; and when a boy gets old enough to marry, the father and the uncle jointly procure a wife for him.[1] On the Lower Congo, "until the uncle comes with the palm wine the lad is under the protection of his father, who is responsible for him to the boy's family, but on the boy going with the uncle, the father's responsibility is ended."[2] The Herero, among whom the father's power is said to consist merely in the right of chastising his child,[3] compel him to pay compensation to his wife's kin if he neglects a child so that it dies, nay apparently if it dies without any fault on his part.[4] In Garenganze, to the south-west of Lake Moero, "if a freeborn child were lost or devoured by wild animals, the father would have to pay its value to his wife's relatives, as . . . freeborn children are in some parts supposed to belong entirely to their mother."[5] Among the Kaupuis of Manipur, on the death of a child, *munda*, or "bone-money," is demanded by the wife's father.[6] Among the Papuans of the Tami Islands, if a child dies the father makes presents to the mother's kin—obviously, as Kohler remarks, because the father is held responsible for the death and redeems his liability with a gift.[7] Dr. Hartland mentions the last four cases as instances of "the alien position occupied among matrilineal peoples by the father in regard to his children."[8]

[1] Härtter, 'Sitten und Gebräuche der Angloer,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xxxviii. 43.

[2] Weeks, *op. cit.* p. 119.

[3] Dannert, *Zum Rechte der Herero*, p. 47.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 47. Kohler, 'Das Recht der Herero,' in *Zeitschr. vergl. Rechtswiss.* xiv. 307.

[5] Arnot, *Garenganze*, p. 242.

[6] Watt, 'Aboriginal Tribes of Manipur,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xx. 355.

[7] Kohler, 'Das Recht der Papuas,' in *Zeitschr. vergl. Rechtswiss.* xiv. 351.

[8] Hartland, *op. cit.* i. 275–279, 281.

In this connection they are of interest as showing that even where the mother's kindred have certain rights over the children, the father is held responsible for their lives.

But it must not be supposed that it is a general rule among matrilineal peoples that the maternal uncle or any other member of the mother's kin has more authority over the children than the father. In all Australian tribes, whether patrilineal or matrilineal, the father is most distinctly the head of the family.[1] The same is the case in many parts of Melanesia, where descent is traced through the mother; as Dr. Codrington puts it, "the house of the family is the father's, the garden is his, the rule and government are his."[2] Of the Khasis in Assam, Major Gurdon writes:—"It is true that the *kni*, or mother's elder brother, is the head of the house, but the father is the executive head of the new home, where, after children have been born to him, his wife and children live with him. It is he who faces the dangers of the jungles, and risks his life for wife and children. . . . In his own family circle a father and husband is nearer to his children and his wife than *u kni*."[3] In Madagascar the prevalence of matrilineal descent does not prevent the commands of a father or an ancestor from being "held as most sacredly binding upon his descendants."[4] Among the Mpongwe, who reckon descent through the mother, the father has by law unrestricted power over his children.[5] Concerning the matrilineal Algonkin of North America, Charlevoix says that even though the father "is not regarded

[1] Curr, *The Australian Race*, i. 60, 62, 69. Eylmann, *Die Eingeborenen der Kolonie Südaustralien*, p. 168. Malinowski, *The Family among the Australian Aborigines*, p. 67 *sqq*. See also *infra*, i. 66 *sq*.

[2] Codrington, *Melanesians*, p. 34. See also Hagen, *Unter den Papua's*, p. 224 *sq*. (natives of Kaiser Wilhelm Land); Vetter, 'Bericht über papuanische Rechtsverhältnisse,' in *Nachrichten über Kaiser Wilhelms-Land*, 1897, p. 86 (natives of Simbang); Jung, 'Rechtsanschauungen der Eingeborenen von Nauru,' in *Mittheil. Deutsch. Schutzgeb.* x. 65 (natives of Nauru, one of the Marshall Islands).

[3] Gurdon, *op. cit.* p. 78 *sq*.

[4] Sibree, *The Great African Island*, p. 326.

[5] Hübbe-Schleiden, *Ethiopien*, pp. 151, 153.

as father, he is always respected as the master of the cabin."[1] Of the Iroquois—who, on the authority of Morgan,[2] have been represented as one of the few instances of mother-right "in its most typical form," where the father has no authority in the household[3]—an earlier authority tells us that the mother superintends the children, but that the word of the father is law and must be obeyed by the whole household.[4] These are only a few instances of a very widespread right granted to the father among peoples who have the matrilineal system of descent.

Dr. Hartland—to mention only the latest exponent of "mother-right"—regards the authority of the father, nay even that of the maternal uncle, as the result of later development. The *potestas*, he says, vests in the first instance in the elders of the kin at large. "As the consciousness of kin becomes gradually more vivid and defined the elders of the inchoate family absorb the headship of their more immediate kin and administer its concerns. Gradually the headship becomes concentrated in the hands of one man, often chosen by the family from among a small number specially qualified by age experience wisdom or courage, or designated by propinquity of blood to the predecessor in office." But "when the family under motherright emerges the power is found to be wielded not by the husband but by the wife's brothers, or her maternal uncles, a circle constantly narrowing until the definition of these terms approximates to our own, one of whom takes ultimately the lead and appropriates the greater part or sometimes the whole of the *potestas*. Nor does the transition to the reckoning of descent through the father entirely and at once divest him of it. Enough survives in his hands to form very material evidence of the more archaic social organisation which preceded the estab-

[1] Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, v. 424.

[2] Morgan, *League of the Iroquois*, p. 325.

[3] Rivers, 'Mother-Right,' in Hastings, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, viii. 851.

[4] Seaver, *Narrative of the Life of Mrs. Mary Jemison*, p. 165. Mrs. Jemison was a white woman who was captured by the Indians in 1755.

lishment of fatherright." And we are told that " the result of anthropological investigations during the past half-century has been to show that motherright everywhere preceded fatherright and the reckoning of descent in the modern civilised fashion through both parents." [1] In short, the family consisting of father, mother, and children has everywhere been preceded by a social organisation of mother-right where the father was a wholly subordinate personage.

The main facts on which this theory is based have already been mentioned. Among a few peoples, not even half a dozen in number, it is said to be the custom for husband and wife to remain permanently in their own communities, apart from each other, and for the children to stay with the mother. Among various other peoples, the mother's kin, and particularly the maternal uncle, are said to have greater rights over the children than the father, if not exclusive rights over them; whereas among many matrilineal peoples the father's *potestas* is paramount. I can find no reason whatever to assume that the latter peoples, also, had full-fledged mother-right in former times. If a certain institution is highly developed among some peoples and much less developed among others, it does not follow that it was once highly developed among the latter as well. In the present case any such conclusion is particularly illegitimate, considering that the fullest mother-right prevails among agricultural tribes, whereas the matrilineal system is nowhere feebler than among the Australian aborigines, who still live in the hunting and food-collecting stage. This is very significant on account of the close connection which exists between the family organisation and factors of an economic character. Nor can I accept the statement that " mother-right everywhere preceded fatherright "; but this question will be most conveniently discussed together with the hypothesis which regards the matrilineal system as a relic of early promiscuity. Those who advocate a primitive stage of mother-right without paternal rights and paternal duties are faced by the formidable fact, which will be dealt with

[1] Hartland, *op. cit.* i. 299, 300, 256 *sq.*

presently, that among the lowest savages, who chiefly or exclusively subsist on game and such products of nature as they can gather without cultivating the soil or breeding domestic animals, the family consisting of parents and children is a well-marked social unit, with the father as its head and protector.

That the functions of the husband and father in the family are not merely of the sexual and procreative kind, but involve the duty of protecting the wife and children, is testified by an array of facts relating to peoples in all quarters of the world and in all stages of civilisation. The North American Indian considered it disgraceful for a man to have more wives than he was able to maintain.[1] Powers says that among the Patwin, a rude hunting tribe of California, "the sentiment that the men are bound to support the women—that is, to furnish the supplies—is stronger even than among us."[2] Among the Iroquois it was the office of the husband "to make a mat, to repair the cabin of his wife, or to construct a new one." The product of his hunting expeditions belonged during the first year of marriage to his wife, and afterwards he shared it equally with her, whether she remained in the village or accompanied him on the chase.[3] Among the Tarahumare of Mexico the bridegroom's father at the wedding makes a speech in which he tells the young man "that he has to kill deer and take care always to bring some animal home to his wife, even if it be only a chipmunk or a mouse. He also has to plough and to sow corn and to raise crops, that he and she may always have enough to eat and not go hungry."[4] Among the Pawnee "a young man did not expect to marry until he had come to be an expert hunter, and so was able to support a wife."[5] So also among the Guaraunos on the Orinoco "un garçon n'entre en ménage que lorsqu'il peut nourrir une

[1] Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, iii. 109. Carver, *Travels through the Interior Parts of North America*, p. 367.

[2] Powers, *Tribes of California*, p. 222.

[3] Heriot, *Travels through the Canadas*, p. 338.

[4] Lumholtz, *Unknown Mexico*, i. 269.

[5] Grinnell, *Story of the Indian*, p. 42 *sq.*

femme avec les produits de sa chasse et sa pêche."[1] Of the Indians of the North-West Amazons we are told that " the husband, once he has obtained his wife, is entirely responsible for her maintenance."[2] Among the Charruas of Uruguay, " du moment où un homme se marie, il forme une famille à part, et travaille pour la nourrir."[3] Among the Fuegians, " as soon as a youth is able to maintain a wife, by his exertions in fishing or bird-catching, he obtains the consent of her relations."[4]

Concerning the Tonga Islanders, Mariner remarks that " a married woman is one who cohabits with a man, and lives under his roof and protection."[5] In Samoa, it is said, " whatever intercourse may take place between the sexes, a woman does not become a man's wife unless the latter take her to his own house."[6] Among the Maori " the mission of woman was to increase and multiply ; that of man to defend his home."[7] In Pentecost, of the New Hebrides, the father of the bride, or some friend of consequence at the wedding, formally exhorts the bridegroom " to feed his wife properly and treat her kindly."[8] Among some of the Marshall Islanders even natural children were received by the father into his house as soon as they were able to walk.[9]

Among the Bangerang tribe in Victoria " the ordinary business of the married men was to see to the safety of the family, procure meat or fish, and opossum skins enough to keep them clad " ; whilst the women provided the daily supply of wild roots and vegetables.[10] With reference to the

[1] Chaffanjon, *L'Orénoque et le Caura*, p. 11.

[2] Whiffen, *North-West Amazons*, p. 66. See also *ibid.* p. 164 *sq.*

[3] Azara, *Voyages dans l'Amérique méridionale*, ii. 22.

[4] King and Fitzroy, *Voyages of the Adventure and Beagle*, ii. 182. For other instances from South America see Rivet, ' Les Indiens Jibaros,' in *L'Anthropologie*, xviii. 607 ; Cardús, *Las Misiones Fransiscanas entre los infieles de Bolivia*, p. 263 (Tobas).

[5] Mariner, *Natives of the Tonga Islands*, ii. 167.

[6] Pritchard, *Polynesian Reminiscences*, p. 134.

[7] Johnstone, *Maoria*, p. 28 *sq.* [8] Codrington, *op. cit.* p. 240.

[9] Kotzebue, *Voyage of Discovery into the South Sea*, iii. 173. *Cf.* Kohler, in *Zeitschr. vergl. Rechtswiss.* xiv. 423.

[10] Curr, *Recollections of Squatting in Victoria*, pp. 255, 251.

Kurnai in Gippsland, Dr. Howitt states that "the man has to provide for his family with the assistance of his wife. His share is to hunt for their support, and to fight for their protection."[1] Among the North-West-Central Queensland aborigines, according to Dr. Roth, "it is the husband's business in the main to supply the animal food for the family."[2] In the Encounter Bay tribe in South Australia paternal care is considered so indispensable that if the father dies before the child is born, it is put to death by the mother, as there is no longer any one to provide for it.[3] In his study of the South Australian natives Dr. Eylmann observes that it is also the business of the husband and father to erect the hut.[4]

The Sea Dyak women "generally regard marriage as a means of obtaining a man to work for them. A woman will often separate from her husband simply because he is lazy, and will not do his fair share of the work."[5] Among the Barito tribes in the south-east part of Borneo it is considered to be a husband's duty to provide his wife with food and clothing and other necessaries, as also to protect her from all dangers.[6] The Nagas are not permitted to marry until they are able to set up house on their own account.[7] Among the Eravállens, a jungle tribe in the Cochin State, "a young man is never allowed to marry unless he is able to support a wife."[8] Among the Maldivians, "although a man is allowed four wives at one time, it is only on condition of his being able to support them."[9]

[1] Fison and Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, p. 206.

[2] Roth, *Ethnological Studies among the North-West-Central Queensland Aborigines*, p. 184.

[3] Meyer, 'Manners and Customs of the Encounter Bay Tribe,' in Woods, *Native Tribes of South Australia*, p. 186.

[4] Eylmann, *op. cit.* p. 168.

[5] Gomes, *Seventeen Years among the Sea Dyaks*, p. 128.

[6] Schwaner, *Borneo*, i. 199.

[7] Stewart, 'Notes on Northern Cachar,' in *Jour. Asiatic Soc. Bengal*, xxiv. 614.

[8] Anantha Krishna Iyer, *Cochin Tribes and Castes*, i. 44.

[9] Rosset, 'On the Maldive Islands,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xvi. 168 *sq.*

The Rock Veddas in Ceylon "acknowledge the marital obligation and the duty of supporting their own families."[1]

In Nyasaland "native custom expects the husband to maintain his wife in clothes, to build the hut in which they are to live, to pay the Government tax on it, and generally to protect his spouse and treat her with reasonable confidence."[2] The Wasania in British East Africa prohibit a man from having more than three wives, as they consider him incapable of supporting a larger number.[3] Among the Shambaa in East Africa a wife is allowed to leave her husband if he neglects to provide her with food, clothing, and a dwelling;[4] and the like is said of the Negroes of Angola.[5] So also among the Bavili a wife may demand dissolution of the marriage if her husband is long absent from home and fails to support her.[6] Among the Xosa-Kafirs the father must provide for the maintenance and welfare of the members of the family.[7]

The husband and father being a supporter and protector of his family, a man is often not permitted to marry until he has given some proof of his ability to fulfil these duties.

Among the Macusis of British Guiana, before a young man is allowed to choose a wife, "he must prove that he is a man, and can do man's work. Without flinching, he suffers the infliction of wounds in his flesh; or he allows himself to be sewn up in a hammock full of fire-ants; or by some other similar tests he shows his courage. And he

[1] Tennent, *Ceylon*, ii. 441.

[2] Duff, *Nyasaland under the Foreign Office*, p. 317.

[3] Barrett, 'Notes on the Customs and Beliefs of the Wa-Giriama, etc., British East Africa,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xli. 30.

[4] Dahlgrün, 'Heiratsgebräuche der Schambaa,' in *Mittheil. Deutsch. Schutzgeb.* xvi. 227.

[5] Monteiro, *Angola and the River Congo*, i. 264 *sq.*

[6] Dennett, *At the Back of the Black Man's Mind*, p. 40.

[7] Kropf, *Das Volk der Xosa-Kaffern im östlichen Südafrika*, p. 139. For other African instances see Poupon, 'Étude ethnographique des Baya de la circonscription du M'Bimou,' in *L'Anthropologie*, xxvi. 124; Vergette, *Certain Marriage Customs of some of the Tribes in the Protectorate of Sierra Leone*, p. 21 *sq.*

clears a space in the forest to be planted with cassava, and brings in as much game and fish as possible, to show that he is able to support himself and others."[1] Some similar exhibition of courage or the ability to support a family is required of a bridegroom in various other South American tribes.[2] Thus, among the Bororó every young man who wishes to marry must have killed either five peccaries or one jaguar, whilst he who kills five jaguars has the right to have two wives.[3] The Indians of Pennsylvania considered it a shame for a youth to think of a wife before he had given some proof of his manhood.[4] Among the Kinipetu and some other Eskimo in the neighbourhood of Hudson's Bay, a young man is not permitted to marry until he, through his skill in hunting and otherwise, has shown that he can support not only his wife and children, but his parents-in-law as well.[5] The Koyúkun of Alaska believe that a man who marries before he has killed a deer will have no children.[6]

Among the Koryak and Yukaghir, according to Dr. Jochelson, the custom of serving for a bride is intended to test the young man's ability to work, the bridegroom being required to be a good hunter and fisherman and capable of doing everything necessary in a household. Among the Yukaghir, besides serving, he had to pass through another test as well :—" The prospective father-in-law would go to the woods and fell as thick a tree as he could find.

[1] Im Thurn, *Among the Indians of Guiana*, p. 221. See also v. Martius, *Beiträge zur Ethnographie Amerika's*, i. 645 ; Appun, ' Die Indianer von Britisch-Guayana,' in *Das Ausland*, xliv. 446.

[2] Crevaux, *Voyages dans l'Amérique du Sud*, pp. 307 (Apalaï, Roucouyennes), 612 (Guaraunos). Wallace, *Narrative of Travels on the Amazon and Rio Negro*, p. 498 (Uacarrás). v. Martius, *op. cit.* i. 247 (Guatós), 688 (Arawaks). Ignace, ' Les Capiekrans,' in *Anthropos*, v. 477. Fernandez, *Relacion de las missiones de los Indios, que llaman Chiquitos*, p. 33. Schmidt, ' Über das Recht der tropischen Naturvölker Südamerikas,' in *Zeitschr. vergl. Rechtswiss.* xiii. 307 *sq.*

[3] Frič and Radin, ' Contribution to the Study of the Bororo Indians,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxvi. 390.

[4] Buchanan, *Sketches of the History, etc. of the North American Indians*, p. 323.

[5] Klutschak, *Als Eskimo unter den Eskimos* p. 233.

[6] Dall, *Alaska and its Resources*, p. 196.

The bridegroom had to drag the trunk of the tree to the house of his future father-in-law, and throw it upon the tent, so that it would fall. Then the father-in-law would say, 'This is a good man; he will be able to support us and to care for our safety.'"[1] Among the Koryak, again, on the evening of the wedding day the parents of the bride attacked the bridegroom with sticks, after which everybody else was allowed to do the same; and only on showing himself as a man by receiving the flogging with fortitude and without making resistance was he allowed to take away the bride.[2] So also among some Arabs of Upper Egypt the man must undergo an ordeal of whipping by the relations of the bride in order to test his courage; and if he wishes to be considered worth having, he must receive the chastisement, which is sometimes exceedingly severe, with an expression of enjoyment.[3] We shall see, however, that customs of this kind may be something else than mere tests of courage.[4]

Mr. Campbell of Selangor, in writing of the marriages of the Ulu Langat Sakai, tells us that one custom was for the relations on both sides to sit on the ground round an ant-heap, and for the bride or her father to question the bridegroom as follows:—"Are you clever with the blowpipe?" "Can you fell trees cleverly?" "Are you a good climber?" and "Do you smoke cigarettes?" If these questions were answered in the affirmative, the bridegroom gave a cigarette to the bride and lighted one himself. They then ran round the mound three times. If the man succeeded in catching the woman the ceremony was completed, and they were declared married, whereas if he failed to catch her he tried again another day.[5] In the Ladrone Islands the wedding took place only after the bridegroom through

[1] Jochelson, *Koryak*, p. 740. *Idem*, *Yukaghir*, p. 87 *sq.*

[2] v. Dittmar, 'Über die Koräken,' in *Mélanges russes tirés du bulletin hist.-philol. de l'Académie impér. des Sciences de St.-Pétersbourg*, iii. 25. *Cf.* Kennan, *Tent Life in Siberia*, p. 137 *sq.*

[3] Baker, *Nile Tributaries of Abyssinia*, p. 125.

[4] See *infra*, on Marriage Rites.

[5] Campbell, quoted by Skeat and Blagden, *Pagan Races of the Malay Peninsula*, ii. 67 *sq.*

careful tests had proved capable of maintaining a wife.[1] And according to Don Luis de Torres, no Caroline Islander "is allowed to marry until he has given proofs of his dexterity in steering a *proa*."[2]

Of the Atayals of Formosa,[3] the Gaddanes of Luzon,[4] the Alfoors of Ceram,[5] the Dyaks of Borneo,[6] and the Nagas of Upper Assam,[7] it is reported that no man can marry without having first procured at least one human head as a token of his valour; but with reference to the Sea Dyaks, Mr. Gomes observes that this is true only of their chiefs.[8] As to the hill tribes of Assam, Mr. Hodson is inclined to believe "that success in head-hunting was at one time, if not essential to marriage, regarded at least as a token of having passed from adolescence to maturity."[9] The ancient Karmanians, according to Strabo, were considered marriageable only after they had killed an enemy.[10] The desire of a Galla warrior is to deprive the enemy of his genitals, the possession of such a trophy being said to be a necessary preliminary to marriage.[11] Formerly, no Masai was able to marry until he had been on several raids.[12] Among the Wapokomo of British East Africa early marriage is, in some districts of their country, prevented by the rule that no man may marry until he has killed a crocodile, and given a part of the flesh to the woman to eat.[13] Among the Bechuana and Kafir tribes south of the Zambesi a youth is only

[1] Meinicke, *Die Inseln des Stillen Oceans*, ii. 407. Freycinet, *Voyage autour du monde*, ii. 277 *sq.*

[2] Arago, *Voyage round the World*, ii. 16.

[3] Davidson, *Island of Formosa*, p. 566.

[4] Worcester, *Philippine Islands*, p. 439.

[5] Bickmore, *Travels in the East Indian Archipelago*, p. 205.

[6] Wilkes, *United States Exploring Expedition*, v. 363. Bock, *Head-Hunters of Borneo*, pp. 216, 221, &c.

[7] Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal*, p. 40.

[8] Gomes, *op. cit.* p. 74. *Cf. ibid.* pp. 73, 87.

[9] Hodson, 'Head-Hunting among the Hill Tribes of Assam,' in *Folk-Lore*, xx. 141.

[10] Strabo, *Geographica*, xv. 2. 14.

[11] Krapf, *Reisen in Ost-Afrika*, i. 274.

[12] Hollis, *Masai*, p. 302 n. 1.

[13] Gregory, *Great Rift Valley*, p. 343.

allowed to take a wife after he has killed a rhinoceros,[1] and among the Auin Bushmen, after he has killed some big game.[2]

Among some uncivilised peoples a man is even obliged to support the girl he is going to marry from the day of their betrothal.[3] Among others, again, custom requires the former husband to support his divorced wife with her children.[4] And on a man's death the obligation of maintaining his widow often devolves on his heir, the widespread custom of a man marrying the widow of his deceased brother being, as will be seen in a subsequent chapter, not only a privilege, but among several peoples a duty incumbent upon him.

When we find in mankind a habit which it has in common with many other animal species, including those most nearly related to it, we naturally ask whether it may have a similar origin in all these cases. May we suppose that the more or less durable union between man and woman and the care which the man takes of the woman and their common offspring are due to instincts which were once necessary for the preservation of the human race? We found reasons to believe that the marital and paternal relations among the man-like apes are the results of instincts which are needed for the subsistence of the offspring, because their number is small, the period of infancy is long, and the kind of food on which the species lives and the quantity of it required prevent a gregarious mode of life. Now there can be no doubt whatever that in mankind, also, the number of children has always been comparatively very small and the period of infancy comparatively very

[1] Livingstone, *Missionary Travels*, p. 147.

[2] Kaufmann, 'Die Auin,' in *Mittheil.Deutsch. Schutzgeb.* xxiii. 157.

[3] *E.g.*, the Botocudos (v. Tschudi, *Reisen durch Südamerika*, ii. 283), Ladrone Islanders (Meinicke, *op. cit.* ii. 407), Fanti (Sarbah, *Fanti Customary Laws*, p. 50).

[4] *E.g.*, the Basuto (Endemann, 'Mittheilungen über die Sotho-Neger,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* vi. 40), Munda Kols of Chota Nagpur (Jellinghaus, 'Sagen, Sitten und Gebräuche der Munda-Kolhs in Chota Nagpore,' *ibid.* iii. 370).

long. We have also good reasons to believe that our earliest human or half-human ancestors subsisted on essentially the same diet—chiefly but not exclusively vegetable[1]—and required about the same quantities of food as the man-like apes.[2] Is it not likely, then, that the same causes have produced the same results in either case? The objection will perhaps be raised that man, unlike the anthropoid apes, is now an extremely social animal and could therefore, like other social animals, easily have dispensed with those marital and paternal ties which for some reason or other exist, but could hardly have been needed for the subsistence of the species. But this objection loses its force when we consider the social conditions of savages who know neither cattle-rearing nor agriculture—unless perhaps of the most primitive kind—and exclusively or almost exclusively subsist on what nature directly gives them—game, fish, fruit, roots, and so forth.

The natives of Tierra del Fuego are social in a very small degree. Snow states that "they reside in families."[3] According to Bishop Stirling, family life is exclusive among

[1] The chimpanzee has even a marked inclination for animal food (*Cambridge Natural History*, x. 576).

[2] Kollmann's view (see his 'Neue Gedanken über das alte Problem von der Abstammung des Menschen,' in *Globus*, lxxxvii. 141 *sqq.*) that primitive man was a pygmy who had descended from a small anthropoid at most one metre high has not been accepted (see particularly Schwalbe, 'Zur Frage der Abstammung des Menschen,' *ibid.* lxxxviii. 159 *sqq.*, and in his *Studien zur Vorgeschichte des Menschen*, p. 11 *sqq.*). Professor Keith observes (*Antiquity of Man*, p. 498) that the great anthropoids—the gorilla, chimpanzee, and orang—"are so like man in structure of body that we must, to account for the degree of similarity, regard all of them as collateral descendants of a common stock." He adds (*ibid.* p. 498 *sq*):—"We do not hesitate to think that the anthropoids retain, to a much greater degree than man, the structure and manner of living of the ancient stock from which all four have been evolved. If, therefore, we try to form a picture of the world of ancient and primitive humanity, we must base it on the conditions now existing among anthropoids, not on those which hold for the modern world of mankind."

[3] Snow, 'Remarks on the Wild Tribes of Tierra del Fuego,' in *Trans. Ethn. Soc. London*, N.S., i. 264.

them. "Get outside the family," he says, "and relationships are doubtful, if not hostile. The bond of a common language is no security for friendly offices."[1] Wilkes observes that they "appear to live in families and not in tribes, and do not seem to acknowledge any chief."[2] Other writers tell us that among the Yahgans (who live in the southern part of the archipelago, south of the Beagle Channel to the islands off Cape Horn) and the Alacalufs (who live on the western islands) each family is perfectly independent of all the others, and that only the necessity of common defence now and then induces a few families to form small gangs without a chief.[3] With reference to the former, Hyades writes, "La famille est bien constituée, mais la tribu n'existe pas, à proprement parler."[4] In a letter to me Mr. T. Bridges gave the following account of them:—"They live in clans, called by them *ucuhr*, which means a house. These *ucuhr* comprise many subdivisions; and the members are necessarily related. But the Yahgans are a roving people, having their districts and moving about within these districts from bay to bay and island to island in canoes, without any order. The whole clan seldom travels together, and only occasionally, and then always incidentally, is it to be found collected. The smaller divisions keep more together. . . . Occasionally as many as five families are to be found living in a wigwam, but generally two families." In a printed article Mr. Bridges says that "family influence is the one great tie which binds these natives together, and the one great preventive of violence."[5] Admiral Fitzroy observes that "scarcity of food, and the facility with which they move from one place to another in their canoes, are, no doubt, the reasons why the Fuegians are always so

[1] Stirling, 'Residence in Tierra del Fuego,' in *South American Missionary Magazine*, iv. 11.

[2] Wilkes, *op. cit.* i. 124.

[3] Bove, *Patagonia. Terra del Fuoco*, p. 134. Lovisato, 'Appunti etnografici sulla Terra del Fuoco,' in *Cosmos di Guida Cora*, viii. 150.

[4] Hyades, 'Ethnographie des Fuégiens,' in *Bull. Soc. d'Anthr. Paris*, ser. iii. vol. x. 333.

[5] Bridges, 'Manners and Customs of the Firelanders,' in *A Voice for South America*, xiii. 204.

dispersed among the islands in small family parties, why they never remain long in one place, and why a large number are not seen many days in society."[1] Of the Onas, who inhabit especially the eastern part of the island of Tierra del Fuego and are a branch of the Tehuelches of Southern Patagonia,[2] Señor Gallardo writes that they lead a nomadic life in bands the size of which depends on the supply of food, but that they do not join in groups sufficiently large to be called tribes. He adds that every man is the chief of his family and is obeyed by its members.[3] Of the Patagonian Tehuelches, who are essentially hunters without having a fixed residence, Hutchinson states that they "are divided into a number of small tribes, dispersed into families."[4] The natives of the Patagonian Channel Region between the Magellan Straits and the Gulf of Peñas, according to Dr. Skottsberg, "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." These Indians are still in the stone age, inhabiting a country devoid of available metals and with a climate inimical to agriculture of any kind.[5]

Of the Guayaki, on the right side of the Upper Paraná, opposite the Argentine territory Misiones, Father Vogt writes that they "live, as it seems, not in tribes but in families"; they have no agriculture but subsist chiefly on game, fish, and fruits.[6] Von Martius states that the Guachís of the Gran Chaco and the Guatós, a tribe near the sources of the Araguaya, are for the most part scattered in families.[7]

[1] King and Fitzroy, *op. cit.* ii. 177 *sq.*

[2] Cojazzi, *Los indios del Archipiélago Fueguino*, p. 6.

[3] Gallardo, *Tierra del Fuego—Los Onas*, p. 207 *sq.*

[4] Hutchinson, 'Tehuelche Indians of Patagonia,' in *Trans. Ethn. Soc.* N.S. vii. 317.

[5] Skottsberg, *Wilds of Patagonia*, p. 97. *Idem*, 'Observations on the Natives of the Patagonian Channel Region,' in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. xv. 594, 596.

[6] Vogt, 'Material zur Ethnographie und Sprache der Guayaki-Indianer,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xxxiv. 35, 37.

[7] v. Martius, *op. cit.* i. 244, 247.

Concerning the Guatós, Castelnau observes that they never unite in villages. Each family lives alone and builds for itself a hut in some inaccessible place. More than one man is never found in the same hut, for as soon as a son reaches the age of puberty he seeks a wife and makes an establishment of his own. At certain times, but only twice a year, the men assemble in places which have been fixed beforehand by their chiefs, but they remain there together for two days only.[1] According to Bates, the social condition of the Caishánas, inhabiting the forests of the Tunantins, among whom each family has its solitary hut, "is of a low type, very little removed, indeed, from that of the brutes living in the same forests."[2] The Marauá Indians, on the Lower Juruá, are likewise dispersed in separate families or small hordes, and so were some of the other tribes visited by Bates.[3] Ehrenreich states that the southern Karayá Indians, on the Araguaya, are compelled to scatter owing to lack of food, and that in the neighbourhood of S. José small bands consisting of eight to ten individuals are still met with during the dry season. According to the same authority, the forest Indians of Amazonas, on the Purús, and the nomadic hunters on the coast, live in small gangs comprising two or three families each.[4] Concerning the Botocudos, a Brazilian tribe on the Tocantins, v. Tschudi writes that "the family is the only tie which joins these rude children of nature with each other."[5] Von Martius observes that travellers in Brazil often meet with a language used only by a few individuals connected with each other by relationship, who are thus completely isolated, and can hold no communication with any of their other countrymen far or near.[6]

The Togiagamiut—an Eskimo tribe of Alaska, never visited by white men in their own country until the year

[1] Castelnau, *Expédition dans les parties centrales de l'Amérique du Sud*, iii. 12 *sq.* See also Max Schmidt, in *Verhandl. Berliner Gesellsch. Anthr.* 1902, p. 86.

[2] Bates, *The Naturalist on the River Amazons*, ii. 376.

[3] *Ibid.* ii. 381, 377 *sq.*; i. 328.

[4] Ehrenreich, *Beiträge zur Völkerkunde Brasiliens*, p. 12.

[5] v. Tschudi, *op. cit.* ii. 283. [6] v. Martius, *op. cit.* i. 46.

1880—who lead a thoroughly nomadic life, wandering from place to place in search of game or fish, appear, according to Petroff, "to live in the most perfect state of independence of each other. Even the communities do not seem bound together in any way; families and groups of families constantly changing their abode, leaving one community and joining another, or perhaps forming one of their own. The youth, as soon as he is able to build a kaiak and to support himself, no longer observes any family ties, but goes where his fancy takes him, frequently roaming about with his kaiak for thousands of miles before another fancy calls him to take a wife, to excavate a miserable dwelling, and to settle down for a time."[1]

Among the Reindeer Chukchee, in the north-eastern extremity of Asia, the family, says Dr. Bogoras, "forms the basis of the social relations between members of the tribe. Even family ties are not absolutely binding, and single persons often break them and leave their family relations. Grown-up sons frequently leave their parents and go away to distant localities in search of a fortune. . . . It may be said that a lone man living by himself forms the real unit of Chukchee society." There are, however, camps, usually consisting of two or three families, with ten or fifteen persons together; camps of four to six families form but a slight minority, and a camp with ten houses is almost impossible unless formed for special reasons, like the temporary camps in trading-places. In most cases the camp consists of related families—for instance, of brothers, cousins, etc., with their wives and children; but each family has a house of its own. A group of kindred families, designated by the term *va'rat* (literally, "collection of those who are together") "may perhaps be called an embryo of a clan; it is unstable, however, and the number of families that 'are together' changes almost every year."[2] The Reindeer Koryak usually wander in groups consisting of a few families, but "it sometimes happens that separate families wander far from their native

[1] Petroff, 'Report on the Population, Industries, and Resources of Alaska,' in *Tenth Census of the United States*, p. 135.

[2] Bogoras, *Chukchee*, pp. 537, 541, 612.

places, leaving the groups to which they originally belonged for one reason or another; as, for instance, on account of quarrels, lack of pastures in the old places for their reindeer, or the establishment through marriage of new family ties."[1] The Yukaghir, as a hunting-tribe, "frequently have to scatter in separate families, or groups of related families, in search of food."[2] Among the reindeer-breeders of the Northern Yenisei valley, says Miss Czaplicka, "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. Occasionally several families are found living together in two or three *chums* (tents), but this is never a permanent arrangement, nor in accordance with any customary rules."[3]

The forest Veddas of Ceylon only occasionally assemble in greater numbers.[4] According to Bailey, the Nilgala Veddas, who are considered the wildest, "are distributed through their lovely country in small septs, or families, occupying generally caves in the rocks, though some have little bark huts. They depend almost solely on hunting for their support, and hold little communication even with each other."[5] The brothers Sarasin tell us that during the dry season every family wanders about on its hunting-ground and only seldom comes into contact with its neighbours, unless induced to do so by disturbing influences from the outside. During the rainy season the various families living in the same district retire to their rock centre and stay there in their caves. The families who concentrate themselves in the same rock centre during this period form

[1] Jochelson, *Koryak*, p. 431. [2] *Idem*, *Yukaghir*, p. 86.
[3] Miss Czaplicka, *My Siberian Year*, p. 101.
[4] Pridham, *Account of Ceylon*, i. 454. Hartshorne, 'Weddas,' in *Indian Antiquary*, viii. 320.
[5] Bailey, 'Wild Tribes of the Veddahs of Ceylon,' in *Trans. Ethn. Soc.* N.S. ii. 281.

a clan; but the different clans have nothing to do with one another.[1] M. Deschamps writes, "Chaque village est formé par une ou deux huttes pour une ou deux familles, mais le plus généralement une famille s'établit seule."[2] To this day, says Mr. Nevill, "if one wishes to approach a Vaedda's home, one waits nearly a quarter mile off it, and shouts until the dogs bark."[3]

In his history of Mindanao and Sulu, published in 1667, Father Francisco Combes says that the Subanu, a sub-Visayan mountain folk of Mindanao, lack human intercourse, "living, as they do, in high, wild country, with as little sociability as animals, and having their houses placed *a league apart, wherever one of them may be pleased to make himself a settlement.*" *Nor have they in later times* congregated into villages. "The family," say Messrs. Finley and Churchill, "is the governmental unit. The father is the head of the family and its absolute ruler. . . . As soon as the young men take to themselves wives they break away from the old family home and establish new family units at remote points, where they can enjoy all the freedom of their peculiar nomadic life." They have associations or confederations of families forming communities, each under the leadership of a *timuai*, or chief. But "family rights are supreme and therefore the right of secession from the community inheres in the head of the family." The Subanu draws his sustenance from the earth by primitive agricultural methods; "he seeks the isolated and wildest portions of the interior and relies upon his strength and native ingenuity to cope with nature and wring from it a means of living for himself and his family."[4] The Negritos of Northern Luzon, most of whom do not practise agriculture at all, are said to be "usually scattered here and there through the forest, although occasionally a group of one or two dozen will be

[1] Sarasin, *Ergebnisse naturwissenschaftlicher Forschungen auf Ceylon*, iii. 476, 477, 481, 485.

[2] Deschamps, 'Les Veddas de Ceylan,' in *L'Anthropologie*, ii. 305.

[3] Nevill, 'Vaeddas of Ceylon,' in *Taprobanian*, i. 186.

[4] Finley and Churchill, *Subanu. Studies of a Sub-Visayan Mountain Folk of Mindanao*, pp. 12, 15, 24 *sq.*

found together"; [1] or to live in small hordes of twenty to thirty persons, who recognise no other ties but those of the family.[2] The Kubus of Southern Sumatra, who chiefly subsist on game and fish and the products of the forest though they also practise a kind of primitive agriculture, are said by Volz to live, as a rule, in settlements of one or two families each, which are spread over a very wide area. They seldom come together in small hordes.[3]

Among the Orang Muka Kuning, of the Orang Laut in Malacca, who neither cultivate any plants nor breed any animals save dogs, the families "live scattered in the forest in small huts beneath the trees."[4] Of the Orang Semang Vaughan Stevens says that they are true nomads who never remain long at the same place, and that even the families among them dissolve, to reunite again afterwards. Dr. Martin quotes this with approval,[5] and makes the general statement that the pure tribes of the Malay Peninsula "always live in small groups only, consisting of one to at most six families. . . . These family groups form the separate hordes, which are in the habit of nomadising together but also on occasion separate from one another." Every family erects a shelter or hut for itself; at their halting-places more than two or three huts are seldom seen together, each inhabited by two to seven individuals. Thus "the separate family (*Sonderfamilie*) forms everywhere the fundamental element, which grows into a family group (*Grossfamilie*)" with the eldest man as its regular chief. The connection between the different family groups is exceedingly loose, and there is no such organisation as a phratry or a tribe.[6]

[1] Worcester, 'Non-Christian Tribes of Northern Luzon,' in *Philippine Journal of Science*, i. 808 *sq.*

[2] Blumentritt, *Versuch einer Ethnographie der Philippinen*, p. 8. Meyer, *Die Philippinen. II. Negritos*, p. 15.

[3] Volz, 'Zur Kenntniss der Kubus in Südsumatra,' in *Archiv f. Anthrop.* N.S. vii. 98, 100, 107.

[4] Logan, 'Orang Muka Kuning,' in *Jour. Indian Archipelago*, i. 337 n. *

[5] Martin, *Die Inlandstämme der Malayischen Halbinsel*, p. 861.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 859 *sqq.*

The Bushmen of South Africa, according to Mr. McCall Theal, "lived in little communities, often consisting of only a few families. It was impossible for a large number, such as would constitute an important tribe, to gain a subsistence solely from the chase and the natural products of the earth in any part of South Africa at any time, and more especially after the Hottentots and the Bantu had taken possession of the choicest sections."[1] Fritsch observes that they are almost entirely devoid of a tribal organisation, and that even when a number of families occasionally unite in a larger horde the association is more or less accidental and not regulated by any law.[2] The families that thus associate are now and then obliged to disperse, as the same spot will not afford sufficient sustenance for all; "the smaller the number, the easier is a supply of food procured."[3] Indeed, a horde frequently consists of the different members of one family only, at least if the children are old and strong enough to help their parents to find food.[4] There may be a chief in the horde, but his power is hardly greater than that of any other man who rules over his own wife and children—and over the latter only before they are grown-up.[5] Of the Auin, who belong to the Kalahari Bushmen, Kaufmann states that the size of the settlement depends on the circumstances: during the dry season it is mostly formed by one or two families only, whereas towards the end of and shortly after the rainy period, when food is more plentiful, even as many as thirty families may join into one "village." The dwellings are of the most primitive character.[6] Among the Tati Bushmen—who inhabit the Bechuanaland Protectorate, the Kalahari, and the portions of Southern Rhodesia

[1] Theal, *History of the Boers in South Africa*, p. 17.

[2] Fritsch, *Die Eingeborenen Süd-Afrika's*, p. 443 *sq.*

[3] Lichtenstein, *Travels in Southern Africa*, ii. 49, 194.

[4] *Ibid.* i. 48. Thulié, 'Instructions sur les Bochimans,' in *Bull. Soc. d'Anthr. Paris*, ser. iii. vol. iv. 409 *sq.*

[5] Schinz, *Deutsch-Süd-West-Afrika*, p. 396. v. François, *Nama und Damara Deutsch-Süd-West-Afrika*, p. 234. Passarge, 'Die Buschmänner der Kalahari,' in *Mittheil. Deutsch. Schutzgeb.* xviii. 213, 271 *sqq.* Kaufmann, 'Die Auin,' *ibid.* xxiii. 154 *sq.*

[6] Kaufmann, *loc. cit.* pp. 136, 138.

adjoining these territories—a few "clans or families may combine in the face of danger, but the combination soon comes to an end as soon as the danger is past. They never seem to feel the need of unity. Each family goes its own way, and the father is a despot as long as he can maintain his position." Our informant has "seldom seen more than four families numbering twenty-two individuals together, and this was a camp at permanent water."[1] From all that has been said it is obvious that among the Bushmen, also, the family consisting of parents and children is the fundamental and, so far as living together is concerned, among many of them at least, the only permanent social unit.[2]

The Central African Pygmies live in communities of variable size. Hutereau speaks of groups of two to twenty families, subject to the rule of a family chief; but "parfois plusieurs groupes de familles se réunissent pour se déplacer et pour chasser ensemble."[3] Stuhlmann found "villages," consisting of two to four huts and others consisting of one to two hundred.[4] Each hut seems to be occupied by one family only, and the people forming a community are probably, as a rule, branches of the same parent family.[5] David says that the Wambutti of Ituri live in patriarchal family groups.[6] According to Casati, the huts serving as family dwellings "are usually scattered in the forests, or over the hills," and seldom form a village; but he also found a good many families living without any shelter at all on the side of a stream or in the thickets of the forest.[7] If the communities

[1] Dornan, 'Tati Bushmen (Masarwas) and their Language,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xlvii. 47, 53.

[2] See also Passarge, *loc. cit.* p. 213 *sq.*; Trenk, 'Die Buschleute der Namib, ihre Rechts- und Familienverhältnisse,' in *Mittheil. Deutsch. Schutzgeb.* xxiii. 166, 168; Moffat, *Missionary Labours and Scenes in Southern Africa*, p. 56.

[3] Hutereau, *Notes sur la Vie familiale et juridique de quelques populations du Congo Belge*, p. 1.

[4] Stuhlmann, *Mit Emin Pascha ins Herz von Afrika*, p. 449.

[5] Schmidt, *Die Stellung der Pygmäenvölker in der Entwicklungsgeschichte des Menschen*, pp. 61, 62, 187, 192.

[6] David, 'Notizen über die Pygmäen des Ituriwaldes,' in *Globus*, lxxxvi. 196.

[7] Casati, *Ten Years in Equatoria*, i. 157 *sq.*

of the Central African Pygmies are more permanent than those of many other peoples who have now come under our notice, the reason for it is no doubt their richer food supply. They are skilful bowmen and exceptionally expert as hunters ;[1] and while they do not themselves cultivate the soil, they get from their neighbours corn, bulbs and other vegetable food in exchange for products of the chase, or, more simply still, make raids on their fields and carry off what they want.[2] Junker says of the Akkas that " they are feared by all their neighbours, and despite their thievish habits, permitted to frequent the cultivated grounds." [3]

Among the Australian aborigines, who also are a race of hunters and food-collectors without agriculture and cattle-rearing, we find a much more definite social organisation than among any other people in the same state of economic culture. But what interests us in this connection is not their social organisation in general, but their actual manner of living. They live in hordes ; and here again we find that the size of the horde is regulated by the food supply. It has been remarked that where the country is sterile and unproductive the natives congregate in small numbers, whereas in fertile districts they are comparatively numerous.[4] The horde or tribe has always a tendency to break up for a time in search of food. In his book on the aborigines of Victoria, Mr. Brough Smyth remarks that " in any large area occupied by a tribe, where there was not much forest land, and where kangaroos were not numerous, it is highly probable that the several families composing the tribe would withdraw from their companions for short periods, at certain seasons, and betake themselves to separate portions of the area, . . . and it is more than probable—it is almost certain—that each head of a family would betake himself,

[1] Junker, *Travels in Africa during the Years* 1882–1886, p. 85. *Emin Pasha in Central Africa*, p. 316.

[2] v. Wissmann, Wolf, v. François, and Mueller, *Im Innern Afrikas*, p. 261. *Emin Pasha in Central Africa*, p. 316. Casati, *op. cit.* i. 159.

[3] Junker, *op. cit.* p. 85.

[4] Wilhelmi, ' Manners and Customs of the Australian Natives,' in *Trans. Roy. Soc. Victoria*, v. 165.

if practicable, to that portion which his father had frequented."[1] Among the natives of Victoria and Riverina, according to Beveridge, "a family, or perhaps several families, as the case may be, select a site for their camp, where abundance of game and other sources of food exist, and are procurable with the least expenditure of time and trouble."[2] Concerning the Encounter Bay tribe in South Australia, the Rev. A. Meyer tells us that "the whole tribe does not always move in a body from one place to another, unless there should be abundance of food to be obtained at some particular spot; but generally they are scattered in search of food."[3] The natives of Port Jackson, in New South Wales, when visited by Captain Hunter at the end of the eighteenth century, were associated in tribes of many families living together, apparently with one fixed residence. Yet, he says, "you may often visit the place where the tribe resides, without finding the whole society there; their time is so much occupied in search of food, that the different families take different routes; but, in case of any dispute with a neighbouring tribe, they can soon be assembled."[4] Speaking of the six tribes living on the immediate banks of the MacLeay River near Port Macquarie in New South Wales, Hodgkinson observes that the whole body of a tribe, containing on an average from eighty to a hundred men and women, exclusive of children, "is never united on the same spot, unless on some important occasion. . . . They are more generally divided into small parties of eight or ten men, with their women and children, for the convenience of hunting, &c., and these detached companies roam over any part of the country within the prescribed limits of the main tribe to which they belong."[5]

[1] Brough Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, i. 146 *sq.*

[2] Beveridge, *Aborigines of Victoria and Riverina*, p. 32.

[3] Meyer, 'Manners and Customs of the Aborigines of the Encounter Bay Tribe,' in Woods, *Native Tribes of South Australia*, p. 191.

[4] Hunter, *Historical Journal of the Transactions at Port Jackson and Norfolk Island*, p. 62.

[5] Hodgkinson, *Australia, from Port Macquarie to Moreton Bay*, p. 222.

Whether assembled or scattered, the families belonging to the same community form distinct and very marked social units among the Australian natives.[1] Mr. Stanbridge, who spent eighteen years in the wilds of Victoria, states that the land of each tribe is parcelled out amongst families and carefully transmitted by direct descent; and so sacredly are these boundaries maintained that the member of no single family will venture on the lands of a neighbouring one without invitation.[2] Mr. Curr remarks that among the Bangerang in Victoria, and all other tribes he has known, each married couple had their own *nia-nia* or hut, although unmarried men and boys of eight or ten years and upwards lived together, and separate from their parents and sisters, in the bachelors' camp.[3] Concerning the Gournditch-mara, Dr. Howitt says that "each family camped by itself."[4] Among the Central Australian Arunta, who are distributed in a large number of small local groups each of which occupies a given area of country and has its own headman, every family, consisting of a man and one or more wives and children, has a separate lean-to of shrubs.[5] There are similar statements relating to many other tribes.[6] Of the Kabi and Wakka tribes in Queensland, Mr. Mathew states that "the family, consisting of husband and wife, or wives, with their children, constituted a distinct social unit. They occupied the same *gunyah* (dwelling), they ate together, they travelled together."[7] Bishop Salvado writes of West Australian natives, among whom he spent most part of his life, that they, "au lieu de se gouverner par tribus, paraissent

[1] See Malinowski, *The Family among the Australian Aborigines*, *passim*.

[2] Stanbridge, 'Tribes in the Central Part of Victoria,' in *Trans. Ethn. Soc.* N.S. i. 286 *sq.*

[3] Curr, *Recollections of Squatting in Victoria*, pp. 259, 277.

[4] Fison and Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, p. 278.

[5] Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 8, 10, 18.

[6] Westgarth, *Australia Felix*, p. 87 (natives of New South Wales). Henderson, *Excursions and Adventures in New South Wales*, ii. 109. Mathews, *Ethnological Notes on the Aboriginal Tribes of N. S. Wales*, p. 99.

[7] Mathew, *Two Representative Tribes of Queensland*, p. 153.

se gouverner à la manière patriarcale : chaque famille, qui généralement ne compte pas plus de six à neuf individus, forme comme une petite société, sous la seule dépendance de son propre chef. . . . Chaque famille s'approprie une espèce de district, dont cependant les familles voisines jouissent en commun si l'on vit en bonne harmonie."[1]

It seems extremely probable that Australian blacks commonly are so much more sociable than most other hunting and food-collecting peoples because the food-supply of their country is naturally more plentiful, or, partly thanks to their boomerangs, more easily attainable. Speaking of West Australian natives, Calvert observes that they, as a rule, have an abundance of food, " although they may run a little short in the height of the rainy season, or when they are overcome with laziness in very hot weather."[2] A Central Australian native is, generally speaking, well nourished ; " kangaroo, rock-wallabies, emus, and other forms of game are not scarce, and often fall a prey to his spear and boomerang, while smaller animals, such as rats and lizards, are constantly caught without any difficulty by the women."[3] Yet, as we have seen, separate families are often compelled to walk about in search of food, and the father has on these occasions an essential function to fulfil both as protector and maintainer of his family.

Our knowledge of the Tasmanians, now an extinct race which was neither agricultural nor pastoral, is very defective. Captain Furneaux, who accompanied Cook on his second voyage as commander of the *Adventure*, wrote that they wandered about in small parties from place to place in search of food, and that more than three or four huts, only capable of containing three or four persons each, were never found in the same place.[4] O'Connor says that they travelled in parties of ten to thirty,[5] and Mrs. Prinsep that they moved

[1] Salvado, *Mémoires historiques sur l'Australie*, p. 265 *sq.* *Idem*, *Voyage en Australie*, p. 178.

[2] Calvert, *Aborigines of Western Australia*, p. 24.

[3] Spencer and Gillen, *op. cit.* pp. 7, 44.

[4] Cook, *Voyage towards the South Pole*, i. 114.

[5] O'Connor, quoted by Ling Roth, *Aborigines of Tasmania*, p. 105.

"in large bodies, with incredible swiftness."[1] Each tribe was divided into several families, consisting of a few individuals, and wherever they located themselves each family kindled its separate fire "at fourteen to twenty yards apart."[2] It also "hunted separately, and erected a hut for its own accommodation."[3]

From this survey of facts it appears that among modern savages living in the hunting and food-collecting stage, or at most acquainted with some primitive mode of agriculture, the family consisting of parents and children is a very well-marked social unit. Yet it is certainly not the only association among them. If travellers speak of the family tie as the only one which joins individuals with one another, they without doubt use the term "family" in a wider sense. Closely related families not only hold friendly relations with each other, but live together in smaller or larger groups; and there may be social organisations of a more comprehensive character, as among the Australian natives. At the same time, it is repeatedly stated that the families belonging to the same group do not always keep together, but often disperse in search of food and may remain separated even for a considerable time; and this is the case not only in desolate regions where the supply of food is unusually scarce, but even in countries highly favoured by nature. Now I ask: is it reasonable to suppose that primitive men were more permanently gregarious than many modern savages? The answer must be: they were undoubtedly less. Let us remember that all savages now existing stand high above our earliest human ancestors. Man, as we know him, has—to quote Darwin—"invented and is able to use various weapons, tools, traps, &c., with which he defends himself, kills or catches prey, and otherwise obtains food. He has made rafts or canoes for fishing or crossing over to neigh-

[1] Mrs. Prinsep, *Journal of a Voyage from Calcutta to Van Diemen's Land*, p. 78.

[2] Backhouse, *Narrative of a Visit to the Australian Colonies*, p. 104. Lloyd, quoted by Ling Roth, *op. cit.* p. 107.

[3] West, *History of Tasmania*, ii. 82.

bouring fertile islands. He has discovered the art of making fire, by which hard and stringy roots can be rendered digestible, and poisonous roots or herbs innocuous."[1] In short, he has gradually found out many new ways of earning his living which his ruder ancestors had no idea of, and has thus more and more emancipated himself from direct dependence on surrounding nature. If this notwithstanding there are still so many savage peoples among whom the separate families often are compelled to give up the protection afforded them by living together, in order to find the food necessary for their subsistence, I think we have reason to believe that the family, implying marital and paternal care, was hardly less indispensable for primitive man than it is for the gorilla and chimpanzee. If this was the case, the family may have been an inheritance from the parent species out of which the Anthropoids and the Hominides—the *Pithecanthropus, Homo primigenius,* and *Homo sapiens,* according to Schwalbe[2]—gradually developed. This may be supposed to have been the case if that hypothetical species lived on the same diet as the man-like apes, or even on a diet somewhat more animal than that of the chimpanzee, and also, being of a comparatively large size, required about the same quantities of food as they: if, further, it gave birth to the same small number of young; and if its offspring were in need of parental care for a comparatively long period. I want to emphasise that it is on such factors, and not merely on the habits of the gorilla and the chimpanzee as they are, that I base my supposition that the family consisting of parents and children existed among primitive man.

I have so far spoken of habits, not of institutions. But there is an intimate connection between them. Social habits have a strong tendency to become true customs, that is, rules of conduct in addition to their being habits. A habit may develop into a genuine custom simply because

[1] Darwin, *Descent of Man,* i. 72.

[2] Schwalbe, *Studien zur Vorgeschichte des Menschen,* p. 5.

men are inclined to disapprove of anything which is unusual.[1] But in the present case the transition from habit to custom has undoubtedly a deeper foundation. It is an instinct that induces the male to remain with the female and to take care of her even after the sexual relations have ceased. We may assume that the tendency to feel some attachment to a being which has been the cause of pleasure, in the present case sexual pleasure, is at the bottom of this instinct. Such a feeling may originally have caused the sexes to remain united and the male to protect the female though the sexual desire was gratified; and if procuring great advantage to the species in the struggle for existence, conjugal attachment would naturally develop into a specific characteristic. An instinct must also be the cause of the care which the father takes of his offspring; the paternal feeling seems to be hardly less prevalent among savages than among civilised men.[2] This feeling, however, and also the kindred feeling of maternal love, are not quite adequately defined as the affection which attaches a creature to its young. Though most frequently and most strongly displayed in this relation, the so-called parental feeling is really excitable apart from parenthood, as Spencer justly observed. According to him, the common trait of the objects which arouse it is always relative weakness or helplessness.[3] But this explanation contains only part of the truth; even in a gregarious species mothers make a distinction between their own offspring and other young. To account for the maternal sentiment we must therefore assume the existence of some other stimulus besides the signs of helplessness, which produces, or at least strengthens, the instinctive motor response in the mother. This stimulus, so far as I can see, is rooted in the external relationship in which the helpless offspring from the beginning stand to the mother, being in close proximity to her from their tenderest age. And the stimuli to which the

[1] See my *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, i. 159.

[2] *Ibid.* i. 529 *sqq.*

[3] Spencer, *Principles of Psychology*, ii. 623 *sq.* See also Hartley, *Observations on Man*, i. 497.

paternal instinct responds are apparently derived from the same circumstances as those which call into activity the maternal instinct, that is, the helplessness and the nearness of the young. Wherever this instinct exists the father is near his offspring from the beginning, living together with the mother. Of course I here speak of the parental feelings only in their original simplicity; later on they become more complex, through the association of other feelings, as those of property and pride, and tend to extend themselves beyond the limits of infancy and childhood.[1]

In mankind these instincts give rise not only to habits but to rules of custom, or institutions. Social beings endowed with such instincts, as also with a sufficiently developed intellect, would feel moral resentment against a man who forsakes the woman with whom he has conjugal intercourse and the offspring resulting from it. And, as I have pointed out in another work, public or moral resentment or disapproval is at the bottom of the rules of custom and of all duties and rights.[2] Thus the institutions of marriage and the family have the same root as the habits with which I have been dealing in this chapter; indeed these institutions and habits are practically identical, except that in the one case there is social sanction or regulation and in the other not. Now as the word "family" is not merely used to denote a certain institution, I think we may be allowed to apply the term "marriage" also in a broader sense than that given to it above. We may alternatively define it as a more or less durable connection between male and female lasting beyond the mere act of propagation till after the birth of the offspring. This definition lays stress on the highly important fact, only too often overlooked by sociologists, that there is a vital difference between marriage and merely sexual relations, even though these be sanctioned by custom. It also implies living together—in agreement with the mediæval saying, "Boire, manger, coucher ensemble est

[1] See Westermarck, *op. cit.* ii. 188–191, 193.

[2] See *ibid.* i. 118–122, 135–137, 139 *sqq.* For the characteristics and origin of moral disapproval see *ibid.* vol. i. ch. ii. p. 21 *sqq.*

mariage, ce me semble."[1] And though rather vague, which is a matter of course, it has the advantage of comprehending in one notion facts which are essentially similar in nature and have a similar origin. The marriage of mankind, as we have seen, is not an isolated phenomenon, but has its counterpart in many other animal species and is probably an inheritance from some pre-human ancestor. It is in order to emphasise this that I have called my book "the history of *human* marriage," although I shall throughout deal with unions which are, or may be supposed to be, sanctioned by custom or law.

From what has been said above it appears that marriage and the family are most intimately connected with one another: it is originally for the benefit of the young that male and female continue to live together. We may therefore say that marriage is rooted in the family rather than the family in marriage. Indeed, among many peoples true married life does not begin for persons who are formally married or betrothed, or a marriage does not become definite, until a child is born or there are signs of pregnancy; whilst in other cases sexual relations which happen to lead to pregnancy or the birth of a child are, as a rule, followed by marriage or make marriage compulsory.

Thus among the Fuegians[2] and the Eastern Greenlanders[3] marriage is not regarded as complete until the woman has become a mother. Among the Lengua Indians of the Paraguayan Chaco "there is only a marriage on approval, corresponding to our engagement, although the couple live together. No marriage is considered binding by native law until a child is born, and if this does not take place within a

[1] Schäffner, *Geschichte der Rechtsverfassung Frankreichs*, iii. 186. Among the Maori, according to Mr. Tregear (*The Maori Race*, p. 293), marriage was merely alluded to as a "dwelling-together," or a "sleeping-together." The Timagami (Ojibway) term for husband and wife, which is used reciprocally, means "the one who lives with me" (Speck, *Family Hunting Territories and Social Life of Various Algonkian Bands of the Ottawa Valley*, p. 24).

[2] Hyades and Deniker, *Mission scientifique du Cap Horn*, vii. 377 *sq.*

[3] 'East Greenland Eskimo,' in *Science*, vii. 172.

reasonable time they are justified in separating. But when once a child is born to them, even should the child die or be put to death, they are considered to be bound to each other for life."[1] Among the Bororó, of Central Brazil, a man after his marriage stays in the house of the bride until he has a family of his own, when he builds a house for himself.[2] In some Canadian tribes a married man was obliged to go to his father-in-law's house to find his wife when he had a mind to her company, until she brought forth a child; then only she went to live with her husband.[3] Among the Aleut the wife stays at her father's home for a certain time or until the birth of a child; the husband is at liberty to visit her, but not to remove her to his own village until the expiration of the customary period, unless a child be born meanwhile.[4] Among the Atkha Aleut a husband does not pay the purchase sum before he has become a father.[5]

Of the Tsalisens of Formosa we are told that, "after matters have been definitely arranged, a month is allowed to intervene, and then on an appointed day the suitor visits the house of his intended and a simple ceremony sanctions the right of the couple to come together. The woman remains at the home of her mother until a child is born, when she removes to the home of her husband, and the marriage is then considered to have been effected. Should she be without issue, however, her suitor ceases to call, and all familiarity between the couple comes to an end. Both parties are now free to seek a mate elsewhere."[6] Among the Sea Dyaks of Borneo "intercourse often takes place between those who have been betrothed, but not formally married, simply to ascertain if the marriage will be fruitful. At the first signs of the desired result themarriage ceremony takes place."[7]

[1] Grubb, *An Unknown People in an Unknown Land*, p. 214.

[2] Frič and Radin, in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxvi. 390.

[3] Lahontan, *New Voyages to North-America*, p. 457.

[4] Veniaminov, trans. by Golder, in *Jour. American Folk-Lore*, xx. 134.

[5] Erman, 'Ethnographische Wahrnehmungen an den Küsten des Berings-Meeres,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* iii. 162.

[6] Davidson, *op. cit.* p. 573.

[7] Gomes, *op. cit.* p. 127. Brooke Low, quoted by Ling Roth, *Natives of Sarawak*, i. 115.

Among the aborigines of North-West-Central Queensland a wife who happens to be but of *kanari* or *kati-kati maro* rank at the time of marriage neither prepares nor cooks her husband's food, and it is only after the birth of her first child that she remains at her husband's apartment permanently.[1] In some other Australian tribes a man may, at least in certain circumstances, retain as his wife a girl with whom he has eloped, if they stay away until a child is born.[2]

Among the Badágas of the Nilgiris in Southern India the marriage bond is not really sealed until the fifth month of the first pregnancy, when the relatives are invited to be present at the ceremony of tying the marriage emblem round the neck of the woman.[3] Among the Mezeyne tribe of Bedouins within the limits of the Sinai peninsula the bride runs away and is caught by the bridegroom, after which she flees back to her home and does not enter her husband's tent until she becomes far advanced in pregnancy.[4]

Concerning the Wolofs in Senegambia, Bérenger-Féraud writes, " Ce n'est que lorsque les signes de la grossesse sont irrécusables chez la fiancée, quelquefois même ce n'est qu'après la naissance d'un ou plusieurs enfants, que la cérémonie du mariage proprement dit s'accomplit."[5] Among the Siéna in the French Sudan " la famille n'est jugée réellement existante que lorsqu'elle comprend des enfants."[6] Among the Southern Bambala in Congo "the marriage seems to become definite only when a child is expected, for then conjugal fidelity becomes obligatory on both parties, as the child is otherwise supposed to die, and deaths of infants are generally attributed to this cause."[7] Dr. Felkin states that

[1] Roth, *op. cit.* p. 180 *sq.*

[2] Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, pp. 259, 263.

[3] Thurston, ' Badágas of the Nilgiris,' in the Madras Government Museum's *Bulletin*, ii. 3 *sq.* See also Harkness, *Neilgherry Hills*, p. 116.

[4] Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins and Wahábys*, p. 153.

[5] Bérenger-Féraud, ' Le mariage chez les nègres Sénégambiens,' in *Revue d'anthropologie*, 1883, p. 286 *sq.*

[6] Delafosse, ' Le peuple Siéna ou Sénoufo,' in *Revue des études ethnographiques et sociologiques*, i. 483.

[7] Torday, *Camp and Tramp in African Wilds*, p. 203.

among the For tribe of Central Africa the husband lives with his wife at his father-in-law's place until his first child is born, when he is permitted to take her away and set up housekeeping on his own account; and during the whole of this time the father-in-law has to pay all housekeeping expenses for the young couple, the husband being entitled to three meals during each night.[1] Among various other peoples the husband takes up his abode with his father-in-law and never removes his wife till after the birth of a child.[2] Among the Khasis in Assam the husband goes to live in his mother-in-law's house, but after one or two children are born and if the married couple get on well together, he frequently takes away his wife and family to a house of his own.[3] Among some of the Old Kuki clans a young man has to serve his future wife's father for three years; during this time he has free access to the girl, and should she become *enceinte* the marriage ceremony must be performed and the price paid.[4]

In many countries, including various parts of Europe, the occurrence of pregnancy or child-birth is a usual preliminary to, or as a general rule leads to, marriage.[5] We are often

[1] Felkin, 'Notes on the For Tribe of Central Africa,' in *Proceed. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh*, xiii. 229.

[2] *E.g.*, the Omaha (James, *Account of an Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains*, i. 242 *sq.*), the Ainu of Yesso (v. Siebold, *Die Aino auf Yesso*, p. 31), one of the aboriginal tribes of China (Gray, *China*, ii. 304), the Khyens (Rowney, *Wild Tribes of India*, p. 203 *sq.*), the Wasania of British East Africa (Barrett, in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xli. 30 *sq.*), some of the Dinka (Cummins, 'Sub-tribes of the Bahr-el-Ghazal Dinkas,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxiv.

[3] Gurdon, *op. cit.* p. 76.

[4] Shakespear, *Lushei Kuki Clans*, p. 154.

[5] Cardús, *op. cit.* p. 71 (Guarayos of Bolivia). Gait, *Census of India*, 1911, vol i. (India) Report, p. 243 (aboriginal tribes). Hutchinson, *Account of the Chittagong Hill Tracts*, p. 23. Kloss, *In the Andamans and Nicobars*, p. 188 (Andamanese). Strzoda, 'Die Li auf Hainan,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xliii. 203 (Chinese tribes). Jenks, *Bontoc Igorot*, p. 66. Martin, *Reisen in den Molukken*, p 63 (natives of Amboyna and Uliase). Pfeil, *Studien und Beobachtungen aus der Südsee*, p. 31 (natives of the Bismarck Archipelago).

told that a seducer or lover is compelled to marry the girl if she becomes with child ;[1] but he may also have the alternative of paying a fine.[2] In many of the wild tribes of Borneo, for instance, there is almost unrestricted intercourse between the young people of both sexes, but if pregnancy ensues marriage is considered necessary.[3] Dr. A. Bunker told me the same of certain Karen tribes in Burma. Among the Wanyamwezi, between Zanzibar and Tanganyika, a man who renders a girl *enceinte* and does not marry her before the child is born " is bound to pay for the woman and also for the child about three times the value of the ordinary dowry."[4] In Tahiti, according to Cook, the father might kill his natural child, but if he suffered it to live the parties were considered to be in the married state.[5] Dr. Rivers states that in Tikopia, " when the illicit intercourse of a youth and girl of the ordinary people results in offspring, the pair usually marry and if

[1] Lumholtz, *Unknown Mexico*, i. 466 (Tepehuane). Endle, *Kachâris*, p. 31. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, i. 248 (Billavas of the South Canara district) ; vii. 348 (Vēlans of the Cochin State). Anantha Krishna Iyer, *op. cit.* i. 60 *sq.* (Ulladans of the Cochin State). *Emin Pasha in Central Africa*, p. 103 (Mâdi and some other Central African peoples). Cunningham, *Uganda and its Peoples*, p. 140 (Bavuma). Tremearne, ' Notes on the Kagoro and other Nigerian Head-Hunters,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xlii. 169. Among the Basoga (Roscoe, *Northern Bantu*, p. 233) and Thonga (Junod, *Life of a South African Tribe*, ii. 97) the man is asked to marry the girl.

[2] Geis, quoted by Rose and Brown, ' Lisu (Yawyin) Tribes of the Burma-China Frontier,' in *Memoirs Asiatic Soc. Bengal*, iii. 263. Taupin, reviewed in *L'Anthropologie*, ii. 488 (Laosians). Hutchinson, *op. cit.* p. 23 (Chittagong Hill tribes). Soppitt, *Kuki-Lushai Tribes on the North-East Frontier*, p. 15 (Nagas and Kukis). Baumann, *Durch Massailand*, p. 161. Felkin, *loc. cit.* p. 208 (Fors).

[3] St. John, ' Wild Tribes of the North-West Coast of Borneo,' in *Trans. Ethn. Soc.* N.S. ii. 237. Low, *Sarawak*, p. 195. Wilken, ' Plechtigheden en gebruiken bij verlovingen en huwelijken bij de volken van den Indischen Archipel,' in *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, ser. v. vol. iv. 442 Hose and McDougall, *Pagan Tribes of Borneo*, ii. 170 (Kayans), 183 (Punans).

[4] Decle, *Three Years in Savage Africa*, p. 348.

[5] Cook, *Voyage to the Pacific Ocean*, ii. 157.

they do so there would be no slur on the child. Should the man refuse to marry in such a case, the child would be killed as soon as born."[1]

To the hypothesis set forth in this chapter as regards the origin of human marriage the objection will perhaps be raised that I have overlooked one most important difference which exists among man and the lower animals. "That which distinguishes man from the beast," Beaumarchais says, "is drinking without being thirsty and making love at all seasons." Where love-making is restricted to a certain season only, it cannot, of course, be the sexual impulse that keeps male and female together till after the birth of the offspring; but the case is different with a species that pairs throughout the year. It may be argued, therefore, that in mankind the prolonged union between the sexes has originated, not in any specific instinct of the kind suggested above, but simply in a protracted tendency to procreation. Although this argument would still leave the father's relation to the offspring unexplained, it cannot be ignored. The permanency or periodicity of the sexual life must certainly affect the relations between the sexes. But when the question is whether this factor has played a part in the origin of human marriage, we must first consider the legitimacy of the assumption that our early human or semi-human ancestors, like ourselves, made love at all seasons. The next chapter will be devoted to this problem.

[1] Rivers, *History of Melanesian Society*, i. 310.

CHAPTER II

A HUMAN PAIRING SEASON IN PRIMITIVE TIMES

It has been assumed by some physiologists that the periodicity in the sexual life of animals depends upon economic conditions, the reproductive matter being a surplus of the individual economy. Hence, it is said, their sexual season occurs when the proportion between receipts and expenditure is most favourable.[1]

According to Mr. Heape, on the other hand, the sexual season is governed by a variety of influences. It may be influenced by the climate of the region in which the animal lives, by the seasons of the year when these are of marked variation, and by the supply of food, or possibly by the nature of the food, obtainable; by special nervous, vascular, and secretory peculiarities of the individual and its habits of life; and by the length of gestation, the claims of the newly-born offspring on the mother, and her powers of recuperation.[2]

There can, of course, be no doubt that the periodicity in question is closely connected with certain conditions

[1] Leuckart, 'Zeugung,' in Wagner, *Handwörterbuch der Physiologie*, iv. 862. Gruenhagen, *Lehrbuch der Physiologie*, iii. 528. *Cf.* Haycraft, 'Some Physiological Results of Temperature Variations,' in *Trans. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh*, xxix. 130.

[2] Heape, 'The "Sexual Season" of Mammals and the Relation of the "Pro-œstrum" to Menstruation,' in *Quarterly Jour. Microscop. Science*, N.S. vol. xliv. pt. i. 16 *sqq.*

prevailing in the particular season when the pairing takes place; but it seems to me equally obvious that the sexual functions are, at least to some extent, affected by different conditions in different species. This is shown by the fact that every month or season of the year is the pairing time of one or another species of Mammals.[1] The sexual season is adapted to the requirements of each species. It is fundamentally governed by the law that the young shall be born at the time which is most favourable for their survival; and the influence of seasonal conditions upon the sexual functions, and the length of the period of gestation, are subordinate to this law. The periodicity in the sexual life of animals is the result of natural selection.

This explains why Reptiles, Birds, and many Mammals bring forth their young early in spring, or, in tropical countries, at the beginning of the rainy season; the period then commences when life is more easily sustained, when prey is most abundant, when there is enough water and vegetable food, and when the climate becomes more suitable. In highlands animals, generally speaking, pair later than in lower regions, and in the polar and temperate zones later than in the tropics; species living in different latitudes have their pairing season earlier or later according to the differences

[1] Thus the bat pairs in January and February (Brehm, *Thierleben*, i. 299); the *Canis Azaræ* (Rengger, *Naturgeschichte der Säugethiere von Paraguay*, p. 147) and the Indian bison (Forsyth, *Highlands of Central India*, p. 108), in winter; the wild-cat and the fox, in February (Brehm, *op. cit.* i. 453, 662); the weasel, in March (*ibid.* ii. 84); the kulan, from May to July (*ibid.* iii. 19); the musk-ox, at the end of August (*ibid.* iii. 377); the elk in the Baltic Provinces, at the end of August, and in Asiatic Russia, in September or October (*ibid.* iii. 111); the wild yak in Tibet, in September (Prejevalsky, *Mongolia*, ii. 192); the reindeer in Norway, at the end of September (Brehm, *op. cit.* iii. 123); the badger, in October (*ibid.* ii. 149); the *Capra pyrenaica*, in November (*ibid.* iii. 311); the chamois, musk-deer (*ibid.* iii. 274, 95) and *Antilope Hodgsoni* (Prejevalsky, *op. cit.* ii. 205), in November and December; the wild camel of Central Asia, in December, January, and February (Hedin, *Central Asia and Tibet*, i. 357; Prejevalsky, *From Kulja to Lob-nor*, p. 91); the wolf, from the end of December to the middle of February (Brehm, *op. cit.* i. 534).

in climate.[1] The dormouse (*Muscardinus avellanarius*), which feeds upon hazel-nuts, pairs in July and brings forth its young in August, when nuts begin to ripen; then the young grow very quickly, so that they are able to bear the autumn and winter cold.[2] While the Adélie penguin chooses the warmest and lightest months of the year for the rearing of its young, the Emperor penguin—by far the largest of all penguins—performs this duty in the darkest, coldest, and most tempestuous time. "The only reason," says Dr. Murray Levick, "that has been suggested for this custom is that many months must pass before the chicks are fully fledged. Were they hatched in December (midsummer), as are Adélies, autumn would find them still unfledged, and probably they would perish in consequence, whereas being hatched in the early spring, they are fostered by their parents until the warmer weather begins, and then have the entire summer in which to accomplish their change of plumage."[3] This shows not only that the sexual season is controlled by the needs of the next generation, but also how very different the conditions may be under which the reproductive functions are called into play even in related species.

Although most of the higher animals breed only once or twice a year, there are certain species—as some whales,[4] the elephant,[5] many rodents,[6] and several of the lower monkeys[7]—that are said to have no definite pairing season. As to them, it is perhaps sufficient to quote Brehm's statement with regard to elephants, that "the richness of their woods is so great that they really never suffer want."[8] But although some monkeys in tropical countries possibly

[1] Brehm, *op. cit.* i. 370, 404, 431; ii. 6, 325, 420; iii. 111, 158, 159, 275, 302, 578, 599. Prejevalsky, *Mongolia*, ii. 193, 206.

[2] Brehm, *op. cit.* ii. 313. [3] Levick, *Antarctic Penguins*, p. 134 *sq.*

[4] Brehm, *op. cit.* iii. 699, 723.

[5] *Ibid.* iii. 482. [6] *Ibid.* ii. 440.

[7] *Ibid.* i. 119, 147, 182, 228. Schomburgk, *Reisen in Britisch-Guiana*, ii. 767.

[8] Brehm, *op. cit.* iii. 480. The birds on the Galapagos Islands, which are situated almost on the equator, likewise seem to have no definite sexual season (Markham, 'Visit to the Galapagos Islands,' in *Proceed. Roy. Geograph. Soc.* N.S. ii. 753).

are in a condition to become pregnant at all times of the year, others are certainly not so ;[1] and to these belong the man-like apes. Dr. Mohnike and other writers mention the occurrence of a sexual season with the orang-utan,[2] although they do not inform us when it takes place. Mr. Wallace, however, told me that he " found the young sucking orang-utan in May ; that was about the second or third month of the dry season, in which fruits began to be plentiful." According to Winwood Reade, the male gorillas fight at the rutting season for their females.[3] Sir Richard Burton says, " The gorilla breeds about December, a cool and dry month : according to my bushmen, the period of gestation is between five and six months."[4]

Considering, then, that the sexual season largely depends on the kind of food on which the species lives, together with other circumstances connected with anatomical and physiological peculiarities, and considering further the close biological resemblance between man and the man-like apes, we have reason to believe that the pairing of our earliest human or half-human ancestors also was restricted to a certain season of the year. This belief derives additional probability from the fact that there are even now some rude peoples who are actually stated to have an annual pairing time, and other peoples whose sexual desire most decidedly seems to undergo a periodical increase at a certain time of the year.

According to Mr. Johnston, the wild Indians of California, belonging to the lowest races on earth, " have their rutting seasons as regularly as have the deer, the elk, the antelope, or any other animals."[5] With reference to some of these

[1] Heape, *loc. cit.* p. 32. *Idem*, ' Menstruation of *Semnopithecus entellus*,' in *Philosophical Transactions*, ser. B. vol. clxxxv. pt. i. 412 *sqq*. *Idem*, ' Menstruation and Ovulation of *Macacus Rhesus*,' *ibid.* ser. B. vol. clxxxviii. 137 *sq*. Marshall, *Physiology of Reproduction*, p. 63.

[2] Mohnike, ' Die Affen auf den indischen Inseln,' in *Das Ausland*, xlv. 850. Hartmann, *Die menschenähnlichen Affen*, p. 230. Huxley, *Man's Place in Nature*, p. 33. [3] Reade, *Savage Africa*, p. 214.

[4] Burton, *Trips to Gorilla Land*, i. 248.

[5] Schoolcraft, *Archives of Aboriginal Knowledge*, iv. 224.

Indians, Mr. Powers says that spring "is a literal Saint Valentine's Day with them, as with the natural beasts and birds of the forest."[1] Of the Californian Hupa we are told that their marriages took place at the beginning of the summer season and were preceded by a courtship which extended through a summer and a winter.[2]

Dr. Cook records that the Eskimo inhabiting the country lying between the seventy-sixth and seventy-ninth parallels exhibit a distinct sexual season, which recurs with great intensity at the first appearance of the sun, that little else is thought of for some time afterwards, and that the majority of the children are in consequence born nine months later.[3] This account is in agreement with statements made by Bosquet regarding other Eskimo.[4] Among the reindeer-breeders of the Northern Yenisei valley the midwinter—the only time when they live for any length of time in one spot, since hunting and fishing are then impossible—is "the season of courtship and matchmaking. With the reappearance of the sun comes the wedding."[5]

Friedrich Müller says that among the Australian aborigines marriage and conception mostly take place during the warm season, when there is the greatest abundance of food, and that the latter is even to some extent confined to this period.[6] This statement is, partly at least, based on the following remark made by Oldfield in his description of the West Australian Watchandies:—"Like the beasts of the field, the savage has but one time for copulation in the year. About the middle of spring . . . the Watch-an-dies begin

[1] Powers, *Tribes of California*, p. 206.

[2] Goddard, *Life and Culture of the Hupa*, p. 55.

[3] Cook, 'Medical Observations among Esquimaux,' in *New York Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics*, vol. iv., quoted by Heape, in *Quarterly Jour. Microscop. Science*, N.S. vol. xliv. pt. i. 37, and Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, vol. i. Evolution of Modesty, &c., p. 126.

[4] Bosquet, 'Note on a Case of Absence of the Uterus,' in *Obstetrical Transactions*, vol. xxvii., quoted by Heape, *loc. cit.* p. 37.

[5] Miss Czaplicka, *My Siberian Year*, p. 102 *sq.* See also *Idem*, *Aboriginal Siberia*, p. 117.

[6] Müller, *Allgemeine Ethnographie*, p. 212 *sq.*

to think of holding their grand semi-religious festival of Caa-ro, preparatory to the performance of the important duty of procreation."[1] If this were literally correct the females would bring forth their offspring at a certain season only, but Curr emphatically denies that this is the case among the Australian aborigines;[2] and Sir W. B. Spencer informs me that Oldfield's statement holds true of none of the tribes known to him. On the other hand, there is Mr. Caldwell's communication to Mr. Heape, according to which those Queensland natives with whom he has been brought in contact have a distinct sexual season in September—that is, spring—and in consequence cannot be prevailed upon to do any work for some weeks at that time of the year.[3]

Concerning the Papuans inhabiting the Maclay Coast of New Guinea, the Russian traveller Miklucho-Maclay writes:—"In the months of July and August I noticed in the Papua villages many women in a late stage of pregnancy and most of the births took place in September. It seems therefore that the procreation is mostly performed in a certain season of the year, and it is also during this time—December and January—that the Papuas living here are least occupied with field-work and celebrate most of their nocturnal feasts, which last for several nights in succession."[4] Among the tribes inhabiting the mouth of the Wanigela River it is during the celebration of their most important feast, the annual *kapa*, that marriages usually take place;[5] and of some other New Guinea savages, the natives of Mailu, we are likewise told, by Dr. Malinowski, that their big annual feast is connected with marriage and sexual life. "The dancing, which takes place with increased intensity during the few

[1] Oldfield, 'Aborigines of Australia,' in *Trans. Ethn. Soc.* N.S. iii. 230.

[2] Curr, *The Australian Race*, i. 310 *sq.*

[3] Heape, in *Quarterly Jour. Microscop. Science*, N.S. vol. xliv. pt. i. 37.

[4] Miklucho-Maclay, 'Anthropologische Bemerkungen über die Papuas der Maclay-Küste,' in *Natuurkundig Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch Indie*, xxxiii. 245.

[5] Guise, 'Tribes inhabiting the Mouth of the Wanigela River,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxviii. 214.

days of the feast, seems to be associated with opportunities for short-lived intrigues, and occasionally there even seem to be features of licentiousness, groups absconding together."[1] Mr. J. H. Hadfield wrote to me from Lifu, near New Caledonia, that marriages there formerly took place at various times, when suitable, but that "November used to be the time at which engagements were made." As the seasons in this island are the reverse of those in England, November falls at the end of spring and the beginning of summer.

Among the Gaddanes of Luzon "it is the custom of the young men about to marry, to vie with each other in presenting to the sires of their future bride all the scalps they are able to take from their enemies, as proof of their manliness and courage. This practice prevails at the season of the year, when the tree—popularly called by the Spaniards 'the fire-tree'—is in bloom."[2] Of the savages of Northern Formosa it is said in a Chinese work that "when vegetation bursts forth women array themselves in their best clothing, and pay visits to their friends in the neighbouring tribes."[3] In the translation of a Chinese chronicle Bowra tells us that the Li of Hainan celebrate a spring festival at which the men and women of neighbouring settlements leap about hand in hand and sing. This is the best occasion for match-making, as the parents have no power to oppose the choice made by their children and no regard is paid to family names. According to the same authority, it is the custom among the wild, or Shêng-, Li that the boys and girls of sixteen or seventeen play and sing together on beautiful spring evenings without being in any way interfered with by their parents; and there are similar customs among various tribes of the continent.[4] In his essay on the Peninsula of Lei-chou, which forms the southern point of the Chinese

[1] Malinowski, 'Natives of Mailu,' in *Trans. Roy. Soc. South Australia*, xxxix. 562, 664.

[2] Foreman, *Philippine Islands*, p. 212. Worcester, *Philippine Islands*, p. 439.

[3] Taintor, *Aborigines of Northern Formosa*, p. 33.

[4] Strzoda, 'Die Li auf Hainan,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xliii. 202 *sq.*

mainland, Hirth writes about the people of Sui-ch'i hsien that "every year when the time for the feast of lanterns (Yüan-hsiao, in February or March) has come, men and women would come together from far and near to pull the rattan, as they call it, *i.e.*, to meet and have a look at each other, and at that time the cities and markets are crowded with people."[1] I am told by Mr. Y. H. Yao that in a famous Chinese poem it is said of a young wife that on a spring day she went on the balcony of her house and, when she saw the sprouting willow, regretted that she had advised her husband to go away to try his fortune.

In Cambodia M. Mondière has found that twice a year, in April and September, men seem to experience a "veritable rut," and will sometimes even kill women who resist them.[2] Concerning the Hami (Semang) of Hulu Jalor, in the Malay Peninsula, Messrs. Annandale and Robinson write:—"When questioned about the number of children usually born to a Hami woman, she volunteered the information that the children of her tribe were always born at the same season of the year, the season, according to some Malays who were present, which corresponds with the first month of the Arabic calendar, as reckoned in the Peninsula, that is to say about March. This would be just after the conclusion of the stormy season. The statement was confirmed by a Malay woman, who remarked that the Panghans bred like beasts; but Malay evidence is practically worthless regarding these people. We were unable to obtain information concerning the number of children usually born, owing to our Hami informant's inability to count; but she said that a child was born regularly every year to women of the proper age."[3] In his book on the tribes in the interior of the Malay Peninsula, Dr. Martin says that this statement stands quite alone, and that the subject therefore requires further investigation.[4] Mr. Skeat informs us that the Besisi, belonging

[1] Hirth, 'Peninsula of Lei-chou,' in *China Review*, ii. 351.

[2] Mondière, 'Cambodgiens,' in *Diction. des sciences anthropol.*, quoted by Ellis, *op. cit.* i. 126.

[3] Annandale and Robinson, *Fasciculi Malayenses*, i. 6.

[4] Martin, *Die Inlandstämme der Malayischen Halbinsel*, p. 897.

to the Jakun, "commonly have a regular carnival (at the end of the *padi* or rice harvest) when (as they say) they are 'allowed to exchange' their wives, a practice which recalls the wedding law of ancient Peru, by which there was established one universal wedding-day annually throughout the land."[1] And Dr. Martin himself states that the Besisi contract their marriages when the rice harvest has come to an end.[2] But, for reasons which will be given below, neither of these statements seems to be of much importance in the present connection.

In Assam the Bihu festival, which takes place every year in April and lasts for seven days, is celebrated with music, dancing, and rejoicing, and the people abandon themselves freely both to drunkenness and other forms of licentiousness. The season of this spring festival "has always been claimed by the female sex as a period of considerable licence; and the exercise of their freedom within that period does not seem to be attended with any stain, blemish, or loss of reputation." An unfortunate youth who has failed to secure the consent of the parents of the girl he has selected to be his wife has then recourse to a stratagem to effect his object. "He lays wait in the road till the damsel passes by to the fair or festival with her female relatives, when, with the aid of his companions, he carries off the feigning reluctant bride, and immediately marries her privately"; and in a few days the parents are obliged to be reconciled and consent to a public marriage.[3] The Khasis, in the hills between Assam and Eastern Bengal, have grand dances in the month of March, at the new moon, and at these dances many matches are made. It is customary for unmarried girls only to dance; they form a ring, and "the young bachelors run round the outside of the ring, moving fans made of feather."[4] The Bhuiyas, an Orissa hill tribe, have in February a festival called Magh Porai, at which they give way to frightful

[1] Skeat and Blagden, *Pagan Races of the Malay Peninsula*, ii. 70. *Cf. ibid.* ii. 76, 145. [2] Martin, *op. cit.* p. 867 *sq.*

[3] Butler, *Travels and Adventures in the Province of Assam*, p. 226 *sq.* Endle, *Kachâris*, pp. 34, 50, 89.

[4] Steel, 'Kasia Tribe,' in *Trans. Ethn. Soc.* N.S. vii. 309.

debauchery and intoxication; it continues for three days, "during which all respect for blood relations and husbands is set at naught, and even sisters and brothers make indecent jokes regarding each other."[1] The Hos in Chota Nagpur, according to Colonel Dalton, have every year a great feast in January, "when the granaries are full of grain, and the people, to use their own expression, full of devilry. They have a strange notion that at this period, men and women are so over-charged with vicious propensities, that it is absolutely necessary for the safety of the person to let off steam by allowing for a time full vent to the passions. The festival, therefore, becomes a saturnalia, during which servants forget their duty to their masters, children their reverence for parents, men their respect for women, and women all notions of modesty, delicacy, and gentleness." Men and women become almost like animals in the indulgence of their amorous propensities, and the utmost liberty is given to the girls.[2] The same writer adds that "it would appear that most Hill Tribes have found it necessary to promote marriage by stimulating intercourse between the sexes at particular seasons of the year."[3] The Punjas of Jeypore have a festival in the first month of the new year, where men and women assemble; and the lower orders or castes observe this festival, which is kept up for a month, by both sexes mixing promiscuously and taking partners as their choice directs.[4] A similar feast, comprising a continuous course of debauchery and licentiousness, is held once a year by the Kotas of the Nilgiris.[5]

Very widely celebrated is the feast which is called Holi, Phāg, or Phaguā in Northern India, Shimgā or Hutāshana in the Deccan and Western India, and Kaman-pandikai

[1] Macmillan, 'Bhuiyas,' in *Calcutta Review*, ciii. 188.

[2] Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal*, p. 196 *sq.* See also de Gryse, 'Les premiers habitants du Bengale,' in *Les Missions Catholiques*, 1897, p. 393. [3] Dalton, *op. cit.* p. 300.

[4] Shortt, *Hill Ranges of Southern India*, iii. 11 *sq.* *Idem*, 'Contribution to the Ethnology of Jeypore,' in *Trans. Ethn. Soc.* N.S. vi. 269.

[5] *Idem*, 'Account of the Hill Tribes of the Neilgherries,' in *Trans. Ethn. Soc.* N.S. vii. 282.

in the south. It is observed in the month of Phālguna (February-March) and lasts for at least three days, but in some places even for fifteen days or more, of which the last three are the most important. It has been styled the festival of the god of lust. "Most of the observers of this feast," says Natesa Sastri, "imagine that the object they worship is Cupid and that the mock-funs they observe are on account of Kama, the God of Love."[1] M. Rousselet gives the following description of it as celebrated among the Hindus of Oudeypur. "The festival of Holi marks the arrival of spring, and is held in honour of the goddess Holica, or Vasanti, who personifies that season in the Hindu Pantheon. The carnival lasts several days, during which time the most licentious debauchery and disorder reign throughout every class of society. It is the regular saturnalia of India. Persons of the greatest respectability, without regard to rank or age, are not ashamed to take part in the orgies which mark this season of the year. . . . Effigies of the most revolting indecency are set up at the gates of the town and in the principal thoroughfares. Women and children crowd round the hideous idols of the feast of Holica, and deck them with flowers; and immorality reigns supreme in the streets of the capital."[2] Among the Rajputs of Mewar, according to Tod, the last days of spring are dedicated to Camdéva, the god of love: "the scorching winds of the hot season are already beginning to blow, when Flora droops her head, and the 'god of love turns anchorite.'"[3] Among the Aryans who inhabited the plains of the North the spring, or *vasanta*, corresponding to the months of March and April, was the season of love and pleasure, celebrated in song by the poets, and the time for marriages and religious feasts.[4] Strabo states that the marriages of the

Crooke, 'Holi: a Vernal Festival of the Hindus,' in *Folk-Lore*, xxv. 55 *sqq*. Natesa Sastri, *Hindu Feasts, Fasts, and Ceremonies*, p. 44 *sqq*. Padfield, *The Hindu at Home*, p. 152.

[2] Rousselet, *India and its Native Princes*, p. 173.

[3] Tod, *Annals and Antiquities of Rajast'han*, i. 495.

[4] Rec'us, *Nouvelle géographie universelle*, viii. 70. *Cf.* Crooke, in *Folk-Lore*, xxv. 56.

ancient Persians were contracted about the vernal equinox.[1] He also tells us that the Amazons for ten months of the year lived in seclusion from all male company, but once every spring ascended a certain mountain to meet the men of a neighbouring people and then during two months had sexual intercourse with them for the sake of propagation.[2] The later Romans connected April with Venus.[3] In an Arabic almanack which has circulation in Northern Africa it is said that April and May are most excellent months for conjugal intercourse, whereas moderation should be observed in August.[4]

A mediæval author, the unknown biographer of St. Adalbert, and the monk of the Russian Abbey of Eleasar, known by the name of Pamphil, who lived in the sixteenth century, speak of the existence of certain yearly festivals among some Slavonic peoples at which great licence prevailed. According to the latter author, such meetings were regularly held on the borders of the State of Novgorod on the banks of rivers, resembling in that particular the annual festivals mentioned in the Chronicle of Nestor at which every man carried off a woman with her own consent.[5] The gatherings took place, as a rule, at the end of June, the day before the festival of St. John the Baptist, which in pagan times was that of a divinity known by the name of Jarilo, corresponding to the Priapus of the Greeks.[6] M. Volkov observes that not long ago these customs still survived in the government of Tver, "où le jour de Yarilo (divinité phallique du printemps) les jeunes filles du peuple étaient envoyées par leurs parents prendre part à des jeux analogues à ceux des anciens Slaves, dans le but de se fiancer."[7] In

[1] Strabo, *Geographica*, xv. 3. 17.

[2] *Ibid.* xi. 5. 1.

[3] Fowler, *Roman Festivals of the Period of the Republic*, p. 67. Westropp and Wake, *Ancient Symbol Worship*, p. 26.

[4] I am indebted to my friend Mr. Henry Bishop for this statement.

[5] Nestor, *Chronique*, p. 10.

[6] Kovalewsky, 'Marriage among the Early Slavs,' in *Folk-Lore*, i. 466 *sq.* *Idem, Modern Customs and Ancient Laws of Russia*, p. 10 *sq.*

[7] Volkov, 'Rites et usages nuptiaux en Ukraïne,' in *L'Anthropologie*, ii. 166 *sq.*

this connection reference may also be made to M. Bagin's statement that the Votyak of Kasan still retain the very ancient custom of marrying their young at a definite period of the year, which is before the hay harvest, about the end of June.[1]

As Mannhardt pointed out, there have been, and are even now, spring and midsummer festivals in various European countries, which are celebrated with bonfires, music, and dancing, and associated with love- and match-making.[2] Yet it seems very doubtful whether these festivals can be regarded as evidence of an increase of the sexual desire in spring or at the beginning of summer, as Kulischer and some later writers have maintained,[3] considering that similar festivals are held at other times of the year as well. Thus, for example, we hear that in ancient Russia the yearly festivals on Christmas day and on the day of the baptism of Christ were likewise characterised by promiscuous intercourse of the sexes.[4] In another place I have stated facts which tend to show that the original object of European, as well as North African, midsummer ceremonies has mainly been to serve as a protection against evil forces supposed to be active at the summer solstice,[5] and I venture to believe that something similar may be said of other festivals held at astronomical crises, such as the winter solstice and the vernal equinox. The leading ceremonies on these occasions are not generally of a sexual character; and that love-making is associated with holiday gatherings of young people of both sexes can easily be explained without the help of the theory

[1] Solotaroff, 'On the Origin of the Family,' in *American Anthropologist*, xi. 230.

[2] Mannhardt, *Wald- und Feldkulte*, vol. i. ch. v. § 8 *sqq.*, especially pp. 449, 450, 469, 480 *sq.*

[3] Kulischer, 'Die geschlechtliche Zuchtwahl bei den Menschen in der Urzeit,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* viii. 152 *sqq.* Pearson, *Chances of Death*, ii. 104 *sq.* Ellis, *op. cit.* i. 130 *sqq.* I myself expressed the same opinion in the earlier editions of this work.

[4] Kovalewsky, in *Folk-Lore*, i. 467. *Idem*, *Modern Customs and Ancient Laws*, p. 11.

[5] Westermarck, *Ceremonies and Beliefs connected with Agriculture, &c. in Morocco*, p. 79 *sqq.*

of an ancient sexual season. More importance may be attached to the connection of the Russian festival with the phallic divinity Jarilo.

Feasts comprising sexual licentiousness are reported from various parts of America[1] and Africa. Among the Bororó Indians, Mr. Frič was told that at a certain time of the year a feast takes place in the *bahito*, or men's house, at which the young men steal girls who have no parents and keep them in the *bahito*.[2] Sir H. H. Johnston mentions the occurrence of orgies of a sexual character in British Central Africa "at certain seasons,"[3] Mr. A. J. Swann among some tribes near Lake Nyasa,[4] Dr. Fritsch among the Hottentots,[5] the Rev. H. Rowley among the Kafirs in connection with the harvest.[6] The Rev. H. T. Cousins wrote to me that among the Kafirs inhabiting what is known as Cis-Natalian Kafirland there are more children born in August and September, which are the spring months in South Africa, than in any other season; and he ascribes this surplus of births to feasts with debauchery and unrestricted intercourse between the unmarried people of both sexes. Dr. A. Sims, again, informed me from Stanley Pool that among the Bateke more children are born in September and October, that is, the season of the early rains, than at other times; and the Rev. Ch. E. Ingham, writing from Banza Manteka, stated that he believed the same to be the case among the Bakongo. These statements, like some others quoted before, were answers to questions which I had addressed to persons living among various savage peoples. Another answer came from Mr. T. Bridges, who informed me that among the Yahgans in the southern part of Tierra del Fuego, so far as he knew,

[1] Latcham, 'Ethnology of the Araucanos,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xxxix. 354. Bancroft, *Native Races of the Pacific States of North America*, i. 551 *sq.* (Keres of New Mexico). Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, ii. 240 *sq.*

[2] Frič and Radin, 'Contribution to the Study of the Bororo Indians,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxvi. 390.

[3] Johnston, *British Central Africa*, p. 408 n.1.

[4] Mr. Swann, in a letter to the author.

[5] Fritsch, *Die Eingeborenen Süd-Afrika's*, p. 328.

[6] Rowley, *Africa Unveiled*, p. 165.

one month is the same as another with regard to the number of births.

The statements which I have now quoted as evidence in favour of a human pairing season are certainly of very unequal value, and some of them might perhaps as well have been omitted altogether. I have already referred to the doubtful testimony of certain feasts at which sexual licence prevails; and it should be added that even when such licence seems to be the chief feature of a feast it is not necessarily an indication of an increase of the sexual desire in the season when the feast is held. It may be a magical rite intended to promote the growth of the crops, especially when found at agricultural festivals, which are in many cases associated with a more or less promiscuous intercourse of the sexes.[1] Of the Besisi carnival mentioned above Mr. Skeat remarks that it is evidently supposed to have some sort of productive influence not only upon the crops, but upon all other contributing sources of food-supply.[2] And Mr. Crooke thinks there is some reason to believe that the intention to promote the fertility of man, animals, and crops supplies the basis of the Holi rites.[3]

Another custom which calls for the greatest caution is that of contracting or celebrating marriages at some special time of the year. This custom may be due to purely practical motives.[4] The Choroti of the Gran Chaco in South America usually contract their marriages during the algaroba-season, "when there is a good supply of food, and drinking-bouts and other festivals are held almost continually."[5] Among the Kubu of Upper Djambi in Sumatra marriages are concluded at a time of the year when there is an abundance of wild fruits of a certain kind which can be preserved for a long time, so that the young couple shall have enough to eat.[6] Among the Benua of Malacca "marriages are

[1] See Frazer *Magic Art*, ii. 97 *sqq.*; Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, ii. 240.

[2] Skeat and Blagden, *op. cit.* ii. 121.

[3] Crooke, in *Folk-Lore*, xxv. 83.

[4] *Cf.* van Gennep, *Les rites de passage*, p. 199.

[5] Karsten, *Indian Dances in the Gran Chaco (S. America)*, p. 30.

[6] Hagen, *Die Orang Kubu auf Sumatra*, p. 131.

ordinarily celebrated about the months of July and August, when fruits are plentiful."[1] In Morocco they are commonly celebrated in the autumn, when the harvest has come to an end and the granaries are full of corn; I was told that the Ait Waráin, south of Fez, never hold a wedding at any other time of the year.[2] For a similar reason, the peasantry of many European peoples celebrate their marriages by preference in the autumn or at the beginning of the winter.[3] The weddings of the Wadshagga in East Africa are held at the time for the brewing of beer, which again depends on the millet-harvest.[4] Among the West African Yoruba marriages took place in the olden days at the beginning of the rains, "but as there was very little food in the house at that season the time was changed to the time of the harvest of the new yams, which was a time of great rejoicing (Orisha Oko), and the second planting season."[5] Some other West Africans preferred the dry season or the latter part of the rainy for their weddings, because there was then an abundance of fish and the weather was better suited for outdoor sports and plays.[6] The leisure enjoyed by the people may also influence their choice of the time when they hold their weddings. This, for example, is the case with the Hopi Indians of Arizona, who generally marry in autumn or winter.[7] In Dardistan marriages as a rule take place in January and February, because "there is then no agricultural work to occupy the men, and the houses are well stored with meat. So firmly is the custom established in Nager, that a heavy fine is inflicted on marriages held at any other season."[8] The Kukis usually marry in the same months

[1] Favre, 'Account of the Wild Tribes inhabiting the Malayan Peninsula,' in *Jour. Indian Archipelago*, ii. 263.

[2] Westermarck, *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco*, p. 86.

[3] v. Schroeder, *Die Hochzeitsgebräuche der Esten, &c.*, p. 48 *sq.* Weinhold, *Die deutschen Frauen in dem Mittelalter*, i. 363 *sq.* Meyer, *Deutsche Volkskunde*, p. 174.

[4] Volkens, *Der Kilimandscharo*, p. 251.

[5] Dennett, *Nigerian Studies*, p. 165 *sq.*

[6] Nassau, *Fetichism in West Africa*, p. 9.

[7] Voth, 'Oraibi Marriage Customs,' in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. ii. 240.

[8] Biddulph, *Tribes of the Hindoo Koosh*, p. 78.

"because they have provisions in the greatest plenty, and it is their most idle time."[1] The Coorg weddings generally "come off during the months of April and May, when the rice-valleys are dry, and there is little work to be done."[2] Superstition, too, may play a part in the matter.[3] Among the Brahmans of India, for instance, there are properly but four months in the year in which marriage can be celebrated, namely, March, April, May, and June, which are considered a fortunate time for marrying. But Dubois thinks that the principal motive which originally induced them to fix on these months was that the country labours were then all closed or suspended on account of excessive heat, and the preceding harvest furnished the means of supplying what the ceremony required.[4] In China the spring season and the last month in the year are regarded as the most fortunate nuptial periods.[5] It is not impossible, however, that superstitions of this kind have their root in sexual periodicity.

It may also be said that some of the statements are too indefinite to be quite convincing, and that a few others bear the stamp of exaggeration. Yet allowing for all such deficiencies in the material, I think there is sufficient evidence left to show that an annual increase of the sexual desire or of the reproductive power, generally in spring, is of frequent occurrence in mankind. This conclusion derives much support from definite statistical data relating to the distribution of births over the different months of the year.

In the eighteenth century Wargentin observed that in Sweden more children were born in one month than in another.[6] The same has since been found to be the case in

[1] Macrae, 'Account of the Kookies,' in *Asiatick Researches*, vii. 194.

[2] Richter, *Manual of Coorg*, p. 134.

[3] See *infra*, on Marriage Rites.

[4] Dubois, *Description of the Character, &c. of the People of India*, p. 103 *sq.* See also Padfield, *op. cit.* p. 101 *sq.*

[5] Wells Williams, *The Middle Kingdom*, i. 791.

[6] Wargentin, 'Uti hvilka Månader flera Människor årligen födas och dö i Sverige,' in *Kongl. Vetenskaps-academiens Handlingar*, xxviii. 249 *sqq.*

other European countries as well. According to Wappäus, the number of births in Sardinia, Belgium, Holland, and Sweden is subject to a regular increase twice a year, the maximum of the first increase occurring in February or March and that of the second in September and October.[1] Sormani observed that in the south of Italy there is an increase only once a year, but more to the north twice, namely, in spring and in autumn.[2] Mayr [3] and Beukemann[4] found in Germany two annual maxima—in February or March and in September; and Haycraft states that in the eight largest towns of Scotland more children are born in legitimate wedlock in April than in any other month.[5] As a rule, according to Sormani, the first annual increase of births has its maximum in Sweden in March; in France and Hol'and, between February and March; in Belgium, Spain, Austria, and Italy, in February; in Greece, in January. Thus it comes earlier in Southern Europe than farther north.[6] Again, the second annual increase is found more considerable the more to the north we go. In South Germany it is smaller than the first one, but in North Germany generally larger;[7] and in Sweden it is decidedly larger.[8]

As to non-European countries Wappäus observed that in Massachusetts the birth-rate likewise underwent an increase twice a year, the maxima falling in March and September; and that in Chili many more children were born in September and October—that is, the beginning of spring—than in any other month.[9] In Cuba, according to

[1] Wappäus, *Allgemeine Bevölkerungsstatistik*, i. 237.

[2] Sormani, *La fecondità e la mortalità umana in rapporto alle stagioni ed ai clima d'Italia*, quoted by Mayr, *Die Gesetzmässigkeit im Gesellschaftsleben*, p. 242.

[3] Mayr, *op. cit.* p. 240.

[4] Beukemann, *Ein Beitrag zur Untersuchung über die Vertheilung der Geburten nach Monaten*, p. 15 *sqq.*

[5] Haycraft, *loc. cit.* p. 119 *sq.*

[6] Sormani, quoted by Mayr, *op. cit.* p. 241.

[7] Beukemann, *op. cit.* p. 26.

[8] Wargentin, *loc. cit.* p. 252. Wappäus, *op. cit.* i. 237.

[9] Wappäus, *op. cit.* i. 250, 237.

the records compiled by Dr. Finlay, both whites and coloured people exhibit a specially high birth-rate in July, and another, though less marked, rise in the birth-rate in November and December.[1] Mr. S. A. Hill, of Allahabad, has shown that among the Hindus of that province the birth-rates likewise vary in different months, the minimum falling in June and the maximum in September and October.[2] According to the records of births registered in the district of Coimbatore during the years 1888–1892, the birth-rate was lowest in February (6·95 per cent.) and highest in October (9·62 per cent.) and July (9·15 per cent.).[3] In North Arcot it was likewise, during the same period, lowest in February (5·98 per cent.) and highest in August and July (10·40 and 10·13 per cent. respectively);[4] whilst in South Canara it was lowest in October and September (6·68 and 6·74 per cent. respectively) and highest in July and June (9·80 and 9·69 per cent. respectively).[5] Europeans and Eurasians were not included in these records.

The periodical fluctuations in the birth-rate may no doubt be due to various causes. But I think there is every reason to believe that the maximum in February and March (in Chili, September) is, at least to a large extent, due to an increased tendency to procreation in May and June (in Chili, December).[6] This seems the more likely since it is especially illegitimate births that are then comparatively numerous.[7] Mr. Heape believes that both the autumn and spring maxima of conceptions in Cuba have a similar origin.[8]

[1] Heape, 'Proportion of the Sexes produced by Whites and Coloured Peoples in Cuba,' in *Philosophical Transactions*, ser. B. vol. cc. 296.

[2] Hill, 'Life Statistics of an Indian Province,' in *Nature*, xxxviii. 250.

[3] Nicholson, *Madras District Manuals: Coimbatore*, ii. 100.

[4] Cox, *Madras District Manuals: North Arcot*, ii. 100.

[5] Stuart, *Madras District Manuals: South Canara*, ii. 92.

[6] The same opinion has been expressed by Wappäus (*op. cit.* i. 239, 247), Ploss (*Das Weib*, i. 414), and many later writers.

[7] See, *e.g.*, Mayr, *Bevölkerungsstatistik*, p. 171.

[8] Heape, in *Philosophical Transactions*, ser. B. vol. cc. 296 *sqq.*

If we thus find in man, even to this day, an increase either of the sexual desire or of the reproductive power in spring or at the beginning of summer, I think we may look upon it as a survival of a pairing season among our early human or pre-human ancestors.[1] We are the more justified in doing so as a sexual season occurs among the man-like apes, and conditions similar to those which led to it in their case may be supposed to have produced the same result in the case of primeval man. We may assume that he in this respect followed the law which governs the pairing of other animals, that his reproductive activity was controlled by the needs of the next generation. It is true that if coition took place in spring or at the beginning of summer, the offspring were born somewhat earlier in the year than is the case in the majority of mammalian species. But we must remember that the infancy of man is unusually long, and that with regard to the time most favourable to the subsistence of children, we have to take into consideration not only the first days or weeks of their existence, but the earlier period of their infancy in general. Besides food and warmth there are other factors that may affect the welfare of the offspring, and it is not easy to find out all of them. We may be unable to say exactly why the badger bears its young at the end of February or the beginning of March,[2] and the reindeer of the Norwegian mountains as early as April;[3] but there can be no doubt that these seasons are adapted to the requirements of the respective species.

The cause of the winter maximum of conceptions, especially considerable among the peoples of Northern Europe, is

[1] That the periodical increase of births is a survival of an ancient sexual season was suggested by Kulischer (*loc. cit.* p. 156 *sq.*) in 1876, and by Rosenstadt ('Zur Frage nach den Ursachen, welche die Zahl der Conceptionen beim Menschen in gewissen Monaten des Jahres regelmässig steigern,' in *Mittheil. aus dem embryologischen Institute der K. K. Universität in Wien*, ser. ii. pt. iv. 95) in 1890—the year after the present chapter with the same suggestion was originally published (in my academical thesis, *The Origin of Human Marriage*, Helsingfors, 1889).

[2] Brehm, *op. cit.* ii. 149.

[3] *Ibid.* iii. 124.

generally sought in social influences, such as the quiet ensuing on the harvest time, the better food, the amusements of Christmas,[1] or the greater frequency of marriages.[2] But although I do not deny that it may have a social origin, the explanations given are not free from objections. The people certainly recover before December from the labours of the field. Already Wargentin remarked that the Christmas amusements take place at the end of that month and far into January, without showing any particular influence upon the number of births in October.[3] And as regards the supposed connection between an increased tendency to procreation and abundance of food it is worth noticing that in the northern parts of Europe many more conceptions take place in May and June, when the conditions of life are often rather hard, than in September, October, and November, when the supplies of food are comparatively plentiful; indeed, in Sweden and the north-western provinces of Germany the latter months are characterised by a minimum of conceptions.[4] Among the Cis-Natalian Kafirs more children are conceived in November and December than in any other month, although, according to Mr. Cousins, food is most abundant among them from March to September; and among the Bateke the maximum of conceptions falls in December and January, although food is, as I am informed by Dr. Sims, most plentiful in the dry season, that is, from May to the end of August. Finally, the opinion that the winter maximum of conceptions is due to the greater frequency of marriages is opposed to the conclusion arrived at by many investigators, that the unequal distribution of marriages over the different months exercises little or no influence upon the distribution of births.[5]

[1] Wappäus, *op. cit.* i. 241. Mayr, *Bevölkerungsstatistik*, p. 171.

[2] Mayo-Smith, *Science of Statistics*, i. 75.

[3] Wargentin, *loc. cit.* p. 254. [4] Beukemann, *op. cit.* pp. 18, 28.

[5] Wappäus, *op. cit.* i. 242. Villermé, quoted by Ploss-Bartels, *Das Weib*, i. 712. Düsing, quoted by Rauber, *Der Überschuss an Knabengeburten*, p. 40. Bertillon, 'Natalité (démographie),' in *Dictionnaire encyclopédique des sciences médicales*, ser. ii. vol. xi. 479. Rosenstadt, *loc. cit.* p. 94. Mayr, *Bevölkerungsstatistik*, p. 171. Heape, in *Philosophical Transactions*, ser. B. vol. cc. 298.

I am far from venturing to express any definite opinion as to the cause of the winter maximum of conceptions, but I consider it quite possible that this maximum, also, is at least in some measure a result of natural selection, although of a comparatively late date. Considering that the September maximum of births (or December maximum of conceptions) in Europe becomes larger the farther north we go; that the agricultural peoples of Northern Europe have plenty of food in autumn and during the first part of winter, but often suffer some want in spring; and, finally, that the winter cold hardly affects the health of infants, the woods giving sufficient material for fuel—it has occurred to me that children born in September may have a particularly good chance of remaining alive. Dr. Beukemann states in fact that "the children born in autumn possess the greatest vitality and resisting power against the dangers of earliest infancy."[1] And more than half a century ago Edward Smith found, by taking 3050 cases of English children dying within one year of their birth, that the percentage of those born in the different months varied from less than 7 per cent. in February and 7 per cent. in September to nearly 11 per cent. in June—in other words, that children conceived in May and December showed signs of the highest vitality and those conceived in September of the lowest.[2] Commenting on this very interesting fact—which was not known to me when I first made my suggestion—Dr. Havelock Ellis writes, "As we have seen, May and December are precisely the periods when conceptions in Europe generally are at a maximum, and September is precisely the period when they are at a minimum, so that, if this coincidence is not accidental, the strongest children are conceived when there is the strongest tendency to procreate, and the feeblest children when the tendency is feeblest."[3] This would perhaps be an adequate explanation either of an increase of the sexual desire or of a greater disposition to impregnation in December; and it may also explain why the spring and early summer maximum of conceptions, instead of dying

[1] Beukemann, *op. cit.* p. 59. [2] Smith, *Health and Disease*, p. 172.
[3] Ellis, *op. cit.* i. 142 *sq.*

out as a useless survival, is still preserved in the midst of civilisation. But the cases investigated are too few to allow any definite conclusions.

Perhaps the increase of births among the Hindus of Allahabad in September and October—that is, the end of the hot season and the beginning of winter—has a similar origin. It may be that children born in those months have the best chance of surviving; during the winter the granaries get filled, and some of the conditions of life become more healthy, although September itself is a very unhealthy month.[1] Mr. Hill, on the other hand, attributes the increase of conceptions to the direct influence of healthy conditions with an abundant food supply.[2] But, as already said, the birth statistics for other countries do not show any such influence.

That man at present is not restricted to any particular season for the procreation is, of course, no objection to the hypothesis that his primitive ancestors were so. When Professor Nicholson says that Darwinism fails to assign any adequate cause for this,[3] he forgets that natural selection is only a negative cause, which checks undesirable variations. The more progress man makes in arts and inventions; the more he acquires the power of resisting injurious external influences; the more he rids himself of the necessity of freezing when it is cold and starving when nature is niggard of food; in short, the more independent he becomes of the changes of the seasons—the greater is the probability that children born at one time of the year will survive almost as well as those born at any other. Variations as regards the pairing time, which may always occur occasionally, will do so the more frequently on account of the changed conditions of life, which directly or indirectly cause variability of every kind;[4] and these variations will be preserved and transmitted to following generations. It is interesting to note that the periodical fluctuation in the number of

[1] Hill, *loc. cit.* p. 250. [2] *Ibid.* p. 250.

[3] Nicholson, *Sexual Selection in Man*, p. 9.

[4] Darwin, *Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication*, ii. 255.

births, though comparatively inconsiderable in every civilised society, is greater in countries predominantly agricultural, such as Chili, than in countries predominantly industrial, as Saxony;[1] that it is greater in rural districts than in towns;[2] and that it was greater in Sweden in the middle of the eighteenth century than it is now.[3] The more man has abandoned natural life out of doors, the more luxury has increased and his habits have got refined, the greater is the variability to which his sexual life has become subject, and the smaller has been the influence exerted upon it by the changes of the seasons.

In the sexual life of domesticated animals and wild animals kept in captivity there is also great variety, and the variations are extended not only to varieties of a species, but even to individuals of that species under domestication.[4] Among dogs,[5] goats,[6] asses in southern countries,[7] and captive cattle and deer,[8] the males are indeed prepared to propagate at all times, or almost at all times, throughout the year. The domestic cat may have three or four sexual seasons each year, whereas the wild cat has only one—some say two, but this is doubtful.[9] Among dogs in the wild state the bitch only experiences heat once a year, in the spring; but among domesticated dogs there is not only the spring period of heat, early in the year, but also an autumn period, about six months after, though the primitive period remains the most important one.[10] Dr. Hermann Müller has observed a canary which laid eggs in autumn and winter.[11] Natural selection cannot, of course, account for such changes: they fall under the law of variation. It is the limited pairing season that is a product of this

[1] Wappäus, *op. cit.* i. 247.
[2] *Ibid.* i. 246. Quetelet, *Treatise on Man*, p. 20. Bertillon, *loc. cit.* p. 480.
[3] Wappäus, *op. cit.* i. 343.
[4] Heape, in *Quarterly Jour. Microscop. Science*, N.S. vol. xliv. pt. i. 21 *sqq.*
[5] *Ibid.* p. 64.
[6] Brehm, *Thierleben*, iii. 333.
[7] *Ibid.* iii. 43.
[8] Heape, *loc. cit.* p. 64.
[9] *Ibid.* p. 23.
[10] Ellis, *op. cit.* i. 124.
[11] Müller, *Am Neste*, pp. 2, 86, 104.

powerful process, which acts with full force only under conditions free from domestication or civilisation.

If the hypothesis set forth in the present chapter holds good, it must be admitted that the continued excitement of the sexual instinct could not have played a part in the origin of human marriage, provided that marriage existed among primitive men—as I believe it did.

CHAPTER III

A CRITICISM OF THE HYPOTHESIS OF PROMISCUITY: ALLEGED INSTANCES OF PEOPLES LIVING IN PROMISCUITY

THE inference that marriage and the family consisting of parents and children existed among primitive man is opposed to the views held by many sociologists who have written upon early history. It is often said that the human race must have originally lived in a state of promiscuity, where individual marriage did not exist, where all the men in a horde or tribe had indiscriminately access to all the women, and where the children born of these unions belonged to the community at large. This opinion has been expressed by Bachofen, McLennan, Morgan, Lord Avebury, Giraud-Teulon, Lippert, Kohler, Post, Wilken, Kropotkin, Wilutzky, Bloch, and many others.[1] It is apparently somewhat less

[1] Bachofen, *Das Mutterrecht*, pp. xix. xx. 10. *Idem, Antiquarische Briefe*, p. 20 *sq.* McLennan, *Studies in Ancient History*, pp. 92, 95. *Idem, Studies in Ancient History. Second Series*, pp. 55, 57. Morgan, *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity*, pp. 480, 487 *sq.* *Idem, Ancient Society*, pp. 418, 500 *sqq.* Avebury, *Origin of Civilisation*, p. 68 *sqq.* *Idem, Marriage, Totemism and Religion*, p. 3 *sqq.* Giraud-Teulon, *Les origines du mariage et de la famille*, p. 70. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte der Menschheit*, ii. 7. Kohler, 'Ein Beitrag zur ethnologischen Jurisprudenz,' in *Zeitschr. vergl. Rechtswiss.* iv. 267. Post, *Die Geschlechtsgenossenschaft der Urzeit*, p. 16 *sq.* *Idem, Die Grundlagen des Rechts*, p. 183 *sq.* *Idem, Studien zur Entwickelungsgeschichte des Familienrechts*, p. 54 *sq.* Wilken, 'Over de primitieve vormen van het huwelijk en den oorsprong van het gezin,' in *De Indische Gids*, 1880, vol. ii. 611. *Idem, Das Matriarchat bei den alten Arabern*, p. 7 *sq.* Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid*, pp. 86, 313 *sqq.* Wilutzky, *Vorgeschichte des Rechts*, i. 12 *sqq.* Bloch, *Sexual Life of Our Time*, p. 188 *sqq.* Fiske, *Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy*, ii. 345. Kulischer, 'Die geschlecht-

popular now than it was at the time when I first wrote this book, but it has still as staunch supporters as ever. Dr. Bloch, for instance, says that recent ethnological research has proved the untenability of my criticism of the doctrine of promiscuity, that there can be no doubt whatever that in the beginnings of human development a state of sexual promiscuity actually prevailed, and that it even seems incomprehensible how a dispute could ever have arisen in the matter.[1] Some other recent writers are almost equally positive. I consider it therefore by no means superfluous to renew and extend my criticism. And now, as before,[2] I shall not merely endeavour to show that the supposed survivals of ancient promiscuity really are no such survivals at all, but also indicate how the customs in question may be explained.

The evidence adduced in support of the hypothesis of promiscuity flows from two different sources. First, there are in books of ancient and modern writers notices of peoples who are said to live or to have lived promiscuously. Second, there are certain customs which are assumed to be relics from an earlier stage of civilisation when marriage did not

liche Zuchtwahl bei den Menschen in der Urzeit,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* viii. 140 *sq.* Gumplowicz, *Grundriss der Sociologie*, p. 107. Engels, *Der Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigenthums und des Staats*, p. 17. Bebel, *Woman in the Past, Present, and Future*, p. 9. Reclus, *Primitive Folk*, p. 157. Finck, *Primitive Love and Love-Stories*, pp. 79 n. 1, 438. Parkinson, *Dreissig Jahre in der Südsee*, p. 676 *sq.* Grandidier, *Ethnographie de Madagascar*, ii. 175. Herbert Spencer (*Principles of Sociology*, i. 635) infers that even in prehistoric times promiscuity was checked by the establishment of individual connections, but thinks that in the earliest stages it was but in a small degree thus qualified. Müller-Lyer writes (*Die Familie*, p. 47) :—" Über die Frage, ob die urzeitlichen Menschen in Promiskuität gelebt haben, oder ob es in den Urhorden schon Sonderfamilien und Sonderehen gegeben habe, lassen sich nur Vermutungen aufstellen. Wahrscheinlich ist die letzere Annahme nicht." Dr. Hartland ('Totemism and Exogamy,' in *Folk-Lore*, xxii. 367) finds the hypothesis of primitive promiscuity " by no means untenable."

[1] Bloch, *op. cit.* pp. 188, 194.

[2] I do not understand how Schurtz (*Altersklassen und Männerbünde*, pp. 68, 69, 175 *sq.*) could accuse me of having been merely negative in my criticism.

exist. In the present chapter I shall deal with the former groups of facts.

McLennan observes that "tradition is found everywhere pointing to a time when marriage was unknown, and to some legislator to whom it owed its institution: among the Egyptians to Menes; the Chinese to Fohi; the Greeks to Cecrops; the Hindus to Svetaketu."[1] The Chinese annals recount that in the beginning men differed in nothing from other animals in their way of life. As they wandered up and down in the woods and women were in common, it happened that children never knew their fathers, but only their mothers. But the emperor Fou-hi abolished this indiscriminate intercourse of the sexes and instituted marriage.[2] In the Indian epic Mahabharata, Pāṇḍu tells his wife Kuntī that the women were in former times not kept within houses and dependent upon husbands and other relatives, but enjoyed themselves as best they could. This practice was not regarded as sinful, but was applauded by great Rishis, and is still in vogue among the Uttarakurus. But it was abolished by Śvētakētu, the son of the sage Uddālaka, when he saw that a strange Brahman in the presence of his own father took his own mother away with him.[3] According to Athenian tradition, the women were of old the common property of the men, who coupled with them like beasts, so that while every one knew his mother, nobody knew who his father was. This communism, however, was abolished by Kekrops, the first king of Athens, who established the laws and rules of marriage in its place.[4] The remote Laplanders, also, sing about Njavvis and Attjis, who instituted marriage and bound their wives by sacred oaths.[5]

[1] McLennan, *Studies in Ancient History*, p. 95.

[2] Goguet, *Origin of Laws, Arts, and Sciences*, iii. 311, 313.

[3] *Mahabharata*, i. 122. 4 *sqq*. Muir, *Original Sanskrit Texts*, ii. 327.

[4] Clearchus of Soli, quoted by Athenaeus, *Dipnosophistæ*, xiii. 2, p. 555 D. Charax of Pergamus, *Hellenica*, 10 (in *Fragmenta Historicorum Græcorum*, ed. C. Müller, iii. 638). John of Antioch, *Historia*, 13 (*ibid.* iv. 547). Suidas, *Lexicon Græce et Latine*, *s.v.* 'Κέκροψ,' vol. ii. 198 *sq*. Justin, *Historiæ Philippicæ*, ii. 6. 7. St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, xviii. 9. See also Frazer, *Magic Art*, ii. 284.

[5] v. Düben, *Lappland och Lapparne*, p. 330.

Legends of this sort can no more be regarded as evidence of primitive promiscuity than the second chapter of Genesis can be quoted in proof of primitive monogamy. They may be simply due to the tendency of the popular mind to ascribe almost any great institution to a wise legislator or ruler, if not to direct divine intervention. But at the same time I do not deny that they may be an echo of social conditions in the past. The story in the Mahabharata may allude to the laxity of morals among the non-Aryan people of India and the Himalayas, as the polyandry of the five Pāṇḍavas is probably an allusion to their polyandrous practices.[1] Lassen fixed the abode of the Uttarakurus beyond that great mountain chain.[2] The Athenian legend, again, has been represented as a survival of mother-right;[3] but that matrilineal descent once prevailed in Greece is an hypothesis which has been strongly contested.[4] Mr. Rose suggests that the legend in question may be "the theory of primitive promiscuity, no less a theory and no more a fact because stated by an anthropologist who lived 2000 years ago." He adds that any one who has read Lucretius or Ovid knows how much in favour this theory was among Greek scientists.[5]

Statements about foreign tribes living in a state of promiscuity abound in Greek and Roman literature. Herodotus[6] and Strabo[7] tell us that among the Massagetae, although each man had but one wife, the men used the women promiscuously, and that when a Massagetan desired to have the company of a woman he hung up his quiver in front of her chariot and had intercourse with her without shame.

[1] See *infra*, on Polyandry.

[2] Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, i. 612, 802. See also Oppert, *Original Inhabitants of Bharatavarṣa or India*, p. 613.

[3] Avebury, *Origin of Civilisation*, pp. 123, 127 Frazer, *Magic Art*, ii. 284. Miss Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, p. 262. Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, ii. 134 n. 1.

[4] Rose, 'On the alleged Evidence for Mother-right in Early Greece,' in *Folk-Lore*, xxii. 279 *sqq*. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and Niese, *Staat und Gesellschaft der Griechen und Römer*, p. 33.

[5] Rose, *loc. cit.* p. 289.

[6] Herodotus, i. 216. [7] Strabo, *Geographica*, xi. 8. 6.

It should be noticed that in these statements, which have constantly been quoted as evidence in favour of early promiscuity, individual marriage is expressly said to exist, although not only the husband but other men as well had access to his wife. According to a later authority, a Chinese writer of the thirteenth century by name Ma-touan-lin, it was the custom among the Massagetae of Turkestan that brothers had one wife between them and that the children born of these unions belonged to the eldest brother; and if a man had no brothers he associated with other men.[1] This account seems to be correct, considering that polyandry of the same type has prevailed among other Central Asiatics from time immemorial.[2] Now it is by no means improbable that the statements of Herodotus and Strabo had their origin in facts of this kind, and that the monogamous marriage mentioned by them was the union of the eldest brother or the first male partner, who was the chief or the real husband. And it should also be borne in mind that polyandry is not infrequently combined with polygyny, so that a group of men actually have several wives in common.[3]

Of the Galactophagi, another Scythian people, Nicolaus Damascenus says that they had their property and women in common, and that they called the old men fathers, the young men sons, and those of equal age brothers.[4] According to the same writer, the Liburnes in Illyria likewise had community of wives and brought all the children up together till they became five years of age, when each child was attributed to the man to whom it bore the strongest resemblance; and thenceforth that man educated the child as if it were his own.[5] Herodotus states of the Agathyrsi, who in his time dwelt in the country now called Transylvania and afterwards were driven more to the north,[6] that they

[1] Rémusat, *Nouveaux mélanges asiatiques*, i. 245.

[2] See *infra*, on Polyandry.

[3] See *infra*, on Group-marriage and other Group-relations.

[4] Nicolaus Damascenus, *Morum mirabilium collectio, e Stobaei Florilegio*, v. 73.

[5] *Ibid.* xliv. 41.

[6] Rawlinson's translation of Herodotus, iii. 91 n. 6.

had wives in common so that they might be all brothers and, as members of one family, might neither envy nor hate one another.[1] Promiscuity is said to have prevailed among the Mosyni, on the coast of Pontus.[2]

Communism in women and children was ascribed by classical writers to various Ethiopian peoples :—the Ichthyophagi (inhabiting islands in the Red Sea),[3] Hylophagi and Spermatophagi,[4] Garamantians,[5] and Troglodytes.[6] Of the last-mentioned people, however, it was said that chiefs had their own wives, and that anybody who had intercourse with the wife of a chief had to pay a sheep. Concerning the Auseans, inhabiting the borders of Lake Tritônis, Herodotus writes :—" These people do not marry or live in families, but dwell together like the gregarious beasts. When their children are full-grown they are brought before the assembly of the men, which is held every third month, and assigned to those whom they most resemble."[7] Of the Nasamonians, another Libyan people who dwelt around the shores of the Greater Syrtis, he says :—" Every man, by the custom of the country, has several wives, and they have intercourse with them in common ; and much the same as the Massagetae, they have intercourse when they have set up a staff before them."[8] It is of interest to notice that Herodotus expressly affirms the existence of individual marriage among these Libyans ;[9] for what he says about their oath-taking and some other customs is so true of the present inhabitants of Northern Africa that it may be supposed that his statement concerning their sexual

[1] Herodotus, iv. 104.

[2] Pomponius Mela, *Chorographia*, i. 19. *Cf.* Xenophon, *Anabasis*, v. 4. 33 ; Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca historica*, xiv. 30. 7.

[3] Ex Agatharchide de *Mari Erythraeo*, v. 51, in Müller, *Geographi Graeci minores*, i. 130. Diodorus Siculus, *op. cit.* iii. 15. 2.

[4] Ex Agatharchide de *Mari Erythraeo*, v. 31, in Müller, *op. cit.* i. 143. Diodorus Siculus, *op. cit.* iii. 24.4.

[5] Solinus, *Collectanea rerum memorabilium*, xxx. 2. Pliny, *Historia naturalis*, v. 8. 45.

[6] Strabo, *op. cit.* xvi. 4. 17. Ex Agatharchide de *Mari Erythraeo*, v. 61, in Müller, *op. cit.* i. 153. Diodorus Siculus, *op. cit.* iii. 32. 1.

[7] Herodotus, iv. 180. [8] *Ibid.* iv. 172. [9] See also *ibid.* iv. 296.

communism also had some foundation in fact. What the facts actually were it is of course impossible to say. Perhaps they had promiscuous intercourse on certain occasions. Marmol Caravajal speaks of a very ancient city situated on the road leading from Sefru, in the neighbourhood of Fez, to the province of Numidia, in which, according to African writers, there was a great temple where men and women had promiscuous intercourse during one night at a certain time of the year, after sacrifices had been made and the lights had been extinguished. The women who had been present were not allowed to sleep with their husbands until it was known whether they had become pregnant, and the children resulting from those irregular connections were destined to become servants of the temple. But when the Arabs invaded Mauritania, they destroyed the city with its temple and all its houses.[1] Yet similar practices are reported to exist in Morocco even to this day. In the interior of that country I heard stories about certain tribes or communities where people of both sexes are said to assemble in a mosque once every year in the night. The lights are extinguished, everybody lies down, and the men and women who are lying near each other have sexual intercourse regardless of all ties of marriage and consanguinity; but before the commencement of the orgies the leading man moves a bamboo staff over their heads to find out whether anybody remains standing and consequently, being a stranger, is to be turned out. This was told me not by the people themselves, but by other natives, and must therefore be looked upon with considerable suspicion; but there may be some truth in it after all.[2]

[1] Marmol Caravajal, *La descripcion general de Affrica*, book iv. ch. 109, vol. ii. fol. 163a.

[2] See also Salmon, 'Les Bḍaḍoua,' in *Archives marocaines*, ii. 362 *sq.*; Doutté, *Merrâkech*, p. 366 *sq.*; Mouliéras, *Une Tribu Zénète anti-musulmane au Maroc* (*les Zkara*), p. 100 *sq.* Similar stories are told about the Lycian Tachtadshys by their Turkish neighbours; but whether partially true or not, the stories contain obvious inaccuracies (Petersen and Luschan, *Reisen in Lykien*, p. 199). See also Blau, 'Nachrichten über kurdische Stämme,' in *Zeitschr. Deutsch. Morgenländ. Gesellsch.* xvi. 623 *sq.*

Considering how uncertain the information is which people give about the sexual relations of their own neighbours, we must be careful not to accept as trustworthy evidence the statements made by classical writers with reference to more or less distant tribes of which they evidently possessed very little knowledge. In the very chapter where Pliny states that among the Garamantians men and women lived in promiscuous intercourse he tells us of another African tribe, the Blemmyans, that they were said to have no head and to have the mouth and eyes in the breast.[1] I have never seen this statement quoted in any book on human anatomy, and can see no reason to assume that our author was so much better acquainted with the sexual habits of the Garamantians than he was with the personal appearance of the Blemmyans. Moreover, the statements referred to above are so short and ambiguous that different constructions may be put upon them. The community of women mentioned in them does not necessarily imply general promiscuity within the horde or tribe but may mean group-relations similar to those which are known to prevail among certain modern savages; and if the existence of marriage is denied, we must remember that the word "marriage" may have many meanings.

Promiscuity has been ascribed by mediæval writers to certain European peoples. Cosmas of Prague, a Latin annalist of the eleventh century, writes of the Bohemians or Czechs:—"Ipsa connubia erant illis communia. Nam more pecudum singulas ad noctes novos ineunt hymeneos, et surgente aurora trium gratiarum copulam et secreta amoris rumpunt vincula."[2] Professor Kovalewsky says that this statement as to promiscuity is directly confirmed by that of another mediæval author, the unknown biographer of St. Adalbert—who ascribes the animosity of the Bohemian people towards the saint to the fact of his strong

[1] Pliny, *op. cit.* v. 8:—"Garamantes matrimoniorum exortes passim cum feminis degunt. . . . Blemmyis traduntur capita abesse, ore et oculis pectori adfixis."

[2] Cosmas of Prague, *Chronica Bohemorum*, i. 3 (Migne, *Patrologiae cursus*, clxvi. 60 *sq.*).

opposition to the shameful promiscuousness which in his time prevailed in Bohemia—as also by the monk Pamphil, who lived in the sixteenth century; both speak of the existence of certain yearly festivals at which great licence prevailed.[1] But to indulge in sexual excesses once a year is not the same as to live in promiscuity permanently; and as for Cosmas' statement it should be noticed that he himself distinguishes between a mythical age and an historical age, and leaves it to his readers to decide which of his statements refer to the former and which to the latter.[2] Krek points out that his Chronicle is almost valueless as an historical source and that anybody who looks upon it otherwise shows incapacity of discerning between history and myth.[3] But even if we could be induced to believe that an Aryan people a few centuries ago had no marriage, we should certainly have to admit that it had lost something which its ancestors possessed in the past. In the Chronicle ascribed to Nestor, who is supposed to have been a Russian monk of the eleventh century, we read of the Drevlians that they lived like wild beasts, that marriage was unknown to them, and that they carried off young girls on the banks of rivers. Of three other Slavonic tribes, the Radimich, the Viatich, and the Severs, it is said:—"Marriage did not exist among them, but games were held in the outskirts of the villages. They met at these games for dancing and every kind of diabolic amusement, and there every man carried off the woman with whom he had previously come to an agreement. They had even two or three wives."[4] This description makes it clear that when the Russian monk denied the existence of marriage among some pagan tribes he did not use the term marriage in the sense given to it by the modern sociologist.

Professor Kovalewsky says that an Arabic traveller of

[1] Kovalewsky, 'Marriage among the Early Slavs,' in *Folk-Lore*, i. 466. *Idem, Modern Customs and Ancient Laws of Russia*, p. 10. See also Volkov, 'Rites et usages nuptiaux en Ukraïne,' in *L'Anthropologie*, ii. 164.

[2] Cosmas of Prague, *op. cit.* i. 13 (Migne, *op. cit.* clxvi. 79).

[3] Krek, *Einleitung in die slavische Literaturgeschichte*, p. 199.

[4] Nestor, *Chronique*, p. 10.

the tenth century, Abū-el-Qassim, speaks of the hetairism of the married women as a peculiarity of the national life of the Circassians; and he adds that this statement is confirmed by another Arabic writer, Massūdi.[1] But the former simply wrote that the Circassian women "pass for being voluptuous,"[2] and the latter that they "are said to be surprisingly beautiful and very voluptuous."[3] The old traveller Tavernier, who is also referred to by Professor Kovalewsky, states that the more gallants a Circassian woman has the more highly is she respected; but at the same time he speaks of their marriages, describes how they are concluded, and adds that if no child is born within a few years the husband is permitted to take another wife.[4] Nor do other travellers speak about a state of promiscuity among the Circassians.[5]

Lord Avebury quotes the sexual relations of various modern savages as instances of promiscuity or, as he calls it, "communal marriage."[6] "The Bushmen of South Africa," he says, "are stated to be entirely without marriage." He does not indicate the source from which he has taken this statement; all the authorities I have consulted unanimously assert the reverse, and, as we have noticed before, the family is in fact the chief social institution of this people. Sir Edward Belcher tells us that in the Andaman Islands the custom is for the man and woman to remain together until the child is weaned, when they separate and each seeks a new partner.[7] Lord Avebury, however, also draws attention to Mr. Man's account of the Andaman Islanders, according to which "bigamy, polygamy, polyandry, and divorce are unknown" among them,[8] but seems to maintain that the

[1] Kovalewsky, 'La famille matriarcale au Caucase,' in *L'Anthropologie*, iv. 266.

[2] Quoted by Darinsky, 'Die Familie bei den kaukasischen Völkern,' in *Zeitschr. vergl. Rechtswiss.* xiv. 175.

[3] Massūdi, 'Description du Caucase,' in Klaproth, *Magasin Asiatique*, i. 289.

[4] Tavernier, *Six Voyages*, i. 339. [5] Darinsky, *loc. cit.* p. 177 *sqq.*

[6] Avebury, *Origin of Civilisation*, p. 68 *sqq.*

[7] Belcher, 'Andaman Islands,' in *Trans. Ethn. Soc.* N.S. v. 45.

[8] Man, 'Aboriginal Inhabitants of the Andaman Islands,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xii. 135.

two accounts may refer to different tribes and consequently both be true. Mr. Portman expressly says that Belcher's statement is "quite incorrect";[1] but even if it were otherwise it could not be looked upon as evidence of promiscuity, suggesting as it does monogamous marriages of short duration. Speaking of the Haida of Queen Charlotte Islands, Mr. Poole says that among them "the institution of marriage is altogether unknown," and that the women "cohabit almost promiscuously with their own tribe, though rarely with other tribes."[2] From the description of Captain Jacobsen's voyage to the north-western coast of North America, however, it appears that marriage exists among those Indians although the husbands often prostitute their wives;[3] and Mr. Swanton, who spent ten months among them, gives us various details about their marriages and tells us that these were often arranged as soon as a child was born. Indeed, if a man were unfaithful after marriage, his mother-in-law exacted a large amount of property from him, and if the wife were unfaithful the husband generally took personal revenge.[4] In the Californian Peninsula, it is said, the sexes met without any formalities, and the vocabulary of the people did not even contain the verb "to marry."[5] But surely, the want of an equivalent for the verb "to marry" does not imply the want of the fact; and Baegert, the authority for the statement in question, indicates himself that marriage did occur among those Indians when he says that "each man took as many wives as he liked, and if there were several sisters in a family he married them all together."[6]

Lord Avebury observes that in the Pacific Islands, according to Mr. Hyde, there was an "utter absence of what we mean by the family, the household, and the husband; the only thing possible was to keep distinct the line through the

[1] Portman, *History of Our Relations with the Andamanese*, p. 519.
[2] Poole, *Queen Charlotte Islands*, p. 312.
[3] Woldt, *Capitain Jacobsen's Reise an der Nordwestküste Amerikas*, pp. 20, 21, 28 *sq.*
[4] Swanton, *Haida*, p. 50 *sqq.*
[5] Baegert, 'Aboriginal Inhabitants of the Californian Peninsula,' in *Smithsonian Report*, 1863, p. 368. [6] *Ibid.* p. 368.

mother, and enumerate the successive generations with the several putative fathers."[1] As an evidence of "communal marriage," this statement is contradicted by all that we know about the marriages of the peoples inhabiting the various islands of the Pacific Ocean. It is true that some of them have been said to have no marriage, but these statements have been proved to be erroneous. According to one narrator, the women of Easter Island had sexual intercourse in a promiscuous manner.[2] This statement was probably based on the fact that, although most girls were married very early in life, there were some who remained unmarried and acted as a kind of prostitutes, having even as many as five lovers, owing to the great preponderance of men in the island.[3] Geiseler says that each family lived by itself.[4] With reference to the Tahitians, Forster wrote, "We have been told a wanton tale of promiscuous embraces, where every woman is common to every man: but when we enquired for a confirmation of this story from the natives, we were soon convinced that it must, like many others, be considered as a groundless invention of a traveller's gay fancy."[5] Nowhere has debauchery been practised more extensively than among the Areois of Tahiti, who have also been accused of having their women in common.[6] Yet Ellis assures us that, "although addicted to every kind of licentiousness themselves, each Areoi had his own wife; . . . and so jealous were they in this respect that improper conduct towards the wife of one of their own number was sometimes punished with death."[7] Lord Avebury observes that the original Hawaian word for "to marry" meant "to try," and that the missionaries have been attempting to replace this by our word "marry" under a native form;[8] but Fornander has objected to this derivation, and Dr. Emerson has

[1] Avebury, *Origin of Civilisation*, p. 69.
[2] Quoted by Tregear, 'Easter Island,' in *Jour. Polynesian Soc* i. 99.
[3] Geiseler, *Die Oster-Insel*, p. 29.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 41.
[5] Forster, *Voyage round the World*, ii. 132.
[6] Turnbull, *Voyage round the World*, p. 364.
[7] Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, i. 239.
[8] Avebury, *op. cit.* p 69.

pointed out that the word meaning "to try" is *ho-a'o* and not *ho-ao*.[1] Contrary to the view that Hawaian society was characterised by relations between the sexes which approached a condition of complete promiscuity, Dr. Rivers maintains that the evidence clearly shows "that in Hawaian society in its ancient condition there existed the institution of individual marriage, though undoubtedly accompanied by much sexual laxity and with the possession of marital rights by others than the husband."[2] Lisiansky wrote more than a hundred years ago:—"Former voyagers have asserted, that the Marquesan men and women have no individual attachments, but cohabit promiscuously, as inclination may dictate. This, however, is a mistake: the marriage state is held nearly as sacred among them as it is among any uncivilised people. It is true indeed, fathers sometimes offered us their daughters, and husbands their wives; but this proceeded from their ardent desire of possessing iron, or other European articles. . . . This out of the question, jealousy is so prevalent with the men, that upon the smallest suspicion of infidelity, they punish their wives with severity."[3] In a quite recent book of travels Mr. Rannie states that he was told by the natives of New Ireland themselves that there is no marriage among them;[4] but this statement is disproved not only by what we are told by other travellers, but by some facts mentioned in his own description of those islanders.

Lord Avebury quotes certain Australian facts as evidence for his theory. With these I shall deal in the chapter on group-marriage; for what they prove, or are supposed to prove, is not promiscuity or "communal marriage," but sexual relations, or marriage, between a definite group of men and a definite group of women within the community. I presume that no authority on the Australian aborigines would deny the accuracy of Mr. Curr's statement that in none of their tribes men and women have been found living in a state of promiscuous intercourse, the reverse being a

[1] Rivers, *History of Melanesian Society*, i. 383.
[2] *Ibid.* i. 385 *sq.* [3] Lisiansky, *Voyage round the World*, p. 82.
[4] Rannie, *My Adventures among South Sea Cannibals*, p. 265.

matter of notoriety.[1] Indeed, nowhere is marriage subject to stricter rules than among those savages. Lord Avebury also mentions the Nayars, Tottiyars, and Todas of Southern India; but the statements he refers to only speak of polyandry or group-marriage, and will be considered under these forms of marriage. He also says, quoting Watson and Kaye, that the Teehurs of Oude live together almost indiscriminately in large communities, and that even when two persons are regarded as married the tie is but nominal.[2] With reference to this alleged instance of promiscuity, Mr. Crooke observes:—"There is no evidence whatever that anything like communal marriage prevails among them. The fact seems to be that by the necessities of their occupation the husbands leave their wives for long periods at a time and go on voyages as far as Calcutta. That a high standard of female morality is maintained during their absence it would be rash to assert: but this is very different from communal marriage."[3]

Bernhöft mentions two other peoples of India, the Irulas and Kurumbas, as instances of savages who have no marriage.[4] Of the former, Harkness writes that they "have no marriage contract, the sexes cohabiting almost indiscriminately; the option of remaining in union, or of separating, resting principally with the female. Some among them," he adds, "the favourites of fortune, who can afford deliberately to expend the sum of four or five rupees on festivities, will celebrate their union, by giving a feast to all their friends and neighbours."[5] That they are not without marriage also appears from the following statement made by Ward:—"In their marriages perhaps they are singular. This contract does not take place between the parties cohabiting till the second or third child is born, when the man agrees to pay a stipulated sum by instalments as a dowry to the friends of

[1] Curr, *Australian Race*, i. 126.

[2] Watson and Kaye, *People of India*, ii. no. 85.

[3] Crooke, *Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh*, i. p. clxxxiii. *sq.*

[4] Bernhöft, 'Altindische Familienorganisation,' in *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Rechtswiss.* ix. 14, quoting Ritter, *Erdkunde*, p. 1015 *sq.*

[5] Harkness, *Description of a Singular Aboriginal Race inhabiting the Neilgherry Hills*, p. 92.

the woman, who give with her as a portion a buffalo; the contract now becomes binding."[1] Of the Kurumbas Harkness simply says, "They have no marriage ceremony; but occasionally, when two have been living together for some time, they will enter into an agreement, in the presence of friends, to remain united for life."[2] To be without a marriage ceremony is certainly not the same as to be without marriage.

Bastian adds to the list the Keriahs and the Chittagong tribes, and some American Indians—the Guaycurûs, the Arawaks, and the Kutchin.[3] Concerning the Keriahs, Colonel Dalton only asserts that they have no word for marriage in their own language, but he does not deny that marriage itself occurs among them; on the contrary, it appears that they buy their wives.[4] The Chittagong Hill tribes, as we shall find later on, practise mostly monogamy. Anyone who takes the trouble to read Richardson's,[5] Kirby's,[6] or Bancroft's[7] account of the Kutchin will notice that polygyny, but not promiscuity, is prevalent among them, and that the husbands are very jealous of their wives. The same is stated by v. Martius about the Arawaks, whose blood-feuds are generally due to jealousy and a desire to avenge violations of conjugal rights;[8] and the occurrence of marriage among them has also been ascertained by Schomburgk[9] and Brett.[10] Of the Guaycurûs, Lozano says that the men have not more than one wife, but that nevertheless there are no proper marriages among them, since the husband may part with his wife and the wife with her husband without

[1] Ward, in Grigg, *Manual of the Nilagiri District*, Appendix, p. lxxviii. [2] Harkness, *op. cit.* p. 129.

[3] Bastian, 'Ueber die Eheverhältnisse,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* vi. 406.

[4] Dalton, 'The "Kols" of Chota Nagpore,' in *Trans. Ethn. Soc.* N.S. vi. 25.

[5] Richardson, *Arctic Searching Expedition*, i. 383.

[6] Kirby, 'Journey to the Youcan,' in *Smithson. Rep.* 1864, p. 419.

[7] Bancroft, *Native Races of the Pacific States*, i. 131.

[8] v. Martius, *Beiträge zur Ethnographie Amerika's*, i. 693.

[9] Schomburgk, *Reisen in Britisch-Guiana*, ii. 459 *sq.*

[10] Brett, *Indian Tribes of Guiana*, p. 98.

difficulty and without disgrace.[1] That they have marriages appears from other accounts as well, and it is even said that separations between husbands and wives are rare among them.[2] Bastian further states that the Jolah on the island of St. Mary, according to Hewett, possess their women in common,[3] and that, according to Magalhães, the like is true of the Kahyapó of Matto Grosso.[4] The former of these statements I have been unable to check. As regards the Kahyapó, Magalhães says that their "communism" is of the following kind. When a woman reaches the age at which she is allowed to enter into relations with the other sex she may become pregnant by any man she likes. During the period of pregnancy and suckling she is supported by the father of the child, who also can have intercourse with the other women dwelling in the same hut. Subsequently the woman is at liberty to conceive again by the same man, or she can do so by another one; but if she does the latter, the duty of maintaining the earlier offspring is transferred to the new father.[5] This can certainly not be called promiscuity. Krause says that monogamy seems to prevail among the Kahyapó.[6]

Garcilasso de la Vega asserts that among the natives of Passau, in Peru, before the time of the Incas, men had no separate wives. He assures us that he saw those Indians with his own eyes when on his way to Spain, as the ship stopped on their coast for *three days*.[7] Speaking of the Yahgans of Tierra del Fuego, Admiral Fitzroy says, "We had some reason to think there were parties who lived in a promiscuous manner—a few women being with many

[1] Lozano, *Descripcion chorographica del terreno, &c. de las Provincias del Gran Chaco, Gualamba*, p. 70.

[2] Charlevoix, *History of Paraguay*, i. 91 *sq.* Sánchez Labrador, *El Paraguay Católico*, ii. 24 *sqq.* do Prado, 'Historia dos Indios Cavalleiros, da Naçâo Guaycurú,' in *O Patriota*, 1814, no. 4, p. 20 *sq.*

[3] Bastian, *Rechtsverhältnisse*, p. lxi. n. 36.

[4] *Idem, Die Culturländer des alten America*, ii. 654 n. 4.

[5] Couto de Magalhães, *Trabalho preparatorio para aproveitamento do selvagem e do solo por elle occupado no Brazil. O selvagem*, p. 111.

[6] Krause, *In den Wildnissen Brasiliens*, p. 401.

[7] Garcilasso de la Vega, *Royal Commentaries of the Yncas*, ii. 443.

men."[1] With reference to this statement Mr. Bridges, who had lived amongst them for thirty years, wrote to me, "Admiral Fitzroy's supposition concerning parties among the natives who lived promiscuously is false, and adultery and lewdness are condemned as evil, though through the strength of animal passions very generally indulged, but never with the consent of husbands or wives, or of parents."

According to Wilken, there is no marriage among the Lubus of Sumatra, the Poggy Islanders off the west coast of that island, the Olo Ot together with a few other tribes of Borneo, the mountaineers of Peling east of Celebes, and the Orang Sakai, Orang Semang, and Orang Benua of Malacca.[2] None of these statements can be trusted. Van Ophuijsen assures us that among the Lubus a man has to give presents to the father of the girl he marries.[3] Of the Poggy Islanders, Crisp wrote at the end of the eighteenth century, "Simple fornication between unmarried persons, is neither a crime nor a disgrace: and a young woman is rather liked the better, and more desired in marriage, for having borne a child."[4] This implies that marriage prevailed among them; and the same is testified by later authorities. According to Rosenberg[5] and Hollander,[6] a man has only one wife, whom he buys from her parents, divorces are unknown, and in the case of adultery both culprits are punished with death. Among the Olo Ot, according to Schwaner, the will of the girl plays the most important part at the conclusion of a marriage; he adds that the marriage tie is very loose among them, but says expressly that the statement which denies the existence of marriage among them is based on

[1] King and Fitzroy, *Voyages of the Adventure and Beagle*, ii. 182.

[2] Wilken, in *De Indische Gids*, 1880, vol. ii. 610 *sq.* *Idem, Over de verwantschap en het huwelijks- en erfrecht bij de volken van het maleische ras*, pp. 20, 82 note.

[3] van Ophuijsen, 'De Loeboes,' in *Tijdschrift voor indische taal-, land- en volkenkunde*, xxix. 97 *sq.*

[4] Crisp, 'Account of the Inhabitants of the Poggy Islands,' in *Asiatick Researches*, vi. 87 *sq.*

[5] Rosenberg, *Der malayische Archipel*, p. 199.

[6] Hollander, *Handleiding bij de beoefening der land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch Oost-Indië*, i. (1895) p. 615.

hearsay only.[1] As for the mountaineers of Peling, it is significant that, in a later edition of the very work from which Wilken derived his information, the sentence in which marriage is said to be unknown among them [2] has been excluded.[3] Wilken also refers to a statement of a person who has several times visited Peling and each time stayed there for a considerable period, to the effect that the mountaineers there "on the whole have no idea of the marriage tie: men and women meet each other only temporarily, and mingle without any shame before the eyes of all."[4] But M. de Clercq states, on the other hand, that it is entirely untrue that the islanders of Peling have no marriage; they usually have one wife, whom they acquire by purchase.[5] Miklucho-Maclay wrote of the Orang Sakai:—"Communal marriage exists, it appears, among the Orang Sakai; at least I must conclude so from a great number of accounts. A girl having been married to a man for some days or weeks goes, with his consent, and voluntarily, to live for a shorter or longer period with another man. She thus goes in turn to all the men of the party until she comes back to her first husband; she does not remain with him however but continues to engage in such temporary marriages, which are regulated by chance and by her wishes. She is however considered the wife of the man who first took her."[6] Mr. Skeat observes that this is "the only notice of such a custom, and resting as it does on second-hand evidence or worse, cannot be accepted without corroboration."[7]

[1] Schwaner, *Borneo*, i. 230, 231 note:—"De Koeteinezen verhalen, dat hunne Ot geene huwelijken sluiten, geen woningen hebben, en als de dieren des wouds door hen gejaagd worden."

[2] Hollander, *op. cit.* ii. (1864), p. 236:—"Zelfs het huwelijk ie bij hen niet bekend."

[3] The same work, 5th edition, revised by R. van Eck, ii. (1898) p. 235. [4] Wilken, in *De Indische Gids*, 1880, vol. ii. 610.

[5] de Clercq, *Bijdragen tot de kennis der residentie Ternate*, p. 131.

[6] Miklucho-Maclay, 'Ethnological Excursions in the Malay Peninsula,' in *Jour. Roy. Asiatic Soc. Straits Branch*, no. ii. 215.

[7] Skeat and Blagden, *Pagan Races of the Malay Peninsula*, ii. 56 n. 2. As regards the untrustworthiness of Malay evidence see Favre, *Account of the Wild Tribes inhabiting the Malayan Peninsula*, p. 47, and Annandale and Robinson, *Fasciculi Malayenses*, i. 6.

Miklucho-Maclay admits himself that his meetings with the Orang Sakai were too short to enable him to say much on the subject of their mode of living and customs, and that he only received his information about their "communal marriage" from Malays in Pahang and members of the Catholic Mission at Malacca.[1] According to Maxwell, the stringency which attaches to the marriage law of the Sakai is astounding, and the punishment for adultery is death, usually carried out by a relative.[2] M. Pleyte, who in a violent attack upon my criticism of Wilken's statements in the first edition of the present work accuses me of having evaded those relating to the Orang Sakai and the mountaineers of Peling,[3] could thus no longer maintain that these statements are better substantiated than the rest. With regard to the Semang, Mr. Skeat writes that they are, as far as he could learn, habitually monogamists, and that he failed to obtain any sort of evidence in support of the statement which has been more than once advanced, namely, that their women were in common like their other property.[4] "This idea," he says, "of the laxity of the marriage-tie among the Negritos may possibly arise from the great ante-nuptial freedom which appears to be allowed, but there is every reason to believe that when once married the Semang of both sexes are in the highest degree faithful to each other and that cases of unfaithfulness are exceedingly rare. That conjugal infidelity is strongly discountenanced is shown by the penalty assigned to it."[5] Another first-class authority, Dr. Martin, writes:—"So far as my own experience goes, the pure Senoi and Semang tribes are thoroughly monogamous—again a fresh evidence against the formerly so highly cherished hypothesis of promiscuity in primitive

[1] Miklucho-Maclay, *loc. cit.* pp. 211, 215 n. 16.

[2] [Maxwell, in] *Jour. Roy. Asiatic Soc. Straits Branch*, no. i. 112.

[3] Pleyte, in a review of the first edition of the present work in *De Indische Gids*, 1891, p. 2048.

[4] Newbold wrote (*Account of the British Settlements in the Straits of Malacca*, ii. 379), "The Semang women like those of the ancient Massagetae, and the more modern Tartar Kie-Kia-sse tribes, are said to be in common like their other property."

[5] Skeat and Blagden, *op. cit.* ii. 55 *sq.* See also *ibid.* ii. 59.

forms of human life. Most of the earlier observers also agree with this opinion." Polygyny, he adds, has been found only among border tribes who have come into closer contact with the Malays.[1] Among the pure tribes adultery is generally punished with death,[2] and among the Semang, according to Vaughan Stevens, it very rarely happens that a man has intercourse with another man's wife.[3] Of the Semang of Ijoh, Swettenham says not only that they as a rule have one wife, but that there is no divorce among them.[4] Wilken's statement that the Orang Benua have no marriage —repeated by M. Pleyte and Dr. R. Schmidt[5]— is likewise contradicted by the information given by many authorities, who speak about their marriages.[6] We are told that polygamy is prohibited among them[7] or exceptional,[8] that adultery is very rare,[9] and that any married person surprised in it might be put to death, though if a woman so surprised could prove that she was seduced she would not be put to death but would be sent away by her husband.[10] According to Newbold, a man can divorce his wife and take another,[11] according to Favre he lost the dowry given to her in case he divorced her,[12] according to Vaughan Stevens divorce does not occur among them.[13]

M. Pleyte,[14] partly followed by Dr. Schmidt,[15] and van der

[1] Martin, *Die Inlandstämme der Malayischen Halbinsel*, p. 864 *sq.*

[2] *Ibid.* p. 874.

[3] Stevens, *Materialien zur Kenntniss der wilden Stämme auf der Halbinsel Malâka*, ii. 132.

[4] Swettenham, 'Comparative Vocabulary of the Dialects of some of the Wild Tribes inhabiting the Malayan Peninsula,' in *Jour. Roy. Asiatic Soc. Straits Branch*, no. v. 156.

[5] Schmidt, *Liebe und Ehe im alten und modernen Indien*, p. 331.

[6] Skeat and Blagden, *op. cit.* ii. 79 *sqq.* Newbold, *op. cit.* ii. 407 *sq.*

[7] Newbold, *op. cit.* ii. 408. Favre, in *Journal Indian Archipelago*, ii. 269.

[8] Logan, 'Orang Binua of Johore,' in *Journal Indian Archipelago*, i. 270. Grünwedel, 'Die Reisen des Hrn. Vaughan Stevens in Malacca,' in *Verhandl. Berliner Gesellsch. Anthrop.* 1891, p. 833.

[9] Grünwedel, *loc. cit.* p. 833.

[10] Favre, *loc. cit.* p. 269.

[11] Newbold, *op. cit.* ii. 408.

[12] Favre, *loc. cit.* p. 269.

[13] Grünwedel, *loc. cit.* p. 833.

[14] Pleyte, *loc. cit.* p. 2049 *sq.*

[15] Schmidt, *op. cit.* p. 330 *sq.*

Lith,[1] mentions among peoples living in promiscuity the Orang Benua of Johor, the Orang Gunung of Biliton, and the Dyaks of Sidin, because husbands sometimes exchange their wives—which, so far as I can see, presupposes that they must have wives to exchange—as also the Dyaks of Singkawang in Western Borneo, who on the authority of Adriani are said to have communal marriage. I have entered into all these details because M. Pleyte has accused me of using indirect means in my criticism,[2] by which he probably means that I did not deal with all the statements made by Wilken. My subsequent researches have only strengthened my conviction of their exceedingly uncritical character. For the benefit of future champions of the hypothesis of promiscuity I shall add the following statement, which seems to have escaped the vigilance of my Dutch antagonists. Friar Odoric of Pordenone, who visited Sumatra in the earlier part of the fourteenth century, says that somewhere in that island "all the women be in common; and no one there can say, this is my wife, or this is my husband! But when a woman beareth a boy or a girl she giveth the child to whom she listeth of those with whom she hath consorted, and calleth him the father. The whole of the land likewise is in common."[3] I cannot prove that the Friar was wrong, but he does not convert me.

Wilutzky asserts that individual marriage is unknown both among the forest tribes in the interior of Malacca and "to a large extent" (*in weitem Umfang*) in Africa, for instance in Darfur and among the Kafirs.[4] That such a statement can occur in a book with scientific pretensions written in the twentieth century is almost incredible. Otherwise Africa has, since the days of ancient Greece and Rome, contributed very little to the lists of peoples put together by the advocates of primitive promiscuity. Giraud-Teulon[5] refers to Dapper's

[1] van der Lith, Spaan, Fokkens, and Snelleman, *Encyclopaedie van Nederlandsch-Indië*, ii. 63.

[2] Pleyte, *loc. cit.* p. 2051.

[3] 'Travels of Friar Odoric of Pordenone,' in Yule, *Cathay and the Way thither*, ii. 147 *sq.*

[4] Wilutzky, *op. cit.* i. 20. [5] Giraud-Teulon, *op. cit.* p. 72.

old description of the kingdom of Bornu, in which the people are said to have neither law, nor religion nor any proper names, and to possess their women and children in common, and the king is said to be so rich that all his utensils are made of gold.[1] This does not sound very convincing. Dr. Post has found no people in Africa living in a state of promiscuity.[2]

I have now mentioned all the cases which are known to me of peoples said to live in a state of promiscuity. I think that it would be difficult to find a more untrustworthy collection of statements. Some of them are simply misrepresentations of theorists in which sexual laxity, frequency of separation, polyandry, group-marriage or something like it, or absence of a marriage ceremony or of a word for "to marry" or of a marriage union similar to our own is confounded with promiscuity. Others are based upon indefinite evidence which may be interpreted in one way or another, or on information proved to be inaccurate. And not a single statement can be said to be authoritative or even to make the existence of promiscuity at all probable in any case. That no known savage people nowadays is, or recently has been, living in such a state is quite obvious, and this greatly discredits the supposition that promiscuity prevailed among any of the peoples mentioned by classical or mediæval writers in their summary and ambiguous accounts.

But even if we had reason to believe that a few peoples really have had nothing but promiscuity, it would be a great mistake to infer that these utterly exceptional cases represented a stage of human development which mankind as a whole has gone through. Further, nothing would entitle us to consider this promiscuity as a survival of the primitive condition of man, or even as a mark of a very rude state of society. It is by no means among the very lowest races that sexual relations most nearly approach to promiscuity: we shall find that many or most of them are completely or almost completely monogamous, and

[1] Dapper, *Description de l'Afrique*, p. 223.

[2] Post, *Afrikanische Jurisprudenz*, i. 304.

that among some of them even divorce is said to be unknown. Nowhere seems the fidelity of married women to be less insisted upon than among various polyandrous peoples who are pastoral or agricultural in their habits and certainly cannot be looked upon as representatives of the lowest type of humanity known to us. Mr. Rowney states that among the Bhutias the marriage tie is so loose that chastity may be said to be quite unknown, that the husbands are indifferent to the honour of their wives, that "the intercourse of the sexes is, in fact, promiscuous." But the Bhutias are followers of Buddha, and "can hardly be counted among the *wild* tribes of India, for they are, for the most part, in good circumstances, and have a certain amount of civilisation among them."[1] Dr. Jochelson writes in his excellent monograph on the Koryak:—"Sociologists who think that all mankind, without exception, have passed through the so-called period of promiscuity as a necessary stage in the evolution of marital relations, might find this stage in the free morals prevalent in the hamlets of the Russians or Russianised natives of north-western Siberia. It is difficult to find a girl that has reached or even approached the age of sexual maturity that is innocent. . . . On the Kolyma, where often several families live together in one house, it is difficult to say who is whose wife."[2] A very different state of morals prevails among the Koryak who have not been adulterated by the bearers of Russian civilisation.

To sum up: even if there really are or have been peoples living in a state of promiscuity, which has never been proved and is exceedingly hard to believe, these peoples do not afford any evidence whatever for promiscuity having been the rule in primitive times.

[1] Rowney, *Wild Tribes of India*, pp. 142, 143, 140.
[2] Jochelson, *Koryak*, p. 733 *sq.*

CHAPTER IV

A CRITICISM OF THE HYPOTHESIS OF PROMISCUITY: PRE-NUPTIAL UNCHASTITY

It is argued that promiscuity is by no means restricted to those peoples who are said to have nothing else. Side by side with marriage it is found among savages in all parts of the world, and very frequently not as a mere fact but as a practice permitted by custom. This, we are told, shows that sexual intercourse must originally have been unchecked.[1]

It is a well-known fact that among many uncivilised peoples both sexes enjoy perfect freedom previous to marriage. Instances of this have been given by myself [2] as well as by other writers,[3] and I could fill pages with fresh materials at my disposal. If we look at the facts a little more closely, however, we soon find that many of them could not, in any circumstances, be regarded as relics of primitive promiscuity—either because they are known to be of later growth, or because they do not represent promiscuity at all.

[1] Post, *Die Grundlagen des Rechts*, p. 187. Wilken, 'Over de primitieve vormen van het huwelijk en den oorsprong van het gezin,' in *De Indische Gids*, 1880, vol. ii. 1195. Wilutzky, *Vorgeschichte des Rechts*, i. 26 *sqq.* Bloch, *Sexual Life of Our Time*, p. 189 *sqq.* Corin, *Mating, Marriage, and the Status of Woman*, p. 111 *sq.*

[2] *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. 422 *sqq.*

[3] See, *e.g.*, Post, *Grundriss der ethnologischen Jurisprudenz*, i. 21 *sqq.*; Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, ch. vi.; Hobhouse, Wheeler, and Ginsberg, *Material Culture and Social Institutions of the Simpler Peoples*, p. 176 *sqq.*

In various cases we are told that the wantonness of savages is chiefly due to contact with civilised races. The pioneers of a "higher civilisation" are very frequently unmarried men who go out to make their living in uncivilised lands, and though unwilling to contract regular marriages with native women, they may have no objection to corrupting their morals. It is strange to hear from a modern student of anthropology, and especially from an Australian writer, that in sexual licence the savage has never anything to learn, and that "all that the lower fringe of civilised men can do to harm the uncivilised is to stoop to the level of the latter instead of teaching them a better way."[1] Mr. Edward Stephens has a very different story to tell with reference to the tribes which once inhabited the Adelaide Plains in South Australia. "As a rule, to which there are no exceptions," he says, "if a tribe of blacks is found away from the white settlement, the more vicious of the white men are most anxious to make the acquaintance of the natives, and that, too, solely for purposes of immorality. . . . I saw the natives and was much with them before those dreadful immoralities were well known, . . . and I say it fearlessly, that nearly all their evils they owed to the white man's immorality and to the white man's drink."[2] Mr. Curr observes that prior to the coming of the whites the Bangerang in Victoria as a rule "enforced constancy on the part of their wives, and chastity on their unmarried daughters."[3]

Speaking of some cannibals in New Guinea, Dr. Chalmers remarks:—"Why savages should be always spoken of as immoral I fail to see. They are not so when compared with the more highly civilised countries of the world. I am sorry to have to say that it is contact with the civilised white that demoralises them, and they then become loose and immoral."[4] From Fiji "there is a mass of

[1] Sutherland, *Origin and Growth of the Moral Instinct*, i. 186.

[2] Stephens, 'Aborigines of Australia,' in *Jour. Roy. Soc. N. S. Wales*, xxiii. 480.

[3] Curr, *Recollections of Squatting in Victoria*, p. 249.

[4] Chalmers, *Pioneer Life and Work in New Guinea*, p. 112

evidence to show that in heathen times the majority of girls were virgins until they married or entered into concubinage, because the law of custom allowed them no opportunities for secret amours; whereas, after fifty years of individual freedom, it is extremely rare for a girl to preserve her virtue to the age of eighteen." It was with the introduction of Christianity, says Sir Basil Thomson, that there came a change;[1] earlier writers speak of the bad influence of European sailors.[2] When visiting the Sandwich Islands with Cook, Vancouver saw little or no appearance of wantonness among the women. But when he visited them some years afterwards it was very conspicuous; and he ascribes this change in their habits to the intercourse with foreigners.[3] Owing to the same influence, it is said, the women of Ponapé (Caroline Islands) and Tanna (New Hebrides) lost their modesty.[4] Even in Tahiti, so notorious for the licentiousness of its inhabitants, immorality was formerly less than it became subsequently. When a girl who had been betrothed as a child grew up, a small platform of considerable elevation was erected for her abode within the dwelling of her parents in order that she should not lose her virtue. "Here she slept and spent the whole of the time she passed within doors. Her parents, or some member of the family, attended her by night and by day, supplied her with every necessary, and accompanied her whenever she left the house. Some of their traditions," Ellis adds, "warrant the inference that this mode of life, in early years, was observed by other females besides those who were betrothed."[5]

In Madagascar most of the tribes attach no importance to the chastity of a girl.[6] But, says Mr. Sibree, "there

[1] Thomson, *Fijians. A Study of the Decay of Custom*, p. 236 *sqq.* See also *ibid.* p. 176.

[2] Meinicke, *Die Inseln des Stillen Oceans*, ii. 45.

[3] Vancouver, *Voyage of Discovery*, i. 171 *sq.*

[4] Waitz-Gerland, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, vol. v. pt. ii. 108. Brenchley, *Jottings among the South Sea Islands*, p. 208.

[5] Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, i. 270.

[6] Sibree, *The Great African Island*, p. 252. Grandidier, *Ethnographie de Madagascar*, ii. 134 *sqq.*

are some other tribes, more isolated, as certain of the eastern peoples, where a higher standard of morality prevails, girls being kept scrupulously from any intercourse with the other sex until they are married."[1] M. Grandidier observes that in certain parts of that island the girls were in former days much chaster than after they came into contact with Europeans.[2] The Bantu Kavirondo were much more moral than most of the other tribes of the Uganda Protectorate " before they became corrupted by Swahili porters from the coast, Indians, and white men."[3]

Admiral Fitzroy observed that the unchastity of the Patagonian women did not correspond with the pure character attributed to them at an earlier time by Falkner, and he thinks that " their ideas of propriety may have been altered by the visits of licentious strangers."[4] A more recent traveller, Captain Musters, observed indeed little immorality amongst the Indians while in their native wilds.[5] Among the Huitoto Indians of the Putumayo region, says Hardenburg, " the women are naturally chaste, and it was not until the advent of the rubber-collectors that they began to lose this primitive virtue, so generally met with among people not yet in contact with white men."[6] Concerning the Pima Indians of Arizona, Mr. Russell says that before they came in contact with " civilisation " chastity was the rule among the young women.[7] Among the Yokut of California the freedom of the unmarried people of both sexes is very great now, but they are said to have been comparatively virtuous before the arrival of the Americans.[8] In British Columbia and Vancouver Island, according to Lord, breaches of chastity on the part either of married or unmarried females were in primitive times often punished by death among the interior tribes,

[1] Sibree, *op. cit.* p. 252. [2] Grandidier, *op. cit.* ii. 137.

[3] Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, p. 746.

[4] King and Fitzroy, *Narrative of the Voyages of the Adventure and Beagle*, ii. 173.

[5] Musters, *At Home with the Patagonians*, p. 197.

[6] Hardenburg, *Putumayo*, p. 154.

[7] Russell, ' Pima Indians,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethnol.* xxvi. 182.

[8] Powers, *Tribes of California*, p. 381.

whereas among the fish-eaters of the north-west coast "it has no meaning, or, if it has, it appears to be utterly disregarded."[1] Among the Queen Charlotte Islanders the present depravation has, according to Captain Jacobsen, been caused by the gold diggers who went there in the middle of the last century.[2] In Greenland, says Dr. Nansen, "the Eskimo women of the larger colonies are far freer in their ways than those of the small outlying settlements where there are no Europeans."[3]

From his experience in Siberia Dr. Jochelson has come to the conclusion that "every contact between representatives of civilised nations and primitive tribes lowers the ideal of the latter by destroying those customs which used to restrict the freedom of sexual relations among these tribes." This is shown by the striking contrast between the relations of the sexes among the Koryak, where there is a lack of Russian influence, and those prevailing among the neighbouring tribes—the Kamchadal, Chukchee, Yukaghir, and Tungus. Among the Koryak, girls before marriage must not have sexual intercourse with men; this rule is pretty strictly observed by them. Young men will not "serve" for a dissolute girl; and "should a girl become pregnant before marriage it is considered shameful and her parents scold her. . . . In olden times cohabitation out of wedlock with a girl sometimes led to wars between the families to which the young people belonged."[4] Vámbéry writes, "The difference in morality which exists between the Turks affected by a foreign civilisation and kindred tribes inhabiting the steppes, becomes very conspicuous to any one living among the Turkomans and Kara-Kalpaks; for whether in Africa or Asia, certain vices are introduced only by the so-called bearers of culture."[5] Mr. Endle praises

[1] Lord, *The Naturalist in Vancouver Island*, ii. 233.

[2] Woldt, *Capitain Jacobsen's Reise an der Nordwestküste Amerikas*, p. 28.

[3] Nansen, *First Crossing of Greenland*, ii. 329.

[4] Jochelson, *Koryak*, p. 733 *sqq*. *Idem*, *Yukaghir*, p. 62. See also Bogoras, *Chukchee*, p. 572.

[5] Vámbéry, *Die primitive Cultur des turko-tatarischen Volkes*, p. 72.

the Kachâris of Assam for their chastity before marriage and their faithfulness to their marriage vows in after-life; but he adds that this holds good of the Kachâri in his simple, patriarchal, village life, and there only. When contaminated by civilisation, much of his innocence disappears: "of this sad deterioration of character any man who has been long in the country, and learnt to know the people well, must have experienced many melancholy and painful illustrations."[1] On the other hand, Mr. Gait, opposing my statement that contact with a higher culture has proved pernicious to the morality of savage peoples, maintains that "on the whole, there can be no doubt that the relations of the sexes in India are steadily becoming more regular."[2] The evidence he produces chiefly shows that polyandry is dying out, or has died out; but as polyandry is commonly combined with general sexual laxity its disappearance may have raised the standard of pre-nuptial chastity. It also seems that Hindu civilisation has in some degree exercised a chastening influence on the Mongolian and Dravidian population of India. When speaking of contact with a "higher civilisation" I am chiefly thinking of contact with Europeans.

The facts I have quoted are certainly sufficient to prove that the pre-nuptial freedom which is found among so many simple peoples is not always primitive. Nor must it be identified with promiscuity. It does not mean that an unmarried woman is constantly changing her lovers or an unmarried man the objects of his love, or that they can do so without reproach. Sexual connections between a boy and a girl are very frequently a preliminary to their marriage. They may be a regular method of courtship, or they may be a trial before establishing more permanent relations.

Among the Yukaghir, in spite of the sexual licence which prevails among their young people, the word *aya'bol'*, which is used for a youth who courts several girls, and for a girl who is accessible, is considered an insult, and for such a girl, according to the songs, the lads do not serve. "The

[1] Endle, *Kachâris*, p. 3.

[2] Gait, *Census of India*, 1911, vol. i. (India) Report, p. 248 *sq.*

time of ' free love ' among young people," says Dr. Jochelson, " may be regarded as a period of trial."[1] Of various tribes in India, such as the Tipperahs,[2] Oráons,[3] and Kolyas,[4] it is said that unmarried girls may cohabit freely with young men, but are never found living promiscuously with them. The Toungtha of the Chittagong Hills draw " a strong distinction between a woman prostituting herself habitually as a means of livelihood, and the intercourse by mutual consent of two members of opposite sexes, leading, as it generally does, to marriage."[5] Of some other tribes in India we are told that they " allow a probationary period of cohabitation," no stigma, however, attaching to the girl if this does not culminate in marriage.[6]

Among the Sea Dyaks promiscuous immorality is said to be unknown. It is true that very often a girl is with child before her marriage, but the father generally acknowledges the child and marries the woman; intercourse often takes place between those who have been betrothed, but not formally married, simply to ascertain if the marriage will be fruitful.[7] Among the Bontoc Igorot of Northern Luzon " marriage never takes place prior to sexual intimacy, and rarely prior to pregnancy " ; and although it is customary for a young man to be sexually intimate with one, two, three, or even more girls at the same time, " a girl is almost invariably faithful to her temporary lover."[8] Among the Southern Massim in British New Guinea, according to Dr. Seligman, marriage does not normally take place except after more or less prolonged sexual connections; and he

[1] Jochelson, *Yukaghir*, pp. 62, 63, 65, 66, 87.

[2] Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal*, p. 203.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 248.

[4] Watt, ' Aboriginal Tribes of Manipur,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xvi. 358.

[5] Lewin, *Wild Races of South-Eastern India*, p. 193.

[6] Gait, *op. cit.* p. 243.

[7] Gomes, *Seventeen Years among the Sea Dyaks of Borneo*, pp. 68, 69, 127. Brooke Low, quoted by Ling Roth, *Natives of Sarawak*, i. 115. See also St. John, *Life in the Forests of the Far East*, i. 53 (Dyaks on the Batang Lupar).

[8] Jenks, *Bontoc Igorot*, p. 66.

believes it can be stated "that love affairs undertaken lightly, under conditions which render marriage impossible or very unlikely, are in a sense excrescences upon a system in which intercourse was in theory at any rate the mode of courtship."[1] In Kaiser Wilhelm Land, also, marriage is as a rule preceded by sexual intimacy.[2] But among the natives of Mailu in British New Guinea a different custom prevails. Dr. Malinowski tells us that when their young men have serious matrimonial plans there is no sexual intercourse between the boy and the girl, whereas if he does not want to marry her intercourse takes place. Yet the great freedom enjoyed by the young people does not mean "that there is anything like a promiscuous intercourse or even anything approaching licentiousness in sex matters. . . . A girl who changes her lover often is considered decidedly open to blame; a girl once betrothed is bound to keep chaste, the same rule of conduct applying to a boy."[3] So also in the Tonga Islands, where unmarried women might bestow their favours upon whomsoever they pleased without any opprobrium, it was thought shameful for a woman frequently to change her lover.[4]

Speaking of the absence of restraint in sexual matters among the natives of Madagascar, M. Grandidier likewise remarks, "Malgré cette liberté excessive des mœurs, il est honteux pour une jeune fille de prendre tous les jours un nouvel amant; mais . . . lorsqu'il y a profit, il n'y a plus ni discrédit ni honte." Their marriages are preceded by shorter or longer periods of free intercourse, in order that the couple shall learn to know each other; this is the case even among the Antimoronă, who exact absolute chastity from their women but nevertheless consider it necessary that there shall be a week's probation previous to the celebration of the marriage.[5] The Thonga, a Bantu tribe on the eastern

[1] Seligman, *Melanesians of British New Guinea*, p. 499.

[2] Neuhauss, *Deutsch Neu-Guinea*, i. 160.

[3] Malinowski, 'Natives of Mailu,' in *Trans. Roy. Soc. South Australia*, xxxix. 559, 561.

[4] Mariner, *Natives of the Tonga Islands*, ii. 174.

[5] Grandidier, *op. cit.* ii. 72, 136, 161–163, 186.

coast of South Africa, have the following custom, which they call *gangisa*. When boys have gone through the puberty rites they ask the girls each to choose one of them, and when the girl has made her choice her boy plays with her as husband and wife, first in building little huts, and so forth, but later on in a less platonic way. In fact, nothing is prohibited in the relations between the young people of both sexes except that the girls must not become pregnant. If this happens the parents of the girl tell the lover to marry her, and if he refuses, the child will belong to the family of the girl. At the same time the Thonga have the idea "that promiscuity of any kind is a bad and a dangerous thing"; and even in the case of *gangisa* boys are censured when two of them court the same girl.[1] Nor can the term "promiscuity" be applied to the relations between the Masai warriors, who are not allowed to marry, and the immature girls, or *ditos*, of their tribe with whom they live. The warrior chooses the *dito* he fancies, and makes her mother numerous small presents. As a rule he keeps only one or two *ditos* at a time, and on returning from war, more often than not, continues with the same *ménage*. If he is dissatisfied with the *dito* he has chosen he returns her to her mother, and selects another, but this is of rare occurrence. When the girl is nearing womanhood, she generally leaves the warrior and goes back to her mother. But if by chance she remains with him and conceives by him, he may make up his mind eventually to marry the girl; according to Baumann, it is even customary for him to do so, although he may free himself from it by giving a present to her father.[2] Among the Warega in the Belgian Congo continence before marriage is unknown; but if a woman too often changes her lover she loses her good name and is called *kitazi*, that is, prostitute.[3] Among the West African Pangwe the free intercourse between a youth and

[1] Junod, *Life of a South African Tribe*, i. 96, 97, 195.

[2] Hinde, *The Last of the Masai*, pp. 55, 72 *sq.* Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, p. 824. Merker, *Die Masai*, p. 83. Baumann, *Durch Massailand*, p. 161.

[3] Delhaise, *Les Warega*, p. 167.

a girl is in many cases only a trial of shorter or longer duration, which if satisfactory leads to marriage.[1]

Among many peoples there is a regular marriage upon trial before the union becomes definite, the bridegroom either taking the girl to his own house or going himself to stay with her parents for a certain length of time.[2] Something of the kind existed even in Scotland prior to the Reformation, as a genuine custom known as "hand-fasting." "At the public fairs men selected female companions with whom to cohabit for a year. At the expiry of this period both parties were accounted free; they might either unite in marriage or live singly."[3] A similar custom existed in Ireland, in a very rude form;[4] and the Welsh, according to Giraldus Cambrensis, did not marry until they had tried, by previous cohabitation, the disposition and particularly the fecundity of the person with whom they were engaged.[5] In an earlier chapter we have seen that among many uncivilised peoples the free intercourse between unmarried persons generally leads to marriage if

[1] Tessmann, *Die Pangwe*, ii. 260.

[2] Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, v. 93 (Muduvars). Elton, 'Notes on Natives of the Solomon Islands,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xvii. 94 *sq.* Rivers, *History of Melanesian Society*, i. 383 (Hawaians). Bastian, *Afrikanische Reisen*, p. 71 (Congo natives). Sarytschew, 'Account of a Voyage of Discovery to the North-East of Siberia,' in *Collection of Modern and Contemporary Voyages*, vi. 76 (Aleut). Simpson, quoted by Murdoch, 'Ethnological Results of the Point Barrow Expedition,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethn.* ix. 412 (Eskimo). Parkman, *Jesuits in North America in the Seventeenth Century*, p. xxxiv. (Hurons). Strachey, *Historie of Travaile into Virginia Britannia*, p. 110. James, *Indians of the Painted Desert Region*, p. 228 (Havasupai of Arizona). Grubb, *An Unknown People*, p. 214 (Lengua Indians of the Paraguayan Chaco). Wilken, *Das Matriarchat bei den alten Arabern*, p. 21 *sq.* Ploss-Bartels, *Das Weib*, i. 660 *sqq.* Potter, *Sohrab and Rustem*, p. 129 *sqq.* Wilutzky, *op. cit.* i. 21 *sq.*

[3] Rogers, *Scotland Social and Domestic*, p. 109. See also Dalyell, *Darker Superstitions of Scotland*, p. 283.

[4] Gomme, 'Exogamy and Polyandry,' in *Archæological Review*, i. 391.

[5] Giraldus de Barri, *Description of Wales*, book ii. ch. 6 (*Itinerary of Archbishop Baldwin through Wales*, vol. ii. 346).

the girl becomes pregnant or gives birth to a child, or that a seducer or lover in such a case is compelled to marry her or otherwise has to pay a fine.[1] All this presupposes that the father of the child is known—which means something very different from promiscuity.

Of course I do not mean to say that pre-nuptial relations among simple peoples always have this character. We have too many and too positive statements to the contrary to allow us to doubt that promiscuity outside marriage does exist. Among the Point Barrow Eskimo, according to Mr. Murdoch, "promiscuous sexual intercourse between married or unmarried people, or even among children, appears to be looked upon simply as a matter for amusement."[2] Concerning the natives of St. Christoval and adjacent islands, of the Solomons, we are told that "for two or three years after a girl has become eligible for marriage she distributes her favours amongst all the young men of the village"; [3] and in Rubiana, belonging to the same group, it is considered an honour for an adult girl to have intercourse with as many men as possible within a short time.[4] The Hawaians regarded it as "a meanness for a man or woman to refuse a solicitation for sensual gratification."[5] Among the common Line Islanders of the Gilbert Group and some neighbouring islands marriage was the exception and free intercourse the rule, and a woman was at liberty to accept as many men as would take her, provided they paid for the privilege.[6] The young girls of Madison's Island, of the Marquesas, "are the wives of all who can purchase their favours, and a handsome daughter is considered by her parents as a blessing which secures to them, for a time, wealth and abundance."[7] And besides the

[1] *Supra*, p. 72 *sqq.*

[2] Murdoch, 'Ethnological Results of the Point Barrow Expedition,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethn.* ix. 419.

[3] Guppy, *Solomon Islands*, p. 43.

[4] Ribbe, *Zwei Jahre unter den Kannibalen der Salomo-Inseln*, p. 270.

[5] Jarves, *History of the Hawaiian Islands*, p. 42.

[6] Tutuila, 'Line Islanders,' in *Jour. Polynesian Soc.* i. 270.

[7] Porter, *Journal of a Cruise made to the Pacific Ocean*, ii. 60.

prostitution of girls by their parents[1] and of married women by their husbands[2] we also find among various uncivilised peoples prostitution carried on by a class of professionals.[3]

There are harlots in some of the Melanesian islands; "at Santa Cruz," says Dr. Codrington, "where the separation of the sexes is so carefully maintained, there are certainly public courtesans."[4] Among the Line Islanders a *niki-rau-raro*, who is earning her living by prostitution, "is greatly respected and envied if successful in doing it."[5] A similar demi-monde class (*raran*) is found in Ponapé, of the Caroline Islands.[6] In Easter Island, where there were many more males than females, some of the young women remained unmarried and offered themselves up to men; they seem to have been looked upon as a kind of public benefactors.[7] In the Hawaian Islands, on the other hand, "common and frequent prostitution was considered in some degree disreputable, and it was enjoined by the better class of parents on their sons to avoid it."[8] In Greenland there were professional harlots already in early times,[9] and similar women have been found among various Indian tribes in North and South America.[10] Among the Omaha, who called them *minckeda*, they were hardly ever girls but

[1] See, *e.g.*, Lery, *Histoire d'un voyage faict en la terre du Brésil*, p. 303 (Tupis); Hennepin, *New Discovery of a Vast Country in America*, p. 481 (Iroquois, &c.); Stannus, 'Notes on some Tribes of British Central Africa,' *in Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xl. 299.

[2] See, *e.g.*, Parry, *Journal of a Second Voyage for the Discovery of a North-West Passage*, p. 529 (Eskimo of Melville Peninsula); Kumlien, *Contributions to the Natural History of Arctic America*, p. 16 (Eskimo of Cumberland Sound); *infra*, i. 332 *sq.*

[3] See Ploss-Bartels, *Das Weib*, i. 584, 590.

[4] Codrington, *Melanesians*, p. 235 *sq.* See also Powell, *Wanderings in a Wild Country*, p. 261 (natives of New Britain).

[5] Tutuila, in *Jour. Polynesian Soc.* i. 270.

[6] Christian, *Caroline Islands*, p. 74.

[7] Geiseler, *Die Oster-Insel*, p. 29.

[8] Jarves, *op. cit.* p. 43.

[9] Cranz, *History of Greenland*, i. 176.

[10] Carver, *Travels through the Interior Parts of North America*, p. 375. Davis, *El Gringo*, p. 221 (Indians of New Mexico). Latcham, 'Ethnology of the Araucanos,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xxxix. 354.

chiefly divorced wives and they were looked down upon.[1] Among the Karayá, on the River Araguaya, they were women belonging to other tribes.[2] Among the Witoto and Boro, in the north-west Amazon region, "very frequently widows become the tribal prostitutes, a custom that is not recognised, but is tolerated, and is never practised openly or immodestly."[3] Prostitution prevails in many negro countries;[4] and so favourably, we are told, is this institution sometimes regarded that rich negro ladies on their death-beds buy female slaves and present them to the public, "in the same manner as in England they would have left a legacy to some public charity."[5] In Unyoro the king usually supported in connection with his own establishment a large number of professional prostitutes—perhaps 2,000—whose existence as an organised corps was recorded by all travellers in that country from the days of Sir Samuel Baker until the complete upsetting of the native Government of Unyoro in 1895.[6] It does not seem, however, that prostitution is common among unadulterated savages. In some cases it is expressly said to be due to contact with foreigners.[7]

Yet however commonly pre-nuptial chastity be disregarded in the savage world, we must not suppose that such

[1] James, *Account of an Expedition from Pittsburgh*, i. 233, 239. Dorsey, 'Omaha Sociology,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethn.* iii. 365.

[2] Krause, *In den Wildnissen Brasiliens*, p. 327.

[3] Whiffen, *North-West Amazons*, p. 167.

[4] Monrad, *Skildring af Guinea-Kysten*, p. 49 (Negroes of Accra). Bowdich, *Mission to Ashantee*, p. 303. Norris, quoted by Ling Roth, *Great Benin*, p. 37 n. 2 (Dahomans). Dennett, *Notes on the Folk-lore of the Fjort* (*French Congo*), p. 21. *Emin Pasha in Central Africa*, p. 88.

[5] Reade, *Savage Africa*, p. 547 *sq.*

[6] Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, p. 590. *Emin Pasha in Central Africa*, p. 87. Wilson and Felkin, *Uganda*, ii. 49.

[7] Bogoras, *Chukchee*, p. 610 (the maritime peoples on both coasts of Bering Sea). Bainbridge, 'Saorias of the Rajmahal Hills,' in *Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, ii. 58. Condon, 'Contribution to the Ethnography of the Basoga-Batamba, Uganda Protectorate,' in *Anthropos*, vi. 372. Nordenskiöld, *Indianliv i El Gran Chaco* (*Syd-Amerika*), pp. 88, 197.

disregard is anything like a universal characteristic of the lower races. Among very many of them sexual intercourse before marriage is said to be rare, if not unknown, at least on the part of any girl who is not a prostitute, or to be looked upon as a disgrace or punished as a crime; and in such cases not only the girl but the man who seduced her is subject to punishment or censure. In other cases, again, it is said that the birth of an illegitimate child is followed by punishment. As facts of this kind have been too often overlooked, I shall produce the evidence.

Among many South American Indians there is no doubt great freedom before marriage.[1] But Dobrizhoffer praised the Abiponian women for their virtuous life.[2] Abbé Ignace tells us that fornication is proscribed among the Canelas in Maranhao.[3] Among the Karayá, another Brazilian tribe, virginity is said to be highly esteemed and carefully guarded and sexual intercourse out of wedlock to be severely punished, sometimes even with death.[4] The latter statement is not confirmed by Krause, but he admits that the girls do their best to preserve their purity and avoid going into the forest alone for fear of the bachelors.[5] Mr. Whiffen also says that among the Witoto and Boro "virginity, as with us, is strictly protected so far as is possible."[6] During his nine years' stay in British Guiana, Appun only heard of one illegitimate birth among the natives; the mother fell into disrepute and was avoided, especially by the men.[7] When one of the Chichimec of Central Mexico marries, a

[1] Guevara, 'Folklore Araucano,' in *Anales de la Universidad de Chile*, cxxvii. 626; Latcham, 'Ethnology of the Araucanos,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xxxix. 354. Nordenskiöld, *op. cit.* pp. 73, 81 *sq.* (Choroti). Chomé. 'Dritter Brief,' in Stoecklein, *Der Neue Welt-Bott*, vol. iv. pt. xxix. 72 (Chiriguanos of Bolivia). Schmidt, 'Ueber das Recht der tropischen Naturvölker Südamerikas,' in *Zeitschr. vergl. Rechtswiss.* xiii. 309.

[2] Dobrizhoffer, *Account of the Abipones*, ii. 153.

[3] Ignace, 'Les Capiekrans,' in *Anthropos*, v. 478.

[4] Ehrenreich, *Beiträge zur Völkerkunde Brasiliens*, p. 27.

[5] Krause, *op. cit.* p. 326 *sq.* [6] Whiffen, *op. cit.* p. 156.

[7] Appun, 'Die Indianer von Britisch-Guayana,' in *Das Ausland*, xliv. 833.

bride who proves not to be a virgin may be returned to her parents.[1] Of the Mexican Tepehuane, Dr. Lumholtz informs us that "outside of her home a woman is absolutely forbidden to speak to any man who does not belong to her own immediate family. . . . Even at the dancing-place it is against the law for her to step aside to exchange a few words with any young man. If discovered in such a compromising position, both offenders are immediately arrested, and their least punishment is two days' imprisonment. If their examination by the judges proves that their conversation was on the forbidden topic of love, they get a whipping and may be compelled to marry."[2] Among the Hupa of California a grown-up girl was not allowed to be alone with a man either in the house or outside; she was told the results of wrongdoing, and severely punished by beating if she were remiss; and a seducer was obliged to marry his victim.[3] Among the Omaha extra-matrimonial intercourse is, as a rule, practised only with public women, or *minckeda*; and so strict are they in these matters, "that a young girl or even a married woman walking or riding alone, would be ruined in character, being liable to be taken for a *minckeda*, and addressed as such."[4]

Of many other North American Indians we read that the girls were chaste or carefully guarded,[5] or that a girl who

[1] Bancroft, *Native Tribes of the Pacific States*, i. 632.

[2] Lumholtz, *Unknown Mexico*, i. 467.

[3] Goddard, *Life and Culture of the Hupa*, p. 55.

[4] Dorsey, 'Omaha Sociology,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethn.* iii. 365. See also Fletcher and La Flesche, 'Omaha Tribe,' *ibid.* xxvii. 323; James, *Account of an Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains*, i. 239.

[5] Cremony, *Life among the Apaches*, p. 244 *sq.* Charlevoix, *Voyage to North-America*, ii. 38 *sq.*; Parkman, *op. cit.* p. xxxiv. n. 1 (Algonkin). Catlin, *Illustrations of the Manners, &c. of the North American Indians*, i. 121 (respectable families of the Mandan). Schoolcraft, *Archives of Aboriginal Knowledge*, v. 654 (Nez Percés in Oregon). Sapir, 'Notes on the Takelma Indians of Southwestern Oregon,' in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. ix. 274. Hearne, *Journey to the Northern Ocean*, p. 311 (Northern Indians). Morice, 'Great Déné Race,' in *Anthropos*, ii. 32 (various Déné tribes).

was known to have lost her virtue lost with it one of her chances of a favourable marriage;[1] although this by no means applies to all, perhaps not even to the majority, of their tribes.[2] Among the Tlingit, "if unmarried women prove frail the partner of their guilt, if discovered, is bound to make reparation to the parents, soothing their wounded honour with handsome presents."[3] Among the early Aleut, according to Veniaminof, "girls or unmarried females who gave birth to illegitimate children were to be killed for shame, and hidden."[4] Egede tells us that among the Greenlanders unmarried women observed the rules of modesty much better than married women. "During fifteen full years that I lived in Greenland," he says, "I did not hear of more than two or three young women, who were gotten with child unmarried; because it is reckoned the greatest of infamies."[5] According to Dalager, whose account likewise dates from the eighteenth century, the Greenlanders, though no models of virtue, are less addicted to wantonness than other peoples. A young man marries as soon as the sexual instinct prompts him to do so and he is able to maintain a wife, and the girls also behave very chastely, since otherwise no bachelor will care to marry them; but it is different with young widows and divorced wives.[6] Modern accounts are less favourable. Holm says that on the east coast of Greenland it is no disgrace for an unmarried girl to get a child, but that it is a

[1] Sproat, *Scenes and Studies of Savage Life*, p. 95 (Aht). Keating, *Expedition to the Source of St. Peter's River*, ii. 169 *sq.* (Chippewa). Heriot, *Travels through the Canadas*, p. 339. Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, iii. 505.

[2] See Cremony, *op. cit.* p. 244 (Navaho); Bossu, *Travels through Louisiana*, i. 231 (Alibamu); Lahontan, *New Voyages to North-America*, ii. 452 *sqq.* (Indians of Canada). Morice, *loc. cit.* p. 32 (Déné and allophylic North Pacific tribes).

[3] Douglas, quoted by Petroff, 'Report on the Population, &c. of Alaska,' in *Tenth Census of the United States*, p. 177.

[4] Veniaminof, quoted *ibid.* p. 155.

[5] Egede, *Description of Greenland*, p. 141.

[6] Dalager, *Grønlandske Relationer*, p. 67.

disgrace for a married woman to get none.[1] Other Eskimo are equally indifferent to the chastity of their girls.[2]

Among the Siberian and other tribes belonging to the former Russian Empire chastity is generally held in little or no regard; but, as we have already noticed, this seems partly at least to be due to Russian influence. According to earlier accounts, the bridegroom might, among several of them, claim a fine in case the bride was found to have lost her virtue;[3] and among the Chulim, if the Mosaic testimony of chastity was wanting, the husband went away and did not return before the seducer had made peace with him.[4] Among the Tungus a seducer was bound to marry his victim and pay the price claimed for her, or, if he refused, submit to corporal punishment.[5] In order to preserve the virtue of their daughters, the Yakut employ a chastity girdle, which is not removed even at night; but when the bride price has been partly or fully paid the parents take no further interest in the matter. The Yakut are said to see nothing immoral in free love, provided only that nobody suffers material loss by it.[6] Among the Koryak the girl is even as inaccessible to the bridegroom while he serves for her as to a stranger; "intercourse of a bride with her bridegroom before the termination of his service is deemed a sin."[7] In Circassia an incontinent daughter was generally sold as soon as possible, being a disgrace to her parents; and if not a virgin, the bride ran the risk of being put away after the

[1] Holm, 'Konebaads-Expeditionen til Grønlands Østkyst, 1883–85,' in *Geografisk Tidskrift*, viii. 91.

[2] Murdoch, 'Ethnological Results of the Point Barrow Expedition,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethn.* ix. 419 *sq.* Turner, 'Ethnology of the Ungava District,' *ibid.* xi. 189 (Koksoagmiut). Parry, *Second Voyage for the Discovery of a North-West Passage*, p. 529 (Eskimo of Iglulik and Winter Island). Kumlien, *Contributions to the Natural History of Arctic America*, p. 16 (Eskimo of Cumberland Sound).

[3] Georgi, *Beschreibung aller Nationen des russischen Reichs* pp. 79, 104, 237, 238, 283.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 232.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 311.

[6] Sieroshevski, quoted by Miss Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, p. 108; and trans. in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxi. 96.

[7] Jochelson, *Koryak*, p. 735.

first night.[1] Professor Kovalewsky states that among the Ossetes the lack of virginity in a bride is considered a disgrace, not only to the husband, but to all his relatives.[2] Among the Chuvash the *signum innocentiae* is exhibited *coram populo*.[3] Vámbéry says that a fallen girl is unknown among the Central Asiatic Turks.[4]

In Dardistan young people have continued opportunities of meeting each other in the fields or at festive gatherings, and love declarations often take place on these occasions; "but if any evil intention is perceived the seducer of a girl is punished by this savage, but virtuous, race with death."[5] Among many of the uncivilised tribes in India and Indo-China the standard of female morality is very low indeed;[6] but this is not true of all of them. Among the Bódo and Dhimáls chastity is prized in man or woman, married and unmarried.[7] The mountaineers of the Rájmahal Hills allow a young man to show his love for a girl of adult age by sleeping on the same bedstead with her; but "should any indiscretion arise previous to marriage for the young couple sleeping together, they are considered disgraced and are visited with fine."[8] Among the Santals a youth and a girl are allowed to look at but not to speak to each other. If they do, the youth is taken to the village council and asked if he wants to marry the girl; should he say no, he is beaten and fined, but should he say yes, he is only fined.[9] The Let-htas, a hill tribe of Burma, are more particular still: until married, the young people of both sexes are domiciled in two long houses at opposite ends of the village, and "when they may have occasion to pass each other, they avert their gaze, so

[1] Klemm, *Allgemeine Cultur-Geschichte der Menschheit*, iv. 26.

[2] Kovalewsky, *Coutume contemporaine et loi ancienne*, p. 176.

[3] Vámbéry, *Das Türkenvolk*, p. 461.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 240.

[5] Leitner, *Results of a Tour in 'Dardistan, &c.,'* iii. 35.

[6] See, *e.g.*, Crooke, *Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh*, i. p. clxxxiv.; Gait, *op. cit.* p. 243.

[7] Hodgson, *Miscellaneous Essays*, i. 123.

[8] Sherwill, 'Notes upon a Tour through the Rájmahal Hills,' in *Jour. Asiatic Soc. Bengal*, xx. 557.

[9] Hertel, *Indisk Hjemmemission blandt Santalerne*, p. 83.

that they may not see each other's faces."[1] Among the Lisu tribes of the Burma-China frontier there is little sexual intercourse before marriage, and it is considered a great disgrace for a girl to give birth to a child out of wedlock.[2] The Assam tribes differ greatly with regard to pre-nuptial chastity. The Nagas give both sexes full freedom before marriage;[3] indeed, among the Angami Nagas girls consider short hair, the symbol of virginity, a disgrace, and men are desirous to have proof that their future wives will not be barren.[4] Among the Kachâris, Rábhás, and Hajongs, on the contrary, sexual intercourse before marriage is rare where contact with "civilisation" has not exercised its deteriorating influence; and when it does take place and pregnancy follows, the seducer is not only compelled to marry the girl but must besides pay an enhanced bride price or a fine to the village elders.[5] Among the Kukis, according to older accounts, a man who seduced a girl had to marry her as soon as her parents heard of it;[6] but nowadays their customs seem to be less stringent.[7] The moral standard of unmarried Garo women is, generally speaking, a high one, although the matrimonial bonds are loose.[8] Among the Kammālans, or artisans, in the Cochin State sexual licence is in no case tolerated; should it occur, the girl and her parents are placed under a ban.[9] The Ulladans, belonging to the lowest caste among the purely Malayáli Hindu and animistic castes of the same State, likewise prohibit sexual intercourse before marriage; "should an unmarried girl

[1] O'Riley, quoted by Fytche, *Burma*, i. 343.

[2] Geis, quoted by Rose and Brown, 'Lisu (Yawyin) Tribes,' in *Memoirs Asiatic Soc. Bengal*, iii. 263.

[3] Hodson, *Nāga Tribes of Manipur*, pp. 78, 87. Soppitt, *Short Account of the Kuki-Lushai Tribes*, p. 5.

[4] Prain, 'Angami Nagas,' in *Revue coloniale internationale*, v. 491 *sq.*

[5] Endle, *Kachâris*, pp. 3, 30, 31, 85 *sq.*

[6] Macrae, 'Account of the Kookies,' in *Asiatick Researches*, vii. 193. Butler, *Travels and Adventures in the Province of Assam*, p. 84.

[7] Soppitt, *op. cit.* p. 5. Shakespear, *Lushei Kuki Clans*, p. 53.

[8] Playfair, *Garos*, p. 70.

[9] Anantha Krishna Iyer, *Cochin Tribes and Castes*, i. 345.

become pregnant and the fact be known, her secret lover is summoned by the tribesmen, who compel him to take her to wife, as otherwise they are placed under a ban."[1] So also among the Vēlans of the Cochin State, the man who has made a girl pregnant must marry her, and very often they are both fined.[2] The strict morality which characterises the Veddas of Ceylon "extends to unmarried girls, who are protected by their natural guardians with the keenest sense of honour," although it does not extend to widows, however young and pretty.[3] Of the wild tribes of the Malay Peninsula Vaughan Stevens says that irregular connections only occur among the Bĕlendas who have been most subject to Malay influence.[4]

In the Malay Archipelago intercourse between unmarried people is among many tribes considered neither a crime nor a disgrace ;[5] but there are others who look upon it in a different light and require that the bride shall be a virgin.[6] In Nias the pregnancy of an unmarried girl is punished with death, inflicted both upon her and upon the seducer.[7] Among the Hill Dyaks the young men are carefully separated from the girls, licentious connections between the sexes being strictly prohibited ;[8] and the Sibuyaus, a tribe belonging to the Sea Dyaks, though they do not consider the sexual intercourse of their young people a positive crime, yet attach an idea of

[1] *Ibid.* i. 60 *sq.*

[2] Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, vii. 348.

[3] Nevill, 'Vaeddas of Ceylon,' in *Taprobanian*, i. 178.

[4] Stevens, 'Mittheilungen aus dem Frauenleben der Ôrang Bĕlendas, der Ôrang Djâkun und der Ôrang Lâut, in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xxviii. 175. See also Martin, *Die Inlandstämme der Malayischen Halbinsel*, p. 874 ; Knocker, 'Aborigines of Sungei Ujong,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xxxvii. 293 ; Logan, 'Orang Sakimba of the Extremity of the Malay Peninsula,' in *Jour. Indian Archipelago*, i. 297.

[5] Wilken, 'Plechtigheden en gebruiken bij verlovingen en huwelijken bij de volken van den Indischen Archipel,' in *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, ser. v. vol. iv. 434 *sqq.* Schmidt, *Liebe und Ehe im alten und modernen Indien*, p. 221 *sq.*

[6] Wilken, *loc. cit.* p. 446 *sqq.* Schmidt, *op. cit.* p. 223 *sq.*

[7] Wilken, *loc. cit.* p. 444. [8] Low, *Sarawak*, pp. 300, 247.

great indecency to irregular connections and are of opinion that an unmarried woman with child must be offensive to the superior powers.[1] Dr. Hagen states that the Kubus of Sumatra expect chastity from their young people and that the free love of which Boers speaks is exceptional, secret, and illegal among them.[2] According to Chamisso, some of the independent tribes of the Philippines held chastity in great honour, not only in the case of women, but also in the case of young girls, and protected it by severe laws.[3] This statement is confirmed by Dr. Hans Meyer[4] and Professor Blumentritt[5] with regard to the Igorot of Luzon. Of the Negritos, Mozo wrote in the eighteenth century, "Before marriage a false step is hardly heard of among them."[6] With reference to those of the interior of Luzon, Garcia states that a girl who became *enceinte* was punished with the greatest severity, even though she at once married the seducer.[7]

In New Guinea the relations between the unmarried vary greatly in different tribes. Among many of them incontinence seems to be very common,[8] whereas among others the greatest chastity is said to be maintained.[9] Among the Mekeo people of British New Guinea, in former days, a girl

[1] St. John, *op. cit.* i. 52 *sq.*

[2] Hagen, *Die Orang Kubu auf Sumatra*, p. 130 *sq.* For other natives of Sumatra see Marsden, *History of Sumatra*, p. 261.

[3] v. Kotzebue, *Voyage of Discovery*, iii. 66.

[4] Meyer, 'Die Igorrotes von Luzon,' in *Verhandl. Berliner Gesellsch. Anthr.* 1883, p. 384 *sq.*

[5] Blumentritt, *Versuch einer Ethnographie der Philippinen*, p. 27.

[6] Mozo, *Noticia histórico natural de los gloriosos triumphos por los religiosos del orden de N.P.S. Agustin en las Islas Philipinas*, p. 108.

[7] Garcia, quoted by Bille, *Beretning om Corvetten Galathea's Reise omkring Jorden*, ii. 181.

[8] Seligman, *op. cit.* pp. 134 (Koita), 499 (Southern Massim). Malinowski, *loc. cit.* pp. 559, 561, 563 (natives of Mailu). Williamson, *Mafulu Mountain People of British New Guinea*, p. 172. Neuhauss, *op. cit.* i. 160 (natives of Kaiser Wilhelm Land). Krieger, *Neu-Guinea*, p. 395 (natives of the western part of Dutch New Guinea).

[9] Krieger, *op. cit.* p. 395. Finsch, *Neu-Guinea*, pp. 77, 82, 92, 101. Earl, *Papuans*, p. 81. Bink, in *Bull. Soc. d'Anthr. Paris*, ser. iii. vol. xi. 307.

who became with child before marriage ran the risk of being killed.[1] Among the natives living in the neighbourhood of Geelvink Bay, on the northern coast, a seducer is compelled to marry the girl and can escape from doing so only by leaving the country.[2] On the Maclay Coast, Miklucho-Maclay found extra-matrimonial intercourse to be exceedingly rare, probably on account of the early marriages.[3] Among the Western Islanders of Torres Straits "irregular intercourse with women was invariably spoken of as 'stealing,' as the girls were regarded as the property of their fathers and the wives as the property of their husbands."[4] In some parts of the Bismarck Archipelago seduction, if proved by witnesses, is severely punished; the girl may even be killed, in which case the man has to pay her value in shell money.[5] Among good families at Saa in Malanta, of the Solomon Islands, "the virginity of a bride is a matter of much concern to her friends, not only because the boy's friends will not pay what they have promised if her character is questionable, but because they value propriety."[6] Among some of the New Caledonians unchastity is considered dishonourable, and to call a person a bastard is an insult;[7] whereas among others "les jeunes filles peuvent disposer de leur corps."[8] The women of Uea, Loyalty Islands, are described as "strictly chaste before marriage, and faithful wives afterwards";[9] and in Lifu, belonging to the same

[1] Williamson, Some unrecorded Customs of the Mekeo People of British New Guinea,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xliii. 278.

[2] Krieger, *op. cit.* p. 395.

[3] Miklucho-Maclay, 'Anthropologische Bemerkungen über die Papuas der Maclay-Küste in Neu-Guinea,' in *Natuurkundig Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch Indie*, xxxiii. 245. *Idem*, 'Ethnologische Bemerkungen über die Papuas der Maclay-Küste in Neu-Guinea,' *ibid.* xxxv. 89.

[4] Haddon, in *Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits*, v. 275.

[5] Pfeil, *Studien und Beobachtungen aus der Südsee*, p. 31.

[6] Codrington, *op. cit.* p. 239.

[7] Lambert, *Mœurs et superstitions des Néo-Calédoniens*, p. 72 *sq.*

[8] Brainne, *La Nouvelle-Calédonie*, p. 251.

[9] Erskine, *Islands of the Western Pacific*, p. 341. See also Cheyne, *Description of Islands in the Western Pacific Ocean*, p. 25.

group, "a young man meeting or walking alone with and speaking to an unmarried or espoused girl might be clubbed by her father or other guardian."[1] We have previously noticed the chastity which in former days characterised the girls in Fiji.[2] It may be added that the old women of the bridegroom's family ascertained whether the bride was a virgin; and if the result of their inquiries was unsatisfactory, the feast connected with the clipping of her hair "was made the occasion for putting her friends to shame."[3] Among the nobles of the Line Islanders proof of virginity is required on marriage and "it must be conclusive."[4] In Tonga the nuptial mat was paraded from house to house;[5] and in Samoa the innocence of the bride is tested in the sight of the whole village by a sort of surgical operation performed by the bridegroom, who then raises his hand to show the blood on his finger.[6] But Turner remarks that although the virtue of chastity was ostensibly cultivated in Samoa by both sexes, it was more a name than a reality.[7] There was more laxity of intercourse between boys and girls in Polynesia than in Melanesia.[8] With reference to the latter, Dr. Codrington observes that although unchastity was not very seriously regarded, "yet it is certain that in these islands generally there was by no means that insensibility in regard to female virtue with which the natives are so commonly charged."[9] Among the Maori,[10] Marquesas

[1] Ray, 'People and Language of Lifu,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xlvii. 280.

[2] *Supra*, p. 127 *sq.* See also Erskine, *op. cit.* p. 255; Meinicke, *op. cit.* ii. 45. [3] Thomson, *Fijians*, p. 202.

[4] Tutuila, in *Jour. Polynesian Soc.* i. 271.

[5] Thomson, *op. cit.* p. 203.

[6] Krämer, *Die Samoa-Inseln*, i. 36 *sqq.* Turner, *Samoa*, p. 95. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition*, ii. 80.

[7] Turner, *Nineteen Years in Polynesia*, p. 184.

[8] *Cf.* Thomson, *op. cit.* p. 234. [9] Codrington, *op. cit.* p. 235.

[10] Taylor, *Te Ika a Maui*, p. 33. Polack, *Manners and Customs of the New Zealanders*, i. 145. Shortland, *Traditions and Superstitions of the New Zealanders*, p. 120. Thomson, *Story of New Zealand*, i. 178. Brown, *Maori and Polynesian*, p. 68. Gisborne, *Colony of New Zealand*, p. 27. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, p. 284. Best, 'Maori Marriage Customs,' in *Trans. and Proceed. New Zealand Institute*, xxxvi. 32, 35.

Islanders,[1] Hawaians,[2] Marshall Islanders,[3] and Pelew Islanders,[4] there is said to be, or to have been, the greatest freedom before marriage.

The same can certainly not be said of the Australian aborigines while in their native state. There is extra-matrimonial intercourse among them on certain occasions or in certain circumstances, recognised and regulated by their customs, but this is something very different from irregular unions. For the latter, says Dr. Howitt, the Dieri have special terms, and they are condemned and abhorred by them.[5] Among the Aranda, or Arunta, in Central Australia, according to Strehlow, if a grown-up youth has sexual intercourse with a grown-up girl or with the wife of another man, they are both speared and their bodies thrown into the fire ; [6] and the same is said to be the case among the Loritja.[7] Of the Maroura tribe, on the Lower Darling, we are told that before the advent of the whites " their laws were strict, especially those regarding young men and young women. It was almost death to a young lad or man who had sexual intercourse till married."[8] Among various tribes in Western Victoria " illegitimacy is rare, and is looked upon with such abhorrence that the mother is always severely beaten by her relatives, and sometimes put to death and burned. The father of the child is also punished with the greatest severity, and occasionally killed."[9] Mr. Moore Davis

[1] Porter, *Journal of a Cruise made to the Pacific Ocean*, ii. 59 *sq.* Tautain, ' Étude sur le mariage chez les Polynésiens (Mao'i) des îles Marquises,' in *L'Anthropologie*, vi. 645. See also Christian, *Eastern Pacific Lands*, p. 95.

[2] Jarves, *History of the Hawaiian Islands*, pp. 18, 42.

[3] Kohler, ' Das Recht der Marschallinsulaner,' in *Zeitschr. vergl. Rechtswiss.* xiv. 417.

[4] Kubary, ' Die Palau-Inseln,' in *Jour. d. Museum Godeffroy*, iv. 53.

[5] Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 187.

[6] Strehlow, *Die Aranda- und Loritja-Stämme in Zentral-Australien*, vol. iv. pt. i. 93.

[7] *Ibid.* vol. iv. pt. i. 103.

[8] Holden, in Taplin, *Folklore of the South Australian Aborigines*, p. 19.

[9] Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, p. 28.

writes :—" Promiscuous intercourse between the sexes is not practised by the Aborigines, and their laws on the subject, particularly those of New South Wales, are very strict. When at camp, all the young unmarried men are stationed by themselves at the extreme ends, while the married men, each with his family, occupy the centre. No conversation is allowed between the single men and the girls or the married women. . . . Infractions of these and other laws were visited either by punishment by any aggrieved member of the tribe, or by the delinquent having to purge himself of his crime by standing up protected simply by his shield, or a waddy, while five or six warriors threw, from a comparatively short distance, several spears at him."[1] Among the Euahlayi tribe, says Mrs. Langloh Parker, " unchaste women were punished terribly. After we went west even the death penalty for wantonness was enforced."[2] Among the North-West-Central Queensland aborigines, on the other hand, women are allowed considerable sexual freedom, unless they happen to be betrothed. Yet " after all, morality in its broadest sense is certainly a recognised virtue." A prostitute, though her frailty is usually due to the death or desertion of her husband, is despised, and has a special name applied to her ; and the man who habitually consorts with such a woman is similarly regarded with contempt, and spoken of under a distinct term.[3]

Among a large number of African peoples the unmarried are allowed full liberty before marriage, and virginity is neither expected nor found in a bride.[4] But those

[1] Moore Davis, quoted by Brough Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, ii. 318. See also Fraser, *Aborigines of New South Wales*, p. 27.

[2] Mrs. Langloh Parker, *Euahlayi Tribe*, p. 59 *sq.*

[3] Roth, *North Queensland Ethnography : Bulletin No. 8. Notes Government, Morals, and Crime*, p. 7.

[4] See, *e.g.*, v. François, *Nama und Damara Deutsch-Süd-West-Afrika*, p. 213 (Hottentots) ; Magyar, *Reisen in Süd-Afrika*, p. 285 (Kimbunda) ; Decle, *Three Years in Savage Africa*, pp. 160 (Matabele), 346 *sq.* (Wanyamwezi) ; Johnston, *British Central Africa*, p. 409 note ; *Idem*, *Uganda Protectorate*, p. 610 (Bairo) ; Roscoe, *Northern Bantu*, pp. 260, 261 (Bateso), 279, 281 (Nilotic Kavirondo) ; Felkin, ' Notes on the For Tribe of Central Africa,'

of them among whom the contrary is the case are also very numerous. Of some Bushman tribes we are told that pre-nuptial intercourse seems hardly to occur,[1] or that the girls generally are virgins when they enter into marriage because most of them marry soon after puberty.[2] The Kafirs hold chastity in little regard; yet in some of their tribes a girl who has lost her virtue fetches a lower price than a virgin,[3] or the father of an unmarried woman who becomes pregnant can demand a fine of one head of cattle from the father of the child,[4] or the mere seduction of a virgin incurs the fine of three or four head of cattle.[5] Mr. Cousins wrote to me that between their various feasts the Cis-Natalian Kafirs, both men and women, have to live in strict continence, the penalty for breaking this rule being banishment from the tribe. Casalis mentions a curious custom prevalent among the Basuto which shows that unchastity in a young man is not looked upon with perfect indifference, and is even supposed in certain circumstances to expose him to supernatural danger.[6] Among the Awemba in Northern Rhodesia chastity is an unknown quantity in young girls over fifteen years of age, but they nevertheless have a very definite code of sex-morality: "all know that

in *Proceed. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh*, xiii. 233; Angus, 'Initiation Ceremony of Girls, as performed in Azimba Land, Central Africa,' in *Verhandl. Berliner Gesellsch. Anthr.* 1898, p. 481; Munzinger, *Ostafrikanische Studien*, p. 524 (Barea and Kunáma); Clozel and Villamur, *Les coutumes indigènes de la Côte d'Ivoire*, p. 101 (Baoulé); Tessmann, *Die Pangwe*, ii. 253, 254, 258 *sq.*; Thomas, *Anthropological Report on Ibo-speaking Peoples of Nigeria*, i. 69; Partridge, *Cross River Natives*, p. 254; Torday and Joyce, *Les Bushongo*, pp. 116, 266, 272; *Idem*, 'Notes on the Ethnography of the Ba-Huana,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxvi. 288; Weeks, *Among the Primitive Bakongo*, p. 163; *Idem*, *Among Congo Cannibals*, p. 127 (Boloki); *Idem*, 'Anthropological Notes on the Bangala of the Upper Congo River,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xxxix. 442, and xl. 417; Delhaise, *Les Warega*, p. 173.

[1] Kaufmann, 'Die Auin,' in *Mittheil. Deutsch. Schutzgeb.* xxiii. 156.

[2] Trenk, 'Die Buschleute der Namib,' *ibid.* xxiii. 169.

[3] Kropf, *Das Volk der Xosa-Kaffern*, p. 138.

[4] Warner, in Maclean, *Compendium of Kafir Laws*, p. 64.

[5] Brownlee, *ibid.* p. 112. [6] Casalis, *Basutos*, p. 267 *sq.*

immorality is wrong, and that it runs counter to the laws of superstitious observances."[1] Among the Herero it is considered a shame to the parents of a girl if she loses her virtue; hence she is in many cases betrothed already as a child, which compels her as well as her *fiancé* to live chastely.[2] And according to one of our authorities a seducer is severely punished, nay is even in danger of losing his life.[3]

Among the natives near Port Herald in British Central Africa, according to Father Torrent, the women are very strict in their habits and it seldom happens that a bride is not a virgin.[4] Among the Konde people, living to the east of the northern part of Lake Nyasa, sexual intercourse between young people is frequent, because the prevailing polygamy makes it impossible for many a young man to marry; but if the case becomes known the seducer is compelled to buy the girl from her father, or, if he cannot pay the bride price, is deprived of his spear and has to leave the country.[5] In Ruanda an adult girl who is known to be unchaste is beaten and can never get a husband, and a bride who is found not to be a virgin is invariably sent away; and in former days a girl was killed if she became a mother or got with child.[6] Among the Wapore of Usambara unmarried daughters are strictly guarded, because a false step on their part reduces the price paid for them.[7] The Baziba, inhabiting a country to the west and south-west of Lake Victoria Nyanza, look upon illegitimate intercourse between the sexes before marriage as the most serious offence known to their laws, although no action is taken until the birth of a child; "then the man and woman are bound hand and

[1] Gouldsbury and Sheane, *Great Plateau of Northern Rhodesia*, p. 141.

[2] Bensen, quoted by Kohler, 'Das Recht der Herero,' in *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Rechtswiss.* xiv. 304. Dannert, *Zum Rechte der Herero*, p. 26.

[3] Meyer, quoted by Kohler in *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Rechtswiss.* xiv. 304.

[4] Fülleborn, *Das Deutsche Njassa- und Ruwuma-Gebiet*, p. 552.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 345. See also v. Behr, 'Die Völker zwischen Rufiyi und Rovuma,' in *Mittheil. Deutsch. Schutzgeb.* vi. 79.

[6] Schumacher, 'Das Eherecht in Ruanda,' in *Anthropos*, vii. 4, 6.

[7] Baumann, *Usambara*, p. 237.

foot and thrown into Lake Victoria."[1] Among the Bantu Kavirondo death was formerly meted out to young men and girls who were found guilty of fornication.[2] Among the Bakoki, another tribe in the Uganda Protectorate, the seducer had to pay three cows to the father of the girl and one to the chief, and the girl was driven from home and remained for ever after an outcast.[3] Among the Banyankole, " should any woman commit fornication and have a child before marriage, she is disgraced for life. The clan condemns and disowns her as soon as the fact is known."[4] It is not surprising therefore to hear that " there is generally chastity amongst the young women before marriage."[5] If a Busoga girl gets a child and the father does not pay the bride price and marries her, she is turned adrift in disgrace by her brother and a medicine-man is called in to kill a goat and cook a meal for the inmates, " thus purifying the house from any taint and propitiating the god of the family."[6] Of the natives of the Sese Archipelago in the Victoria Nyanza we are told that " if a young woman was seduced, the man was obliged to marry her, and in addition to pay a fine of two goats " ;[7] and of the Lendu, that for the seduction of a girl a fine of four cows is payable to her father.[8] In the Madi or Moru tribe the girls are carefully looked after, " but as marriage usually takes place very early, there is not much cause for them to go wrong. This also applies to the men."[9] Among the Akikúyu of British East Africa an unmarried girl about to become a mother meets with the gravest disapproval from her parents, and her own companions also disapprove of her conduct. The man, in such circumstances, can either buy the girl, and take the child, or pay ten goats and one sheep, in which case the girl and child remain at home. For any second child born in similar circumstances

[1] Cunningham, *Uganda*, p. 290.
[2] Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, p. 747.
[3] Cunningham, *op. cit.* p. 102. [4] Roscoe, *Northern Bantu*, p. 121.
[5] Johnston, *op. cit.* p. 630. [6] Roscoe, *op. cit.* p. 233.
[7] Cunningham, *op. cit.* p. 94 *sq.* [8] *Ibid.* p. 334.
[9] Felkin, ' Notes on the Madi or Moru Tribe of Central Africa,' in *Proceed. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh*, xii. 323.

only a small compensation is required, say five goats. "It was very definitely stated that the marriage value of a girl with such a history would be diminished."[1] Among the Wagiriama of British East Africa "the sexes are not allowed free sexual intercourse with each other before marriage as in some tribes."[2] Among the Nandi, "in the event of a warrior causing a girl to conceive, he has to slaughter an ox when the child is born. He may take the head away himself, but the rest of the animal belongs to the girl's father. Except with the Toiyoi clan, the girl is punished by being put in Coventry, none of her girl friends being allowed to speak to or look at her until after the child is born and buried. She is also regarded with contempt for the rest of her life and may never look inside a granary for fear of spoiling the corn."[3] Among the Dinka illegitimate children are said to be the result of there being many people who cannot marry on account of their poverty; for each child the father has to pay the penalty of four head of cattle, but the children appertain to the mother's family.[4] Galla parents inculcate very emphatically the virtue of chastity upon their daughters, and formerly maidens guilty of incontinence were thrown into the Sabaki River and drowned.[5] Among the Beni Amer the unmarried women are very modest, although the married ones believe that they are allowed everything; and if a girl becomes a mother she and the father and the child are all killed.[6] The same is the case among the Marea.[7] Among the Takue a seducer may have to pay the same sum as if he had killed the girl, although the fine is generally reduced to fifty cows.[8] Among the Beni Mzab a man who

[1] Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People*, p. 126.

[2] Barrett, 'Notes on the Customs and Beliefs of the Wa-Giriama, etc., British East Africa,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xli. 21.

[3] Hollis, *Nandi*, p. 76.

[4] Petherick, *Egypt, the Soudan and Central Africa*, p. 393.

[5] Wakefield, 'Marriage Customs of the Southern Gallas,' in *Folk-Lore*, xviii. 325. See also Paulitschke, *Ethnographie Nordost-Afrikas*, ii. 11.

[6] Munzinger, *Ostafrikanische Studien*, pp. 322, 326.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 243.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 208.

seduces a girl has to pay two hundred francs and is banished for four years.[1] In North-Eastern Africa girls are frequently subject to infibulation in order to remain chaste until they marry. This practice occurs among the Beja, Galla, Somal, Massaua, Sudanese, Southern Nubians, and Danakil, as also in a part of Kordofan and in Sennaar.[2]

Of the ancient inhabitants of the Canary Islands we are told that a woman who lost her virtue was ostracised and not spoken to for the rest of her life.[3] Concerning the Algerian Berbers, Hanoteau and Letourneux write that their customs do not tolerate any sexual relation out of wedlock, and that an illegitimate child is killed together with its mother.[4] In Morocco a bride who is found not to be a virgin is frequently sent away by the bridegroom, and in some tribes she is killed by her own father or brother.[5] It is a common though not universal custom there that the garment with the marks of virginity is publicly exhibited—a custom also found in Algeria[6] and Egypt,[7] among the Swahili in East Africa,[8] and among the Yoruba of the Slave Coast.[9] Among the last-mentioned people, however, virginity in a bride is only of paramount importance when the girl has been betrothed in childhood, an unbetrothed girl being mistress of her own actions.[10] Among most of the Ewhe tribes the absence of the *primitiae* is *ipso facto* a reason for repudiating a bride; the penalty for seduction is marriage and the payment of the head-money which would have been

[1] Chavanne, *Die Sahara*, p. 315.

[2] Stoll, *Das Geschlechtsleben in der Völkerpsychologie*, p. 548 *sqq.* Gray, 'Circumcision (Introductory),' in Hastings, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, iii. 667, 669.

[3] Cook, 'Aborigines of the Canary Islands,' in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. ii. 480.

[4] Hanoteau and Letourneux, *La Kabylie et les coutumes Kabyles*, ii. 148, 187.

[5] See Westermarck, *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco*, ch. vii.

[6] Villot, *Mœurs, coutumes et institutions des indigènes de l'Algérie*, p. 107.

[7] Burckhardt, *Arabic Proverbs*, p. 117 *sq.*

[8] Velten, *Sitten und Gebräuche der Suaheli*, p. 135.

[9] Ellis, *Yoruba-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast*, p. 154.

[10] *Ibid.* pp. 154, 184.

demanded, or a heavy fine without marriage, with the alternative of enslavement.[1] On the Gold Coast a similar rule prevails with reference to a bride who is found not to be a virgin; and "if a man betrays a virgin, he is compelled to marry her or to pay the price of her dowry, if the parents will not consent to the marriage."[2] According to Fanti customary law, "if a man seduce an unmarried woman, he is liable to pay to her family damages for the wrong so done her and the disgrace brought on her family."[3] In Sierra Leone a seducer is called on to pay "virgin money."[4] Among the Ibo-speaking people of the Asaba district in Nigeria "a good deal of value is laid upon the virginity of the bride."[5] Among the Nigerian Kagoro "there is very little actual connection before marriage even between betrothed couples, and the girdle of string (*ivyan*) worn by girls *is* a sign of virginity."[6] Among the people of Loango, according to Proyart, "a youth durst not speak to a girl except in her mother's presence," and "the crime of a maid who has not resisted seduction, would be sufficient to draw down a total ruin on the whole country, were it not expiated by a public avowal made to the king."[7] Nowadays at least, great pre-nuptial freedom is common among the Congo tribes. Of the natives of the Lower Congo Mr. Weeks states that, in their lodges, "the sexes were allowed to mix as freely as their worst passions prompted"; and when an unmarried woman has a child no fine is paid by its father.

[1] Ellis, *Ewe-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast*, pp. 156, 157, 201, 202, 206. Klose, *Togo unter deutscher Flagge*, p. 255. Dr. Grade says (in *Aus allen Welttheilen*, xx. 5) that among the Negroes of Togoland a much higher price is paid for a bride who is a virgin than for any other.

[2] Cruickshank, *Eighteen Years on the Gold Coast*, ii. 195, 196, 212.

[3] Sarbah, *Fanti Customary Laws*, p. 48.

[4] Thomas, *Anthropological Report on Sierra Leone. Part I. Law and Custom of the Timne and other Tribes*, pp. 97, 101.

[5] *Idem*, *Anthropological Report on Ibo-speaking Peoples of Nigeria*, iv. 65.

[6] Tremearne, 'Notes on the Kagoro and other Nigerian Head-Hunters,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xlii. 169. See also *ibid.* pp. 172, 190.

[7] Proyart, 'History of Loango,' in Pinkerton, *op. cit.* xvi. 568.

Yet at the same time we are told that such a child, which belongs to the woman's family, is spoken of as a " child of adultery," and that the other children taunt him by saying, " You have no father, you came from a tree."[1] Among various Congo tribes a seducer is fined;[2] and the Bayaka allow a bridegroom to repudiate the bride if he finds that she is not a virgin.[3]

The facts stated do not, of course, give us an answer to the question whether among the uncivilised peoples generally pre-nuptial chastity is more often condemned or condoned. Messrs. Hobhouse, Wheeler, and Ginsberg have in a recent book dealt with this problem and come to the conclusion that among the cases examined by them—about 120 in number, probable ones reckoned as a half—those in which pre-nuptial relations are condemned are nearly as numerous as those in which they are condoned, and that consequently " there is no general tendency either way."[4] Although I prefer giving no figures, partly on account of the indefiniteness of many of the statements, I may say that my own collection of facts convinces me that the standard of savage chastity has at any rate not been overrated by those authors. Considering, moreover, the deteriorating influence which contact with civilisation has in so many cases exercised on the lower races, and the still more important fact that " pre-nuptial chastity " includes all kinds of sexual relations previous to formal marriage, however exclusive and constant they may be—I do not hesitate to affirm that anything like promiscuity among the unmarried is an exception in the customs of unadulterated savages. We have seen that even among peoples who are notorious for their laxity it is a slur upon a girl's reputation frequently to change her lover.

Professor Hobhouse and his collaborators have also

[1] Weeks, *Among the Primitive Bakongo*, pp. 163, 108.

[2] Torday and Joyce, *Les Bushongo*, p. 110. *Iidem*, ' Notes on the Ethnography of the Ba-Yaka,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxvi. 48. Torday, *Camp and Tramp in African Wilds*, p. 203 (Southern Bambala).

[3] Torday and Joyce, in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxvi. 45.

[4] Hobhouse, Wheeler, and Ginsberg, *Material Culture and Social Institutions of the Simpler Peoples*, p. 167.

examined how far the condemnation or condonation of pre-nuptial chastity is correlated with economic advance. They have found the agricultural and pastoral peoples to be in this respect "decidedly above the hunters."[1] So far as the "lower hunters" are concerned, they mention three cases of condemnation and five of condonation.[2] All the former and three of the latter refer to Australian tribes; in other words, 50 per cent. of these tribes are said to condemn and the other 50 per cent. to condone pre-nuptial chastity (all cases of "ceremonial" unchastity being excluded). This, however, does not agree with my own facts, according to which aboriginal Australian custom in general is very strict. The two remaining cases of condonation refer to the Punans of Borneo and the Andaman Islanders. Messrs. Hose and McDougall say of the former:—"Sexual restraint is probably maintained at about the same level as among the other peoples, the women being more strictly chaste after than before marriage. . . . A young man will become the lover of a girl generally of some other group than his own, and when she becomes pregnant the marriage is celebrated."[3] Among the Andaman Islanders, according to Portman, "there is a freedom of intercourse between the sexes before marriage," but their passions are not gratified to any great extent until after marriage.[4] We have previously noticed the high standard of pre-nuptial chastity among some Bushman tribes of South Africa, the Veddas of Ceylon, the wild tribes of the Malay Peninsula, the Kubus of Sumatra, and the Negritos of the Philippines. Some of these tribes practise a primitive kind of agriculture, but they all belong to the lowest races now existing. Concerning the Yahgans of Tierra del Fuego Mr. Bridges wrote that lewdness is condemned among them as evil and never indulged in with the consent of parents, but yet very frequent. With reference

[1] *Ibid.* p. 167.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 177, 179, 181. In the summary on p. 167 the number of the latter is given as six, but this is not borne out by the details in the Appendix.

[3] Hose and McDougall, *Pagan Tribes of Borneo*, ii. 183.

[4] Portman, *History of Our Relations with the Andamanese*, i. 29, 39.

to the lowest races, the general statement may nevertheless be made that pre-nuptial unchastity among them is neither common nor condoned.

The same cannot be said of the higher hunters. Professor Hobhouse and his collaborators have found among them only three cases of condemnation and thirteen of condonation, nearly all from North America.[1] Some of the latter, however, refer to peoples whose morality is said to have been lowered by contact with white people or of whom earlier travellers have given a more favourable account, and the cases of condemnation might have been increased by the Tlingit, Aht, Nez Percés, and some other Indians. And as the lower hunters, generally speaking, have a stricter standard of pre-nuptial chastity than the higher ones, so also the lowest agricultural stage comes out materially better than the two higher stages (9 cases of condemnation and 2 of condonation against respectively 16 and 27, and $18\frac{1}{2}$ and 15); and the higher agricultural tribes also stand considerably below the pastoral ones (6 cases of condemnation and $3\frac{1}{2}$ of condonation).[2]

Whatever may be said about the exactness of these figures —the authors themselves would no doubt be the first to admit that their value is only relative—I think it is perfectly obvious at all events that among the "simpler peoples" the standard of pre-nuptial chastity in a tribe is not proportionate to its degree of culture. There is no evidence whatever for the broad statement made by Dr. Hartland, that "at first, and for a long time, mere passing amours are not regarded, or at least . . . not interfered with," and that only by-and-by "virginity comes to have a special market-value."[3] It seems to me, on the contrary, that in the lowest tribes chastity is more respected than in the higher ones. This is also what might be expected if marriage is the natural and normal relation between the sexes in mankind. Pre-

[1] Hobhouse, Wheeler, and Ginsberg, *op. cit.* pp. 167, 181, 183, 185, 187.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 167. See also Hobhouse, *Morals in Evolution*, p. 174 n.1.

[3] Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, ii. 93.

nuptial chastity or unchastity largely depends on the age when marriages are contracted. This holds true of savages, as is directly indicated in some of the statements quoted above, and it is true of civilised peoples as well. It has been proved that in the cities of Europe prostitution increases according as the number of marriages decreases;[1] and Engel and others have shown that the fewer marriages are concluded in a year the greater is the ratio of illegitimate births.[2] At the lower stages of culture celibacy is much rarer and marriage is entered into at an earlier age than among ourselves. But even in savage life there are circumstances which may compel adult persons to live unmarried for a longer or shorter time. A man may be too poor to maintain a wife, or where he has to buy her he may be unable to pay the price, or the polygyny of some may lead to the celibacy of others. These obstacles, however, would occur chiefly where some advancement in culture has been made, and in a much smaller degree under more primitive conditions, where consequently there would be less reason for pre-nuptial unchastity.

The difficulty of procuring a wife, however, is not the only cause of sexual intercourse before marriage. In many cases, as we have seen, the pre-nuptial relation is a kind of trial, which, if successful, leads to marriage. Its object may be to ascertain that the woman will gratify her lover's desire for offspring, and in such a case the marriage is not concluded before the birth of a child or until there are signs of pregnancy. In his notes on the For tribe of Central Africa, for example, Dr. Felkin states that in the Gebel Marah district, where barrenness is common, "the men always make sure of a woman's fertility before marriage."[3] But offspring may also be secured in another way, namely, by marrying a woman who has conceived by another man. Among the Angami Nagas, although youthful licentiousness never ends in marriage, men are desirous to have proof in advance that

[1] v. Oettingen, *Moralstatistik*, pp. 199, 216.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 327.

[3] Felkin, 'Notes on the For Tribe of Central Africa,' in *Proceed. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh*, xiii. 207 *sq.*

their wives will not be barren.[1] The Akamba in British East Africa "have no respect for maidens, and regard a pregnant girl as the most eligible spouse, exactly as if she were a cow in calf." [2] Of various peoples we are told that a young woman is liked the better and more desired in marriage for having borne a child.[3] Among the Mongwandi of the Upper Mongala region a grown woman who has already been a mother costs quite six times the price of a little girl.[4] Nay, among the Bagas-Foreh, inhabiting the small islands at the mouth of the Rio Nuñez in French Guinea, a young lady cannot hope to find a husband unless she has given birth to two children who are already old enough to walk.[5] Indeed, a woman who is a mother may be a more acceptable wife, not only because she has proved that she can bear children, but on account of the direct value of the offspring she brings with her.[6]

There may be yet other reasons why a man prefers marrying a girl who is not a virgin. Of the Indians of Quito we are told by Juan and Ulloa that a virgin is never the object of their choice; "for they look on it as a sure sign, that she who has not been known to others, can have nothing pleasing about her."[7] A similar view is taken by some of the Ewhe in the interior of Togoland, contrary to the regard in which virginity is held by those living on the coast.[8] Concerning the Kamchadal, Steller says that if a girl was given in marriage as a virgin—which sometimes happened in

[1] Prain, *loc. cit.* p. 491 *sq.* [2] Eliot, *East Africa Protectorate*, p. 125.

[3] Delafosse, 'Le peuple Siéna ou Sénoufo,' in *Revue des études ethnographiques et sociologiques*, i. 483. Roscoe, *Northern Bantu*, p. 171 (Bagesu). Buch, 'Die Wotjäken,' in *Acta Soc. Scientiarum Fennicae*, xii. 509. Melnikow, 'Die Burjäten des Irkutskischen Gouvernements,' in *Verhandl. Berliner Gesellsch. Anthr.* 1899, p. 442. Crisp, 'Account of the Inhabitants of the Poggy Islands,' in *Asiatick Researches*, vi. 87 *sq.*

[4] Johnston, *George Grenfell and the Congo*, ii. 677.

[5] Leprince, reviewed in *L'Anthropologie*, xi. 769 *sq.*

[6] See Tessmann, *op. cit.* ii. 258 *sq.* (Pangwe).

[7] Juan and Ulloa, 'Voyage to South America,' in Pinkerton, *op. cit.* xiv. 521.

[8] Klose, *op. cit.* p. 255.

former times—the bridegroom was dissatisfied and scolded her mother because she had neglected her education in the art of venery.[1] Speaking of Tibetans, Marco Polo observes that no man among them "would on any consideration take to wife a girl who was a maid; for they say a wife is nothing worth unless she has been used to consort with men. And," he adds, "their custom is this, that when travellers come that way, the old women of the place get ready, and take their unmarried daughters or other girls related to them, and go to the strangers who are passing, and make over the young women to whomsoever will accept them; and the travellers take them accordingly and do their pleasure; after which the girls are restored to the old women."[2] This statement suggests that we have here to do with a defloration rite of the kind which will be discussed in the next chapter: if the girl was considered "worth nothing" as long as she remained a virgin, the reason for it was presumably the idea that defloration was coupled with danger, or that intercourse with a stranger was beneficial, or both ideas combined. Notions of this sort have certainly to be taken into consideration when we examine the causes of pre-nuptial unchastity. They seem, partly at least, to account for the custom which requires girls to earn their dowries by prostitution before they marry.[3]

That promiscuous pre-nuptial unchastity is a survival of earlier general promiscuity is a legitimate assumption only if we may assume that the causes to which it can be traced have operated on an infinitely larger scale in the past than they do at present. And for such an assumption there is no justification whatever. We have noticed that the obstacles to early marriages are mainly due to advancement in culture. Trial unions cannot be called promiscuous. Nor do superstitious beliefs concerning defloration generally lead to anything like promiscuity. The cases in which the depreciation of virginity is stated to be due to desire for offspring are quite exceptional and cannot possibly be regarded as the

[1] Steller, *Beschreibung von dem Lande Kamtschatka*, p. 346.
[2] Marco Polo, *Kingdoms and Marvels of the East*, ii. 44.
[3] See *infra*, i. 200.

expression of a tendency which was ever general. On the other hand, there is ample evidence of men giving preference to virgin brides, and this preference is probably very ancient. It seems to spring partly from a feeling akin to jealousy towards women who have had previous connections with other men,[1] and partly from an instinctive appreciation of female coyness. Each sex is attracted by the distinctive characteristics of the opposite sex, and coyness is a female quality. Hence conspicuous eagerness in a woman appears to a man unwomanly, repulsive, contemptible; his ideal is the virgin, the libertine he despises. This preference for virginity and female coyness has undoubtedly tended to keep pre-nuptial intercourse, especially of a promiscuous kind, in check, and has at the same time influenced the moral judgment of it.[2]

One more cause of pre-nuptial unchastity remains to be considered, namely, the taste for variety. This has been much emphasised by Dr. Bloch, who bases on it his chief argument in favour of original promiscuity. It is, he says, "perfectly clear that the human need for sexual variety, which is an established anthropological phenomenon, must in primitive times have been much stronger and more unbridled, in proportion as the whole of life had not hitherto risen above the needs of purely physical requirements. Since even in our time, in a state of the most advanced civilisation, after the development of a sexual morality penetrating and influencing our entire social life, this natural need for variety continues to manifest itself in almost undiminished strength, we can hardly regard it as necessary to prove that in primitive conditions sexual promiscuity was a more original, and, indeed, a more natural, state than marriage. From the purely anthropological standpoint . . . permanent marriage appears a thoroughly artificial institution, which even to-day fails to do justice to the human need for sexual variety."[3] That the sexual instinct is stimulated

[1] See *infra*, i. 316 *sq.*

[2] See Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. 434 *sqq.*

[3] Bloch, *op. cit.* p. 192.

by a change of its object is an undeniable fact. That this taste for variety is a cause of much extra-matrimonial intercourse of a more or less promiscuous character is also well known. But the assumption that it dominated primitive man to such an extent as to exclude all unions of a greater durability is warranted by nothing that is known either about anthropoid apes or savage men. Indeed, promiscuity was not the only means by which he might have satisfied his "need for sexual variety"; if he got tired of his wife he might take another one. This would seem to have been the more sensible course to choose; for a wife is not only a source of sexual pleasure but a helpmate, a food-provider, a cook, and a mother of children. This is a point of view which Dr. Bloch and some other authors are too apt to overlook when they speak of early marriage.

If, as I maintain, marriage is based on an instinct acquired as a means of preserving the life of the progeny, sexual intercourse must no doubt originally, as a general rule, have been followed by a prolonged union between the parties. But this does not imply that the connection between sexual intercourse and marriage would always have remained equally close. As a social fact and a social institution marriage has been greatly influenced by the progress of civilisation, and extra-matrimonial relations can be easily explained without recourse to the hypothesis that in the beginning all relations between the sexes were promiscuous. When we consider that in our own midst prostitution has shown a tendency to increase in a higher ratio than population,[1] and that in spite of the general infertility of prostitutes there are towns in Europe where the illegitimate births outnumber the legitimate ones,[2] it is nothing less than absurd to speak of the unchastity of unmarried savages as a relic of an alleged primitive stage of promiscuity.

As a survival of ancient communism in women has also been regarded the fact that courtesans have sometimes been held in greater estimation than married women.[3]

[1] v. Oettingen, *op. cit.* p. 199. [2] *Ibid.* p. 317.

[3] Avebury, *Origin of Civilisation*, p. 107. Giraud-Teulon, *Les origines du mariage et de la famille*, p. 43 *sqq.* Wilutzky, *op. cit.* i. 27.

Lord Avebury observes that they were highly respected at Athens, and gives instances in which high rank attached to the "Chief of the Courtesans" in the Indian city of Vesali. Moreover, "in Java we are told that the courtesans are by no means despised, and in some parts of Western Africa the negroes are stated to look on them with respect."[1] Such feelings, Lord Avebury argues, would naturally arise when the courtesans were originally fellow-countrywomen or relations, and the special wives were captives and slaves; and they would long survive the circumstances from which they sprang.[2] The courtesans are thus regarded as representatives of the communal wives of primitive times. This conclusion is particularly startling when we consider the state of culture of the chief peoples concerned. McLennan justly remarks, with reference to those "communal wives," that "if any inference is to be made from their standing in Athens, in the brilliant age of Pericles, as to the state of matters in the primitive groups, proof of primitive communism in women might as well be sought in London or Paris in our own day. Far back in the interval between savagery and the age of Pericles are the heroes of Homer, with their noble wedded wives."[3] If courtesans were respected and sought after even by the principal men in Athens, the simple reason was that they were the only educated women there. In India prostitutes are attached to temples, and, according to Dubois, are the only females who may learn to read, to sing, and to dance;[4] and it is said to be the custom for the Hindus in large towns to frequent the society of courtesans for the charm of their witty and pointed conversation.[5]

[1] Avebury, *op. cit.* p. 438 *sq.* [2] *Ibid.* p. 107.

[3] McLennan, *Studies in Ancient History*, p. 343.

[4] Dubois, *Description of the Character, Manners, and Customs of the People of India*, p. 295.

[5] Russell, *Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, iii. 379.

CHAPTER V

A CRITICISM OF THE HYPOTHESIS OF PROMISCUITY: THE *Jus Primae Noctis*

THE hypothesis of promiscuity or "communal marriage" is supposed to derive much support from certain customs which are interpreted as acts of expiation for individual marriage. In many cases, we are told, the exclusive possession of a wife could only be legally acquired by a temporary recognition of the pre-existing communal rights. As a recognition of this kind is regarded the *jus primae noctis* accorded to a priest, king, chief, or nobleman, who is then looked upon as a representative of the community after the ancient right was taken away from its male members in general.[1]

Among some of the Brazilian Indians the *jus primae noctis* is said to be granted to the medicine-man[2] or to the

[1] Bachofen, *Das Mutterrecht*, pp. 12, 13, 17, 18, &c. Avebury, *Origin of Civilisation*, p. 437 *sq.* Giraud-Teulon, *Les origines du mariage et de la famille*, pp. 32, &c. Kulischer, 'Die communale "Zeitehe" und ihre Ueberreste,' in *Archiv f. Anthrop.* xi. 223. Post, *Die Geschlechtsgenossenschaft der Urzeit*, p. 37. Wilken, 'Over de primitieve vormen van het huwelijk en den oorsprong van het gezin,' in *De Indische Gids*, 1880, vol. ii. 1196. Liebrecht, *Zur Volkskunde*. p. 423 *sq.* Wilutzky, *Vorgeschichte des Rechts*, i. 34 *sqq.* Bloch, *Sexual Life of Our Time*, p. 190. See Schmidt, 'Das Streit über das jus primae noctis,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xvi. 44 *sq.*

[2] v. Martius, *Beiträge zur Ethnographie Amerika's*, i. 113 (Juris, Passés).

chief.[1] Oviedo y Valdés states that among the Arawaks and some peoples in the province of Paria a virgin bride had to spend the first night with a *piache*, or priest.[2] In Cumana, in the present Venezuela, legitimate wives, but not concubines, were deflowered by the priests, and it was considered a great crime not to conform to this custom.[3] So also the Caribs of Cuba strictly prohibited a bridegroom from lying with the bride during the first night of their marriage. If it was a cacique that married, he invited other chiefs to lie with his bride, and if the bridegroom was a man of somewhat lower rank he invited his equals; but people of the lowest class "borrowed on this occasion the charitable cares of their caciques and of their priests."[4] In Guatemala it was customary for the high-priest to spend the first night with the bride.[5] Among the Nicaraguans, according to Andagoya, "a man whom they held as a pope, and who lived in a temple, had to sleep with the bride on the previous night";[6] whilst according to Gomara, many virgins were given to the caciques to be deflowered.[7] Castañeda de Naçera wrote in the middle of the sixteenth century that among the Tahus in the province of Culiacan, in the New Kingdom of Galicia (210 leagues west of Mexico), it was the custom for the husbands to buy the women whom they married of their fathers and relatives at a high price, and then to take them to a chief who was considered to be a priest, to deflower

[1] v. Spix and v. Martius, *Reise in Brasilien*, iii. 1182 (Jumanas), 1189 (Culinos).

[2] Oviedo y Valdés, *Historia general y natural de las Indias*, book xxiv. ch. 3, pt. ii. vol. i. 222.

[3] Gomara, 'Primera parte de la historia general de las Indias,' in *Biblioteca de autores españoles*, xxii. 206. Coreal, *Voyages aux Indes Occidentales*, i. 139 *sq.* Herrera, *General History of the West Indies*, iii. 310. Simon, *Primera parte de las Noticias historiales de las Conquistas de tierra firme en las Indias Occidentales*, iv. 26. 3, p. 320.

[4] Coreal, *op. cit.* i. 10 *sq.* Carli, *Le lettere americane*, i. 71.

[5] Herrera, *op. cit.* iii. 341.

[6] Andagoya, *Narrative of the Proceedings of Pedrarias Davila in the Province of Tierra Firme*, p. 33 *sq.* (the early part of the sixteenth century).

[7] Gomara, *loc. cit.* p. 283.

them and see if they were virgins.[1] Among the Tarahumare in modern Mexico, according to Lumholtz, "the shamans avail themselves of *jus primae noctis*."[2] Among the Kinipetu Eskimo near Hudson's Bay the same right is said to belong to the *ankut*, or priest.[3]

Among the Ballante of Senegal the king has not only the power of life and death over his subjects, but also *le droit du seigneur* everywhere in the tribe, and no girl can marry before she has been deflowered by him.[4] The same right is said to have belonged to the chief of the Bagele in Adamawa, a native kingdom in Northern Nigeria and Kamerun,[5] and, in the days of Herodotus, to the king of the Adyrmachidae, a Libyan tribe reckoned to Egypt.[6] Of some of the ancient inhabitants of the Canary Islands we are told that their chiefs had the maidenheads of all virgins that married ;[7] or, that "the night before the bride was presented to her husband, she was delivered to the Guanarteme (or king), who, if he did not chuse to lie with her himself, gave her to the Faycag (a priest or lawyer next in dignity to the king), or to some other noble person of his intimate acquaintance, to enjoy her."[8] In 1632, however, Abreu de Galindo wrote that the natives denied that such a custom ever existed among their ancestors.[9] But there are rumours of the existence of something similar among certain modern Berbers.

Two Berbers from the tribe Ath Ubâḫthi in the eastern part of Morocco, near Ujda, told me that among their neighbours, the Ath Zîḫri (Zkâra), it is the custom for the chief of

[1] Castañeda de Naçera, 'Relacion de la Jornada de Cibola,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethn.* xiv. pt. i. 448, 513 *sq.*

[2] Lumholtz, *Unknown Mexico*, i. 270.

[3] Klutschak, *Als Eskimo unter den Eskimos*, p. 234.

[4] Marche, *Trois voyages dans l'Afrique Occidentale*, p. 70.

[5] Barth, *Reisen in Nord- und Central-Afrika*, ii. 571 n.*

[6] Herodotus, iv. 168.

[7] Alvise Cadamosto, 'Delle navigationi,' in Ramusio, *Navigationi et viaggi*, i. 106. Barros, *L'Asia*, i. 12, vol. i. 24. Faria y Sousa, *Asia Portoguesa*, i. i. i. 12, vol. i. 14. Walckenaer, *Histoire générale des voyages*, i. 76.

[8] Abreu de Galindo, *History of the Discovery and Conquest of the Canary Islands*, p. 69.

[9] *Ibid.* p. 69.

the village to be secretly sent for by the bridegroom's family to have intercourse with the bride the first night, unless she be a widow or a divorced wife. They said that this is well known to all the neighbouring tribes, though denied by the Ath Zḥri themselves. This statement agrees with the information obtained by M. Mouliéras, although, according to him, the person who is said to perform the act belongs to the caste of the *rusma*, or spiritual leaders of the tribe.[1] It is impossible for me to decide whether there is any truth or not in these accounts, but they may perhaps derive some support from certain curious customs among other Berbers in Morocco,[2] as also from some statements relating to the Beni Ulîd, an Arab-speaking mountain tribe in the neighbourhood of Fez. An old man from the Ḥiâina, another tribe near Fez, told me that formerly it was the custom among them that on the evening of the day when the bride arrived at her new home the bridegroom, accompanied by members of his family and women, went to a neighbouring village to fetch from there a man to spend the first night with the bride and have intercourse with her. When they fetched him the women sang, "Rejoice O lady and continue to rejoice, and the perforator has come to you from the Beni Ulîd." According to another account given me by two Berbers from other tribes in the same part of Morocco, it was the custom among the Beni Ulîd that, if the bridegroom was not strong enough to deprive the bride of her virginity, he asked his best-man to inform his father about it and tell him to send for some man who was reputed for his virility. A messenger on horseback was despatched to fetch such a man, who was then received by the women singing a ditty similar to the one already mentioned. He was paid for his service. But the accuracy of these statements, too, is doubtful, coming as they do from neighbours, who are not always trustworthy informants.[3]

Among the Tachtadshys in Lycia there are tribes in

[1] Mouliéras, *Une tribu Zénète anti-musulmane au Maroc (les Zkara)*, p. 85 *sqq.*

[2] See Westermarck, *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco*, p. 273.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 271 *sq.*

which the religious head, called *dede*, possesses the *jus primae noctis*, even though he does not regularly exercise it, and other tribes in which he is entitled to choose any woman he likes at the yearly religious assemblies.[1] The Dusik-Kurds in the Dersim mountains south of Erzingân have every year a great feast, when the men and the married women assemble in a large room and have promiscuous intercourse. After the congregation have kissed the *chodsha*, or priest, on the hand, he cries out, "I am the great bull, not a fattened ox!" The latest married among the women, by preference one who has had her wedding on the same day, steps forward to him and says, "I am the young cow!" When she says this, the lights are extinguished and the orgies begin.[2] Among the Zikrís, an heretical Muhammadan sect in Baluchistan, the Mulla has the *jus primae noctis*, although this right can be redeemed by a small money payment to him.[3]

In the old kingdom of Cambodia, according to a Chinese account from the end of the thirteenth century, parents chose Buddhist or Taouist priests to deprive their daughters of their virginity before their marriage. This ceremony, which was called *chin-than*, was performed on a certain day once a year, which was fixed by the magistrate of the place. Each priest was allowed to deflower one girl only every year, and he was handsomely rewarded for his service. Owing to the difficulty of procuring the necessary gifts, poor girls might have to wait till their eleventh year before they could marry, whereas rich girls generally married at the age of seven to nine. But there were people who supplied poor parents with the money required for the defloration of their daughters, and this was looked upon as a meritorious deed.[4] M. Aymonier maintains that this account is too strange to

[1] Petersen and Luschan, *Reisen in Lykien, Milyas und Kibyratis*, p. 199 n. 1.

[2] Blau, 'Nachrichten über kurdische Stämme,' in *Zeitschr. Deutsch. Morgenländ. Gesellsch.* xvi. 623 *sq.*

[3] Hughes-Buller, *Census of India*, 1901, vol. v. (Baluchistan) Report, p. 45.

[4] Rémusat, *Nouveaux mélanges asiatiques*, i. 116 *sq.*

deserve credit;[1] but the existence of very similar customs among other Asiatic peoples spoils his argument.

On the coast of Malabar, Brahmans have for a long time acted as deflowerers of brides. Barthema wrote in the beginning of the sixteenth century that when the king of Calicut takes a wife he selects the most worthy and the most honoured of the Brahmans and makes him sleep the first night with his wife in order that he may deflower her. But, he says, "do not imagine that the Brahman goes willingly to perform this operation; the king is even obliged to pay him four hundred or five hundred ducats." Barthema adds that the king only, and no other person in Calicut, adopts this practice;[2] but other travellers give us different information. Hamilton, who lived in the East Indies in the latter part of the seventeenth and the earlier part of the eighteenth century, writes:—"When the Samorin marries, he must not cohabit with his bride till the Nambouric or chief priest has enjoyed her, and, if he pleases, may have three nights of her company, because the first fruits of her nuptials must be an holy oblation to the god she worships: and some of the nobles are so complaisant as to allow the clergy the same tribute; but the common people cannot have that compliment paid to them, but are forced to supply the priests' places themselves."[3] Admiral Verhoeven, who visited Calicut in 1608, also states that the brides of lords and noblemen, but not of commoners, were often deflowered by Brahmans;[4] whilst Sir Thomas Herbert, who sailed for the East Indies in 1626, says that it was formerly the custom among the Nayars that a Brahman had the first night's company with the bride, but that this practice had been wholly abrogated.[5] On the other

[1] Aymonier, *Le Cambodge*, iii. 625.

[2] de Barthema, *Itinerario nello Egypte, &c.* fol. li.a. *Travels of Ludovico di Varthema*, p. 140.

[3] Hamilton, 'New Account of the East Indies,' in Pinkerton, *Collection of Voyages*, viii. 374.

[4] Verhoeven, *Kurtze Beschreibung einer Reyse in die Ost Indien*, p. 56.

[5] Herbert, *Travels into Divers parts of Africa, and Asia the Great*, p. 337.

hand, we are told by Mandelsloe, who stayed there a few years later (1638-1639), that the Brahmans of Malabar were held in such veneration that they had the first fruits of all the brides, and that the richer people invited them to perform this task with very considerable presents.[1] According to Roggewein, the Brahmans had introduced into Cochin the custom that when any man married he was absolutely forbidden to sleep with his wife the first night, and that this function was to be performed in his stead by one of the Brahmans or, if there were none, by some other man.[2] And various other writers state in a general way that among the inhabitants of Cochin or Malabar it was the custom for Brahmans to deflower the brides.[3] But in several accounts of extra-matrimonial defloration of brides in Malabar no mention at all is made of Brahmans.[4] Lopez de Castanheda states of the sisters of the Samorin and other kings of Malabar that when any of them reaches the age of ten their kindred send for a young man of the Nayar, or military, caste out of the kingdom, and give him presents to induce him to deprive the young virgin of her maidenhood;[5] and in another early Portuguese account it is said that when a Nayar woman has two or three young daughters she, for the same purpose, chooses a Nayar for each of them.[6] According to Navarette's

[1] 'Remarks and Observations made by J. A. de Mandelsloe, in his Passage through several Countries of the Indies,' in Harris, *Navigantium atque Itinerantium Bibliotheca*, i. 767.

[2] Roggewein, 'Account of Commodore Roggewein's Expedition for the Discovery of Southern Lands,' in Harris, *op. cit.* i. 297.

[3] Balbi, *Viaggio dell' Indie Orientali*, foll. 75b, 137a. Schouten, *Ost-Indische Reyse*, p. 168. Sonnerat, *Voyage aux Indes Orientales*, i. 68. Guyon, *New History of the East-Indies*, i. 431. de Gubernatis, *Memoria intorno ai viaggiatori italiani nelle Indie Orientali dal secolo XIII a tutto il XVI*, p. 137. See also Gaya, *Ceremonies nuptiales de toutes les nations*, p. 56 *sq.*

[4] See *infra*, i. 184 *sqq.*

[5] Lopez de Castanheda, *Historia do descobrimento e conquista da India pelos Portugueses*, i. 45.

[6] 'Sommario di tutti li regni, città, & popoli orientali,' in Ramusio, *op. cit.* i. (1563) 331 D.

description, from the latter part of the seventeenth century, persons who were acquainted with the coast of Malabar said "that when some Persons marry'd, the Husband carry'd his Wife before he had to do with her himself, to the King, who kept her eight Days in his Palace, making use of her at his pleasure; and that time being expir'd, the Man came for his Wife, taking it as a great Honour and Favour that his King would make use of her. In other places they carry them to the Temples of the Idolatrous Priests, and left them there the same number of Days to the same purpose."[1] Admiral Jakob van Neck states that when one of the great lords of Goa married, it was the custom for him to take his bride to the sovereign and ask him to sleep with her for the first three nights.[2]

The Bhutanese, in the eastern part of the Himalayas, according to Mr. Claude White, "follow certain curious customs, such as the right of the head man when girls marry"; but, he adds, "this is being put a stop to by the present Tongsa."[3] The ruin of the ancient city of Harappa, in the Punjab, is ascribed by the people to the vengeance of God on its governor, "who claimed certain privileges on the marriage of every couple in his city, and in the course of his sensualities, was guilty of incest."[4] In his book on the tribes of the Hindu-Kush, Major Biddulph wrote in 1880 with reference to the people of Hunza, who have only the laxest form of Muhammadanism, "The *droit du seigneur* was exercised by the father of the present ruler, and though the custom has been allowed to fall into disuse, it is evident from the accounts given of weekly orgies held by Ghazan Khan that the right is only held in abeyance and not formally renounced."[5] From ancient Arabia we have the story of king 'Amlīq of Tasm, who compelled the subject

[1] Navarette, 'Account of the Empire of China,' in Churchill, *Collection of Voyages and Travels*, i. 320.

[2] van Neck, quoted by Schmidt, *Jus primae noctis*, p. 312.

[3] White, *Sikhim and Bhutan*, p. 13.

[4] Burnes, *Travels into Bokhara*, iii. 137.

[5] Biddulph, *Tribes of the Hindoo Koosh*, p. 77.

tribe of Djadīs to take to him every bride before she had connection with her husband.[1] And according to another story, the last king of Saba, by name Sharahbil, allowed no girl in his country to marry without being deflowered by him.[2]

It has been a widespread popular belief that a *droit du seigneur* existed in feudal times in Europe, and it is said that in some places a similar right was accorded to the clergy.[3] The existence of such rights has also been reported by historians. Thus old writers on the history of Scotland tell us that King Evenus III., contemporary with Augustus, made a law by which he and his successors in the throne were authorised to lie with every bride, if a woman of quality, before her husband could approach her; and in consequence of this law the great men of the nation had a power of the same kind over the brides of their vassals and servants. The law was strictly observed throughout the kingdom, and was only discontinued or repealed more than ten whole centuries afterwards, when the importunities of St. Margaret prevailed with her husband, Malcolm Cammor (or Canmore), to abolish this unjustifiable custom. From that time forward, the vassal or servant was allowed to redeem the first night of his bride by paying a tax in money, which was called *mercheta mulierum*.—The story was first told by Boece, or Boethius,[4] and subsequently repeated by other historians.[5] It was also referred to by an Italian writer living at the beginning of the seventeenth century, Bonifacio Vannozzi, who asserted that a similar custom

[1] Abulfeda, *Historia anteislamica*, p. 182 *sq.* Rasmussen, *Historia præcipuorum Arabum regnorum*, p. 81 *sq.* Caussin de Perceval, *Essai sur l'histoire des Arabes*, i. 28 *sq.* See also Wellhausen, 'Die Ehe bei den Arabern,' in *Nachrichten d. Königl. Gesellsch. d. Wissensch. zu Göttingen*, 1893, p. 464.

[2] Weil, *Biblische Legenden der Muselmänner*, p. 253.

[3] Schmidt, *Jus primae noctis*, p. 43 *sqq.*

[4] Boethius, *Scotorum historiae a prima gentis origine*, book iii. fol. 34 b *sq.*

[5] Leslie, *De origine moribus, et rebus gestis Scotorum*, p. 96. Buchanan, *Rerum Scoticarum historia*, foll. 31 b, 64 a. Mackenzie, *Lives and Characters of the most Eminent Writers of the Scots Nation*, i. 132.

formerly existed in Piedmont, and that a cardinal of the house of Rovere had told him how he himself had burned a charter conveying to his house the privilege of deflowering the brides whom their vassals married. This story afterwards obtained currency through Bayle, who retold it in his great Dictionary.[1] In Russia landlords were said to claim this right as late as in the nineteenth century.[2]

On the other hand, the existence of a *droit du seigneur* in any form in Europe has been eagerly disputed.[3] In the middle of the eighteenth century this was done by Grupen, who reviewed the materials then available, beginning with Lactantius' statement [4] that the Emperor Maximinus did not allow any marriage to take place without his consent so that he should be able to be the *praegustator* at the wedding.[5] A century later Veuillot tried to explain away the chief evidence on which the popular view of the subject was based ;[6] and subsequently Dr. Karl Schmidt in a very learned work, after a penetrating discussion of the whole question, arrived at the conclusion that the belief in the *droit du seigneur* was nothing but "ein gelehrter Aberglaube." The law, he says, which is believed to have extended over a large part of Europe, has left no evidence of its existence in law-books, charters, decretals, trials, or glossaries.[7] In the latter part of the eighteenth century the Scotch story connected with the mythical King Evenus III. was denounced as unhistorical by Macpherson[8] and Lord Hailes.[9] And of

[1] Bayle, *Dictionnaire historique et critique*, xiii. 335, 'Sixte IV.'

[2] Schmidt, *op. cit.* p. 221.

[3] For opinions in favour of and against the existence of such a right see Schmidt, *op. cit.* p. 1 *sqq.* ; *Idem*, 'Das Streit über das jus primae noctis,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xvi. 19 *sqq.*

[4] Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum*, 38 (Migne, *Patrologiae cursus*, vii. 255).

[5] Grupen, *De uxore theotisca*, p. 1 *sqq.*

[6] Veuillot, *Le droit du seigneur au moyen âge, passim.*

[7] Schmidt, *Jus primae noctis*, pp. 379, &c.

[8] Macpherson, *Critical Dissertations on the Origin, &c. of the Antient Caledonians*, p. 175 *sqq.*

[9] Lord Hailes (Sir David Dalrymple), *Annals of Scotland*, vol. iii. Appendix I., 'Of the Law of Evenus, and the *Mercheta mulierum*,' p. 1 *sqq.*

the alleged *droit du seigneur* in Russia Alexander Herzen wrote that no such right ever existed there, and that if the law were put in execution it would punish with the same severity the violation of a female serf as that of a free woman. Yet he admits that it was an easy matter for a landlord to outrage the daughters and wives of his serfs with impunity.[1]

The belief in a mediæval *jus primae noctis* has been traced to two main sources. One is the so-called *marchet* or *merchet*, a fine paid by a vassal to his lord on the marriage of his, the tenant's, daughter, which has been misinterpreted as a pecuniary commutation for a former right claimed by a feudal lord of sleeping with his vassal's daughter on their wedding night. Lord Hailes gave the following explanation of this fine, as existing in old Scots law :—" Persons of low rank, residing on an estate, were generally either *ascripti glebae*, or were subjected to some species of servitude similar to that of the *ascripti glebae*. On that estate they were bound to reside, and to perform certain services to the lord. As women necessarily followed the residence of their husbands, the consequence was, that when a woman of that rank married a stranger, the lord was deprived of that part of his *live stock*. He would not submit to this loss, without requiring indemnification; at first, the sum paid by the father of the young woman would nearly amount to an

[1] Herzen, *Le peuple russe et le socialisme. Lettre à M. J. Michelet*, p. 38. I have to thank Mr. S. Rapoport for referring me to this pamphlet.—How Russian landlords might behave before the emancipation of the serfs is shown in an article named Записки сельскаго священника (' Notes of a Country Clergyman ') in Русская Старина (' Russian Antiquity,' xxvii. 63, 77), where it is said of one of them : " Often N. I——tsh would stroll late in the evening about his village to admire the prosperous condition of his peasants ; he would stop at some cottage, look in at the window, and tap on the pane with his finger. This tapping was well known to everybody, and in a moment the best-looking woman of the family went out to him." Another landlord, whenever he visited his estate, demanded from the manager, immediately after his arrival, a list of all the grown-up girls. " Then," the author continues, " the master took to his service each of the girls for three or four days, and as soon as the list was finished, he went off to another village. This occurred regularly every year."

estimated indemnification; and as the *villains* were grievously under the power of their lord, it would be often exorbitant and oppressive. In process of time, the lord would discover, that as the young women of his estate were exported, the young men of his estate would import others; so that, upon the whole, no great prejudice could arise from *extra-territorial marriages*. Hence the indemnification would be converted into a small pecuniary composition, acknowledging the old usage, and the right of the master. As the intrinsic and marketable value of money decreased, this stated composition would be gradually omitted out of terriers and rent-rolls, or would be thrown into the aggregate sum of rent."[1] As to the *merchet* in English law a similar suggestion has been made by Maitland, namely, that the idea at the root of it was "much rather that of preserving the live stock on the manor than that of a *jus primae noctis*." He points out that the *merchet* was often higher for marriage out of the manor than for marriage within the manor; that fines for marrying sons out of the manor were not unknown; and that "the *merchet* is often mentioned in close connection with a prohibition against giving sons a clerical education—an education which would enable them to take orders and so escape from bondage."[2]

As another proof of the existence of a *jus primae noctis* has been regarded the fee which a husband had to pay to his bishop or other ecclesiastical authority for the privilege of sleeping with his wife on the first night or nights of their marriage. Thus we are told that Philip VI. and Charles VI. in the fourteenth century made vain efforts to induce the Bishops of Amiens to give up the old custom of demanding from every newly married couple in their town and diocese a considerable fine for granting them permission to have conjugal intercourse during the first three nights of their marriage.[3] But it is perfectly obvious that the fee was meant,

[1] Lord Hailes, *op. cit.* iii. 12 *sq.*

[2] Maitland, in a letter quoted by Frazer, *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament*, i. 487 *sq.*

[3] Sugenheim, *Geschichte der Aufhebung der Leibeigenschaft und Hörigkeit in Europa*, p. 104.

not as compensation for the relinquishment of a right accorded to the ecclesiastical authority, but as payment for a dispensation. The Catholic Church had prescribed that newly married couples should observe chastity on their wedding night or, with special reference to the example set by Tobias and Sarah, even during the first three nights ;[1] and in time the clergy found it expedient to mitigate the rigour of the canon and to grant husbands the right of lying with their own wives on the first night of marriage, provided that they paid a moderate fee for the privilege. "This," says Sir James G. Frazer, "was the true *jus primae noctis*, a right accorded, not to a licentious feudal superior, but to a woman's lawful husband."[2]

Yet even though the fine or fee paid to the feudal lord or the ecclesiastical authority has been grossly misinterpreted, there must have been some reason for the misinterpretation. It is not easy to see how the idea of a *jus primae noctis* could have entered the heads of the people if there had not been some tradition of such a right ; travellers' tales from distant parts of the world could hardly account for an idea of this sort. Dr. Pfannenschmid has pointed out that the belief

[1] See *infra*, on Marriage Rites.

[2] Frazer, *op. cit.* i. 501. In the middle of the eighteenth century the Dutch historian van Loon suggested that the *merchet* had a similar origin. He writes (*Beschryving der aloude Regeeringwyze van Holland*, iii. 165 *sqq.*) :—"In the fourth council of Carthage, held in the year 398, it was ordained that all new-married persons, out of respect for the sacerdotal benediction, *eadem nocte in virginitate permaneant*. This species of continence was not only enforced by the general constitutions of the Kings of the Franks, but also prolonged for three nights, after the example of Tobias. . . . Nevertheless, when, about the beginning of the twelfth century, the office of judges in the tribunal of a hundred (*centenae*) had become hereditary, instead of elective, as in the days of the Kings of the Franks, and when in the following century, the jurisdiction of the Counts (*Graven*) became feudal, the ancient constitutions of these Kings, touching the abstinence for three nights, &c., were neglected by the new Lords of the country ; and, if they were not totally abolished, at least the redemption of this inconvenient custom was permitted ; just as in Brabant at this day persons newly betrothed are permitted to purchase an exemption from their bans thrice proclaimed."

in the seignorial privilege has been found especially in districts and places which have been inhabited for long by a celtic or partly pro-celtic population, and thinks that it hints at an ancient right, even though a *jus primae noctis* in the traditional sense of the term has not existed in the Middle Ages.[1] In support of this suggestion I wish to draw attention not only to the legendary statements of old Scottish historians but, in particular, to ancient Irish documents. In the description of the battle of Gabhra, fought A.D. 283, we read that Cairbre, the son of Art, had a fair, mild-eyed, and modest daughter, whom the son of the king or lord of the Decies came to seek as his wife. But when Fionn and the Fenians of Ireland heard of this, they dispatched messengers to Cairbre to remind him to pay the tribute consisting of twenty ounces of gold or the right of cohabiting with the princess the night previous to her marriage.[2] In the old Irish manuscript 'The Book of Leinster,' which was compiled in part about the middle of the twelfth century, it is said that great honour was bestowed on Conchobar, King of Ulster, who lived at the time when Christ was born; for every man who had a marriageable daughter let her sleep the first night with him.[3] In another manuscript, 'Leabhar na h-Uidhri,' which contains a collection of pieces in the Irish language compiled about A.D. 1100, it is likewise stated that the same king deflowered all the virgins of Ulster; and it is indicated that the defloration of maidens even was a duty incumbent upon him.[4] This suggests that we have here to do, not with a mere privilege exacted by a ruler, but with a custom rooted in some popular idea similar to those found in other parts of

[1] Pfannenschmid, 'Jus primae noctis,' in *Das Ausland*, lvi. 150.

[2] O'Kearney, *Battle of Gabhra*, pp. 135, 137.

[3] *Book of Leinster*, p. 106, col. 2; *cf.* Atkinson's Introduction, p. 27. A translation is given by Schmidt, in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xvi. 50. See also d'Arbois de Jubainville, 'Le droit du roi dans l'épopée irlandaise,' in *Revue archéologique*, xlii. 332; *Idem, L'épopée celtique en Irlande*, i. 7, 29 n. 1.

[4] *Leabhar na h-Uidhri*, p. 127, col. 1. See Schmidt, in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xvi. 50; d'Arbois de Jubainville, in *Revue archéologique*, xlii. 333 *sq.*

the world in connection with the defloration of brides or maidens.

A very recent instance of the *jus primae noctis* in Europe is reported from Albania. Mr. Brailsford wrote in 1903:— "For a certain sum paid annually, an Albanian chief will undertake to protect a tributary village, or if the village is outside the Albanian sphere of influence, it is generally obliged to have its own resident brigands, who may or may not be Albanians. If the village belongs to a Turkish landlord, these men are generally chosen from among his retainers. They are known under the name of *bekchi*, or rural guards. . . . The rural guard exacts a substantial ransom in cash for his services. He levies certain traditional dues, *e.g.*, blackmail upon every maid who marries. The sum varies with the ability of her father and her husband to pay, and in default of payment, the *bekchi* will exercise the *jus primae noctis*." [1]

We shall now consider how the facts stated may be explained. Before we are entitled to assume that the *jus primae noctis* accorded to a priest or a headman is a survival of ancient communal rights we must investigate whether it may be accounted for by feelings or ideas existing among peoples who recognise such a right or are addicted to practices of a kindred nature. This is the method which should be adopted in the study of any custom, and is particularly called for in a case like the present one where a custom is used as evidence for the existence of a previous state which is itself entirely hypothetical.

The first fact that attracts our attention is a frequent reluctance on the part of the bridegroom to deflower the bride, or to do so in the manner indicated by nature. Dr. Rivet writes of the Jíbaros in Ecuador, "Suivant certains informateurs indiens, le fiancé ouvrirait le vagin de sa femme à l'aide d'os préparés pour cet usage, de façon à la rendre apte au coït." [2] Among the natives at Alice Springs in Central Australia the husband sometimes performs the

[1] Brailsford, 'The Macedonian Revolt,' in *Fortnightly Review*, N.S. lxxiv. 431 *sq.*

[2] Rivet, 'Les Indiens Jibaros,' in *L'Anthropologie*, xviii. 607.

same operation with a stick after he has taken his new wife to his own camp.[1] In Samoa, as we have seen, public defloration of the bride is a regular feature of the wedding ritual, the bridegroom performing it with his fore-finger.[2] A very similar practice exists in Egypt. In his description of that country, dating from 1840, Clot-Bey wrote :—" Le mari déflore l'épousée avec le doigt indicateur de la main droite, enveloppé d'un mouchoir de mousseline blanche. . . . Le mouchoir, teint du sang de la jeune victime, est présenté aux parents, qui la félicitent de sa chasteté et témoignent hautement leur joie. Cette preuve sanglante de la pureté de l'épouse est présentée ensuite aux invités de la noce."[3] Mr. El-Bakry, a native of Egypt, tells me that this is still true of the *fellaḥīn* of his country.

In other cases girls are artificially deflowered before marriage by somebody else than their future husband. Among the Sakalava of Madagascar " les jeunes filles se défloront elles-mêmes quand elles n'ont pas été déflorées dès leur bas âge par leur mère, et un père ne marie jamais sa fille avant que cette opération ait été menée à bonne fin par l'une ou par l'autre. Les princesses seules restent intactes."[4] In some provinces of ancient Peru, when a girl was sought in marriage, she was brought out in public and, in presence of the relations who had made the contract, her mother deflowered her with her own hand, to show to all present the proof of the care that had been taken of her.[5] Among the Kamchadal a man blamed his mother-in-law if he found his wife to be a virgin ; hence her mother deflowered her in her early youth.[6] In

[1] Gillen, ' Notes on some Manners and Customs of the Aborigines of the McDonnell Ranges belonging to the Arunta Tribe,' in *Report on the Work of the Horn Scientific Expedition to Central Australia*, iv. 165.

[2] Krämer, *Die Samoa-Inseln*, i. 36 *sqq.*

[3] Clot-Bey, *Aperçu général sur l'Égypte*, ii. 44.

[4] Noel, ' Ile de Madagascar,' in *Bulletin de la Société de Géographie*, ser. ii. vol. xx. 294.

[5] Garcilasso de la Vega, *First Part of the Royal Commentaries of the Yncas*, i. 59. Cieza de Leon, ' La Crónica del Perú [parte primera],' in *Biblioteca de autores españoles*, xxvi. 402.

[6] Steller, *Beschreibung von dem Lande Kamtschatka*, p. 346.

the Philippine Islands old women often performed the same operation on young girls.[1] Among the Jatt of Baluchistan an old woman privately deflowers the bride with a razor a few hours previous to consummation, and it is believed that consummation is the only permanent cure for the wound.[2] Among the Wamegi in Central Africa "the girls are deflowered by certain old women."[3] Among the Wayao in British Central Africa they are taken away to the bush by elderly women to be initiated, and the initiation ceremonies comprise, it is said, "a forcible *vaginae dilatatio* by mechanical means, an operation which the girls are enjoined to bear bravely. At the same time they are told that it must be followed by cohabitation with a man. This is regarded by the Yao as a necessity to render the girl marriageable before the age of puberty. The girls and their mothers believe that if after these initiation ceremonies nisi cum mare coitus fiet they will die or at any rate will not bear children when eventually married. Pater puellæ virum robustum (sæpe attamen senem) legit atque ei pecuniam dat ut puellæ virginitatem adimat. Hoc ante pubertatem fieri necesse, ne coitum conceptio sequatur."[4] In many Australian tribes the girls are artificially deflowered by other men than their future husbands,[5] and, as we shall see subsequently, the defloration is followed by sexual intercourse.

Among various peoples young women or girls are deflowered by extra-matrimonial intercourse in circumstances which clearly show that the act by no means implies the exercise of a right on the part of him who performs it, but is an operation which the husband is anxious to

[1] Mallat, *Les Philippines*, i. 61.

[2] Bray, *Census of India*, 1911, vol. iv. (Baluchistan) Report, p. 106.

[3] Roscoe, 'Notes on the Manners and Customs of the Baganda,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxi. 121.

[4] Johnston, *British Central Africa*, p. 410.

[5] Hill, quoted by Miklucho-Maclay, 'Über die Mika-Operation in Central-Australien,' in *Verhandl. Berliner Gesellsch. Anthr.* 1880, p. 89 (natives of New South Wales). Gason, 'Of the Tribes, Dieyerie, &c.,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxiv. 169. *Infra*, i. 200 *sqq.*

avoid. In Azimba Land, in Central Africa, when an unmarried girl is "danced," or initiated, her father "has to hire a man to sleep with his daughter the night after she is 'danced' and to deflower her 'Ka chatoa massita' (take away fat). To this man he has to pay one fowl, one bowl of flour, and a small bowl of beer, and after the girl has slept with this man, she is supposed to have no future intercourse with him."[1] Among the tribes near Fort Johnston in British Central Africa "a virgin on her marriage is 'broken' by a friend of the bridegroom before the latter cohabits with her. The friend is said 'to eat new things'—*Kudia ujobvu*."[2] In New Caledonia, "lorsqu'un mari ne peut ou ne veut déflorer sa femme, il se trouve, en payant, certains individus qui s'en acquittent à sa place. Ce sont des *perceurs* attitrés."[3] In the Philippine Islands also, there were at the time of their discovery men who had for their employment to take away the virginity of damsels and who were paid for doing so, since virginity in a girl was looked upon as a hindrance to her marriage;[4] but these professionals seem to have disappeared in the course of the seventeenth century.[5] Among the Todas of the Nilgiris, in Southern India, a man of strong physique, who may belong to any clan except that of the girl, "comes and stays in the village for one night and has intercourse with the girl. This must take place before puberty, and it seemed that there were few things regarded as more disgraceful than that this ceremony should be delayed till after this period. It might be a subject of reproach and abuse for the remainder of the woman's life, and it was even said that men might refuse to marry her if this ceremony had not been performed at the proper time."[6]

[1] Angus, 'The "Chensamwali" or Initiation Ceremony of Girls, as performed in Azimba Land,' in *Verhandl. Berliner Gesellsch. Anthr.* 1898, p. 481.

[2] Stannus, 'Notes on some Tribes of British Central Africa,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xl. 309.

[3] Moncelon, in *Bull. Soc. d'Anthr. Paris*, ser. iii. vol. ix. 368.

[4] Morga, *Philippine Islands*, p. 304 *sq.* Mallat, *op. cit.* i. 61.

[5] Gemelli-Careri, *Giro del mondo*, v. 87. Hertz, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, p. 198.

[6] Rivers, *Todas*, p. 503.

We have seen that the defloration of girls in Malabar is spoken of by various writers as a right belonging to the Brahmans; but other authorities, whose accounts date from the beginning of the sixteenth century, represent it in a very different light. Alvares Cabral states that the Nayar women beg the men to deprive them of their virginity, since they can find no husbands as long as they remain virgins;[1] and according to Barbosa, the mother likewise asks some young men to deflower her daughter, because the Nayars hold it an unclean thing and almost a disgrace to deflower women.[2] Hieronimo di Santo Stefano wrote of them at the close of the fifteenth century that "the men never marry any woman who is a virgin; but if one, being a virgin, is betrothed, she is delivered over before the nuptials to some other person for fifteen or twenty days in order that she may be deflowered."[3] It seems probable that the *tali kettu*, or mock marriage ceremony, existing among the Nayars and some other castes of the same tract is a relic of such pre-nuptial defloration. Every girl among them, before she arrives at maturity, is subject to this rite, the essential incident of which consists in the nominal husband tying a *tali*, or tiny plate of gold, round her neck. Having played his part in the ritual and received the customary fee, the man goes his way; he has no conjugal rights over the girl, nay in some places at least the fact that he has tied the *tali* round her neck constitutes an insurmountable barrier to his becoming her husband in later life.[4]

[1] 'Navigation del captino Pedro Alvares,' in Ramusio, *op. cit.* i. 137.

[2] Barbosa, *Description of the Coasts of East Africa and Malabar in the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century*, p. 126.

[3] *Account of the Journey of Hieronimo di Santo Stefano*, p. 5.

[4] Gopal Panikkar, *Malabar and its Folk*, p. 143. Mary Billington, *Woman in India*, p. 80. Among the Kammālans, or artisan classes, in the Cochin State, however, "if the *tali* tier of a girl wishes to keep her as wife, he has the preference to anybody else, and to none else may she be given without his consent" (Anantha Krishna Iyer, *Cochin Tribes and Castes*, i. 346). Mr. Gait says (*Census of India*, 1911, vol. i. [India] Report, p. 242) that "in some parts the bridegroom is considered to have some sort of claim to the girl and may afterwards enter into *sambandham* (that is, actual marriage) with

Various theories have been suggested to explain this ceremony.[1] Sir Henry Winterbotham has expressed the opinion that it is a relic from the time when the Malabar Brahmans were entitled to the first fruits and it was considered the high privilege of every Nayar maid to be introduced by them to womanhood.[2] To this the objection has been made[3] that the rite is also performed among castes of a lower status with whose women no Brahman would cohabit, and that in the earliest accounts of it there is no mention of Brahmans being employed as "bridegrooms," although at present Nayar girls often have the *tali* tied round their neck by some elderly Brahman.[4] This, however, does not prevent the *tali kettu* ceremony from being a survival of the defloration of girls which, according to so many accounts, was once customary among the Nayars, but, as we have seen, was not necessarily performed by Brahmans. In his description of the defloration of the king's sister by a young man of the Nayar caste Castanheda expressly connects it with a *tali*-tying ceremony: after the act is done the young man hangs a jewel round the woman's neck, and this she wears all the rest of her life, as a sign that she is now at liberty to dispose of herself to anyone she pleases as long as she lives, because without this ceremony nobody can take a husband.[5] According to another early Portuguese account, referred to above, the Nayar who deflowers a girl of his own caste spends with her four days, and as a token of the defloration hangs round her neck a so-called *quete* made of gold.[6] Barbosa, whose description

her." For the *tali kettu* ceremony in general see Risley, *People of India*, p. 209; Gait, *op. cit.* p. 242; Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, p. 121 *sqq.*; Anantha Krishna Iyer, *op. cit.* ii. 22 *sqq.*

[1] See Risley, *op. cit.* p. 209; Gait, *op. cit.* p. 242; Anantha Krishna Iyer, *op. cit.* ii. 27 *sqq.*

[2] Moore, *Malabar Law and Custom*, p. 70.

[3] Gait, *op. cit.* p. 242.

[4] Moore, *op. cit.* p. 70. Gait, *op. cit.* p. 242.

[5] Lopez de Castanheda, *op. cit.* i. 45 *sq.*

[6] 'Sommario di tutti li regni, &c. orientali,' in Ramusio, *op. cit.* i. (1563) 331_D.

dates from the same age, is less positive. He says that when a Nayar girl becomes ten or twelve years old or more her mother begs some relation or friend to marry her daughter. The bridegroom puts a small gold jewel round the girl's neck, "which she always has to wear as a sign that she may now do what she pleases," and goes then away without touching her, "on account of being her relation." But if he is not so, "he may remain with her if he wish it, but he is not bound to do so if he do not desire it. And from that time forward the mother goes begging some young men to deflower that daughter."[1] Even according to this account there is a connection between the tying of the *tali* and the defloration of the girl, although they may, and, if the *tali*-tier is a relative, must, be performed by different men. Buchanan, who visited Malabar at a much later date—in 1800—wrote:—"The Nairs marry before they are ten years of age, in order that the girl may not be deflowered by the regular operations of nature; but the husband never afterwards cohabits with his wife. Such a circumstance, indeed, would be considered as very indecent."[2] About half a century later Graul informs us that the man who ties the *tali* round the girl's neck then spends four nights with her, and on the fifth morning receives a present from her uncle or brother, after which he goes away; but if he is a semi-Brahman—which is looked upon as a special honour—his connection with the girl ceases already at the moment he has tied the *tali*.[3] It seems that even now the *tali*-tying ceremony is in some cases, for instance, with the Paduvals, followed by a mock consummation; and the Izhavans, or Tiyyans, of Cochin allow or allowed not long ago the *tali kettu* bridegroom to spend several days in the bride's house.[4] It has also been observed that the ritual resembles in certain respects that which is used for the consecration of a *deva-dāsi*, or

[1] Barbosa, *op. cit.* p. 124 *sqq.*

[2] Buchanan, 'Journey from Madras,' in Pinkerton, *Collection of Voyages and Travels*, viii. 737.

[3] Graul, *Reise nach Ostindien*, iii. 337.

[4] Anantha Krishna Iyer, *op. cit.* i. 287 *sq.*

temple prostitute.[1] If the hypothesis which I am here advocating is correct, the object of tying the *tali* round the girl's neck may be explained as a means of protection or purification rendered necessary by the act of defloration, which, as Barbosa says, was held to be "an unclean thing."[2] To this day it is considered a religious impurity for a girl to attain puberty before the performance of this ceremony.[3]

In some cases the defloration is performed by a foreigner. Verhoeven states that when a lord or nobleman in Calicut marries, he hires either a Brahman or a white man to spend the first night with the bride and pays him about four or five hundred florins for doing so.[4] Speaking of the Cochin custom according to which a bride is deflowered by one of the Brahmans or if there be none at hand by some other man, Roggewein adds that "this was formerly a very considerable advantage to such foreigners as were settled here, the Malabars making choice of them, rather than their own countrymen; and on such occasions they made very large presents, which sometimes amounted to 500 or 600 florins: but, of late days, this source is quite dried up; for the Bramins are become so very religious, that they take care never to be out of the way when this part of their duty is to be performed."[5] The inhabitants of Malacca, according to Olearius, were fond of foreigners and even begged them to sleep the first night with their brides to deprive the latter of their virginity.[6] Barthema observes that the king of Tenasserim let his wife be deflowered by a white man, either a Christian or a Moor, and not, like the king of Calicut, by a Brahman; and he illustrates this by the personal experience of his party.[7] Barthema's English

[1] Gait, *op. cit.* p. 242. Risley, *op. cit.* p. 209. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes*, p. 121. See also Francis, *Census of India*, 1901, vol. xv. (Madras) Report, p. 151; Thyagaraja Aiyar, *Census of India*, 1911, vol. xxi. (Mysore) Report, p. 99.

[2] Barbosa, *op. cit.* p. 126. [3] Anantha Krishna Iyer, *op. cit.* ii. 22.

[4] Verhoeven, *op. cit.* p. 56. [5] Roggewein, *loc. cit.* p. 297.

[6] Olearius, in Mandelsloe, *Morgenländische Reise-Beschreibung*, p. 144. See also Francisci, *Neu-polirter Geschicht- Kunst- und Sitten-Spiegel ausländischer Völcker*, p. 937.

[7] Barthema, *Itinerario nello Egypto, &c.* fol. lxviii.

translator adds that the prevalence of a similar custom in the Burmese provinces is confirmed by writers of a later date, and that evidence is not wanting of its existence up to a very recent period.[1] Van Linschoten, who sailed for India in 1583, writes that in the kingdom of Pegu, "when any gentleman or nobleman will marrie with a maide, hee goeth to séeke [one of his friendes, or] a straunger [and entreateth him to lie with] his bride the first night of their mariage, and to take her maydenhead from her, which he esteemeth as a great pleasure and honour [done unto him], that another man wold take upon him to ease him of so much payne. This custome is not onely used among the Gentlemen and chiefe nobilitie of the lande, but by the King himselfe."[2] Of the inhabitants of Aracan in the eighteenth century Richard says:—"Virginity is not an esteemed virtue with them. Husbands prefer running the risk of fathering the children of others, rather than marry a novice. It is generally Dutch sailors who are liberally paid for this infamous prostitution."[3] We have previously spoken of the Tibetan custom mentioned by Marco Polo of old women taking their unmarried daughters or other girls related to them to strangers who were passing, and making them over to whomsoever would accept them.[4]

Among certain peoples it is said to be the custom for a father to deflower his daughter.[5] This has been represented as a right belonging to him. Herport wrote in the latter part of the seventeenth century that when a Sinhalese gave his daughter in marriage, he first slept with her himself on the plea of having a right to the first fruit of the tree he had planted.[6] Miklucho-Maclay was told that among the Orang Sakai of the Malay Peninsula the fathers of grown-up daughters claimed for themselves the *jus primae noctis;*

[1] Jones, in *Travels of Ludovico di Varthema*, p. lxxix.

[2] *Voyage of J. H. van Linschoten to the East Indies*, i. 99.

[3] Richard, 'History of Tonquin,' in Pinkerton, *op. cit.* ix. 760 *sq.*

[4] Marco Polo, *Kingdoms and Marvels of the East*, ii. 44. *Supra*, p. 162.

[5] See Schmidt, *Liebe und Ehe im alten und modernen Indien*, p. 227 (Alfoors of Tonsawang in Minahassa, some Battas).

[6] Herport, *Ost-Indianische Reiss-Beschreibung*, p. 178 *sq.*

and he heard of the existence of the same custom in the Eastern Moluccas.[1] It is difficult, however, to believe that the custom in question really represents a right claimed by the father. His intercourse with the daughter more probably serves the object of making her acceptable to her husband.[2]

Why is a bridegroom reluctant to have intercourse with a virgin bride? One answer which has been given to this question is that he shuns the trouble.[3] This explanation gains some support from statements made by a few first-hand authorities,[4] but can at most have only a very limited application. The chief reason for his reluctance is no doubt superstitious fear.[5] Among the Yahgans of Tierra del Fuego, if the husband wants to continue to eat the flesh of the guanaco or the seal, he must on the morning after the consummation of his marriage purify himself by bathing in the sea, which in many cases, especially in the winter, makes him ill.[6] The Nayars, as we have seen, hold defloration to be polluting.[7] In the most popular mediæval book of travel, 'The Voiage and Travaile of Sir John Maundeville,' which was composed soon after the middle of the fourteenth century, we read of an island in the Far East where it is the custom for the bridegroom not to spend the first night with the bride but to make another man do so and reward him

[1] Miklucho-Maclay, 'Ethnological Excursions in the Malay Peninsula,' in *Jour. Straits Branch Roy. Asiatic Soc.* no. 2, p. 216.

[2] *Cf.* Hertz, *op. cit.* p. 218; Ploss-Bartels, *Das Weib*, i. 691.

[3] Francisci, *op. cit.* p. 936. Virey, *De la femme sous ses rapports physiologique, moral et littéraire*, p. 165 *sq.*

[4] van Linschoten, *op. cit.* i. 99. Hill, quoted by Miklucho-Maclay, in *Verhandl. Berliner Gesellsch. Anthr.* 1880, p. 89. Roth, *Ethnological Studies among the North-West-Central Queensland Aborigines*, p. 175.

[5] *Cf.* Rosenbaum, *Geschichte der Lustseuche im Alterthume*, i. 54; Hertz, *op. cit.* p. 211 *sqq.*; Ploss-Bartels, *op. cit.* i. 691; Crawley, *Mystic Rose*, p. 348 *sq.*

[6] Bove, *Patagonia. Terra del Fuoco. Mari Australi*, p. 132.

[7] *Supra*, p. 187. Among the Nattu Malayans, a jungle tribe in the Cochin State, "a girl who has reached the age of puberty as a virgin is considered impure, and no person will take her for wife" (Anantha Krishna Iyer, *op. cit.* i. 32).

with money and thanks. In every town there are such men, whose sole occupation is to deflower brides, and in consequence are called, in the language of the country, "Cadeberiz, that is to seyne, the Foles of Wanhope. For thei of the Contree holden it so gret a thing and so perilous, for to have the Maydenhode of a Woman, that hun semethe that thei that haven first the Maydenhode, puttethe him in aventure of his Lif." The inhabitants explained this custom as an inheritance from ancient times, when "men hadden ben dede for deflourynge of Maydenes, that hadden Serpentes in hire Bodyes, that stongen men upon hire Zerdes, that thei dyeden anon."[1] I have not been able to find the authority for this superstition, but it cannot be supposed to have originated in the mediæval author's own imagination.

The fear of defloration is no doubt closely connected with the fear of hymeneal blood. In the Vedic literature the blood of the bridal night is represented as a poison and a seat of danger;[2] and a similar belief probably accounts for the old German custom of bringing new clothes to the married couple on the first morning of their wedded life.[3] The woman, as well as the man, may be supposed to be in peril. Rochas writes of the New Caledonians:—"Le premier rapprochement intime est plus effrayant pour les calédoniennes que pour les femmes de nos sociétés policées dont l'esprit éclairé est à l'abri de toute crainte superstitieuse. Il n'a jamais lieu sans une purification *légale*, avec une eau lustrale consacrée par un sorcier et dite *eau virginale*."[4] The hymeneal blood may also be regarded as dangerous to the offspring. In Andjra, in Morocco, there are bridegrooms who take care that no offspring can result from the defloration of the bride, since many people believe that the child would be diseased if the semen came into contact with the blood.[5] Among the Swahili there is on the first day of the wedding only *immissio*

[1] *Voiage and Travaile of Sir John Maundeville*, p. 285 *sq.*

[2] Weber, 'Vedische Hochzeitssprüche,' in *Indische Studien*, v. 189, 190, 211 *sqq.*

[3] Weinhold, *Die deutschen Frauen in dem Mittelalter*, i. 401 *sq.* Hertz, *op. cit.* p. 213. [4] de Rochas, *La Nouvelle Calédonie*, p. 235.

[5] See Westermarck, *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco*, p. 265 *sq.*

penis, not *seminis*.[1] And in Ukrainia, according to Tchoubinsky, the bridegroom likewise refrains from consummating the marriage when he deflowers the bride.[2]

If defloration is considered a dangerous act it may be asked how other men can be induced to perform it on behalf of the bridegroom. This is easy to explain, even apart from the fact that they are often paid for it. As will be shown in a subsequent chapter, a bridegroom is commonly held to be in a state of danger, extremely susceptible to evil influences; hence an act which is supposed to be dangerous to him may be supposed to be much less dangerous or quite harmless to other men. Sometimes the defloration is performed by foreigners, who probably do not share the native dread of it; and in other cases it is performed by a holy man, whose sanctity allows him to do with safety what is perilous to ordinary persons. According to notions expressed in the ancient literature of India, the priest alone can purify the garment of the bride, just as he is the only one who is not polluted by contact with sacrificial blood.[3]

The operation in question may be performed by a holy man not only because it is supposed to entail no risk for him but because it is supposed to be good for the bride or a blessing for the married couple. Sexual intercourse with such a person is frequently held to be highly beneficial. Egede informs us that the native women of Greenland thought themselves fortunate if an Angekokk, or "prophet," honoured them with his caresses; and some husbands even paid him for having intercourse with their wives, since they believed that the child of such a holy man could not but be happier and better than others.[4] Chénier speaks of a saint in Tetuan, in Morocco, who seized a young woman and had commerce with her in the midst of the street; "her companions, who surrounded her, uttered exclamations of joy, felicitated her on her good fortune, and the husband himself

[1] Zache, 'Sitten und Gebräuche der Suaheli,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xxxi. 75, 84.

[2] Volkov, 'Rites et usages nuptiaux en Ukraïne,' in *L'Anthropologie*, ii. 578 *sq.* [3] Weber, *loc. cit.* p. 190.

[4] Egede, *Description of Greenland*, p. 140.

received complimentary visits on this occasion."[1] Among certain tribes of the Tachtadshys in Lycia, where the *dede* is at their yearly religious assemblies entitled to have intercourse with any woman he chooses, her husband "feels considerably honoured by this distinction."[2] When the prelates of the Armenian Yezidees travel about on their visitation tours, they "no sooner arrive in a village, where they intend passing a day or two, than they at once get married; and the young lady selected for this honour becomes, in consequence, so holy that she is looked upon as a kind of saint or demon. If she happens to have a son, he becomes one of the priestly caste." The prelate may never see or even think about his spouse after the wedding day, although his colleague or successor is compelled to make a very heavy disbursement before attaining his predecessor's divorce.[3] In the Mahabharata we read of princes and heroes who go and present their wives or daughters to some pious hermit that he may deign to accord them a son of his good works. It may indeed be said that "all India is imbued with the belief that sacerdotal blood is gifted with regenerating virtues."

Barthema states that when the King of Calicut travels, one of the Brahmans, "although he might be only twenty years of age, remains in the house with the queen, and the king would consider it to be the greatest favour that these Brahmins should be familiar with the queen."[4] According to Mandelsloe, there is in Malabar scarcely a man of note who, when he is to be absent from home for any length of time, does not recommend his family, and especially his wife, to the care of a Brahman, to supply his place.[5] In agreement with these views and practices the intercourse of a Brahman with a bride during

[1] Chénier, *Present State of the Empire of Morocco*, i. 187. See also Westermarck, *Moorish Conception of Holiness* (*Baraka*), p. 85.

[2] Petersen and Luschan, *op. cit.* p. 199 n. 1.

[3] Creagh, *Armenians, Koords, and Turks*, i. 154 *sqq.*

[4] *Travels of Ludovico di Varthema*, p. 144.

[5] Mandelsloe, in Harris, *op. cit.* i. 767. See also Guyon, *op. cit.* i. 431.

the first night is also regarded as beneficial. Sir Thomas Herbert states that the Nayars supposed "the ground of better value by that holy seed, as they call it."[1] Guyon informs us that the young spouse in Malabar frequently rewards the Brahman to whom he has carried his bride, because he is persuaded that a marriage begun by a Brahman "cannot fail of being happy."[2] According to Navarette, the brides who are taken to the temples of idolatrous priests to be deflowered are held to be sanctified thereby, "and the Husbands carry them home well pleas'd."[3] So also the Zikrís consider the bride who has intercourse with the Mulla to be sanctified and cleansed by the association with him.[4] In the case of a bride the first and most obvious benefit derived from intercourse with a holy man is purification or the removal of danger. It should be added that benefits may also be supposed to result from defloration by a stranger, who is often looked upon almost as a supernatural being.

There can be no doubt that the so-called *jus primae noctis* granted to a priest is, largely at least, based upon similar ideas. This is indicated by the facts that it is found among peoples where such ideas prevail; that, where the practice of defloration occurs, it is spoken of sometimes as the exercise of a right and sometimes as a favour or an onus to be paid for; and that even when it is called a right, he who deprives the bride of her virginity may expect a fee for it. Speaking of the *jus primae noctis* of the *pajé* among certain Brazilian tribes, von Martius observes that it is probably founded on the belief in woman's uncleanness, which prevails among so many rude peoples.[5] What is or has been merely a habit may be interpreted as, or actually become, a right.[6] The same may be said of the *jus primae noctis* of a chief or a king, whose services may be sought for on grounds similar to those which have led to defloration by priests. With reference to *le droit du seigneur* of the king of the Ballante, M. Marche remarks:—"Ce n'est même pas

[1] Herbert, *op. cit.* p. 337.
[2] Guyon, *op. cit.* i. 431.
[3] Navarette, *loc. cit.* p. 320.
[4] Hughes-Buller, *op. cit.* p. 45.
[5] v. Martius, *op. cit.* i. 113 *sq.*
[6] *Cf.* Hertz, *op. cit.* p. 214 *sq.*; Ploss-Bartels, *op. cit.* i. 691.

pour lui, à proprement parler, un droit, mais une obligation, car sans cette formalité une jeune fille ne pourrait se marier. Cela oblige le père qui a des filles peu avenantes à aller faire au souverain un beau cadeau, en le suppliant d'avoir pitié de ses filles qui attendent de lui le droit de prendre un époux."[1] And in 'Leabhar na h-Uidhri' the druid Cathbad is represented as saying that King Conchobar was *obliged* to sleep the first night with Cuchulaind's bride.[2]

The defloration of a bride, however, could never have come to be looked upon as a right unless the act had been attractive. It is not to be believed that the chief or the priest slept with another man's bride from unselfish motives alone; and there may be cases in which the right to do so was nothing but a consequence of might. The *jus primae noctis* of a chief may have the same origin as the right of certain chiefs to cohabit with their female subjects at any time. Among the Guarani, according to Charlevoix, the caciques had a right to the use of the daughters of their subjects when they required it.[3] In the Marshall Islands the chief has only to express a wish, and the subjects place anything they possess at his disposal, even their wives and children;[4] and on Jaluit, the southernmost island of the group, the men of the higher classes have a right to appropriate the wives of the lower people.[5] So also in the Hawaian Islands the chief had a claim over the virgins of his districts,[6] and "the wives of the country people were sometimes appropriated by the men about court."[7] Among the Marquesans "les grands chefs du même rang (ou peut-être d'un rang supérieur) que les jeunes mariés pouvaient posséder l'épouse."[8] In Tonga the women of the lower

[1] Marche, *op. cit.* p. 70.

[2] *Leabhar na h-Uidhri*, p. 127, col. 1. Schmidt, in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xvi. 50 *sq.* [3] Charlevoix, *History of Paraguay*, i. 202.

[4] Erdland, 'Die Stellung der Frauen in den Häuptlingsfamilien der Marshallinseln,' in *Anthropos*, iv. 106.

[5] Hernsheim, *Südsee-Erinnerungen*, p. 81.

[6] Rivers, *History of Melanesian Society*, i. 386.

[7] Malo, *Hawaiian Antiquities*, p. 91.

[8] Tautain, 'Étude sur le mariage chez les Polynésiens des îles Marquises,' in *L'Anthropologie*, vi. 645.

people were at the disposal of the chiefs, who even used to shoot the husbands if they made resistance.[1] Among the Maori, when a chief desired to take to himself a wife, he fixed his attention upon one and took her, if need be by force, without consulting her feelings and wishes or those of anyone else.[2] In Madagascar kings and princes had the power to dispose of all women in their dominions.[3] Concerning the Barotse Dr. Holub writes, "Quite indisputed is the king's power to put to death, or to make a slave of any one of his subjects in any way he chooses; he may take a man's wife simply by providing him with another wife as a substitute."[4] Among the Negroes of Fida, according to Bosman, the captains of the king, who have to supply him with fresh wives, immediately present to him any beautiful virgin they may see; and none of his subjects dare presume to offer objections.[5] In Dahomey all women belong to the king, who can cause any girl to be brought to him before marriage and, if he pleases, retain her in the palace.[6] Speaking of the ancient kingdom of Chamba (embracing a large portion of what is now called Cochin China), Marco Polo says, "No woman is allowed to marry until the King shall have seen her; if the woman pleases him then he takes her to wife; if she does not, he gives her dowry to get her a husband withal."[7] There is reason to believe that in comparatively modern times some of the Râjas of Rîwa, a native state bordering on the North-Western Provinces of India, in their annual progresses, insisted on a supply of girls from the lower tribes.[8] Among the Kukis "all the women of the village, married or single, are at the pleasure of the rajah," who is regarded by his

[1] Waitz-Gerland, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, vi. 184.

[2] Yate, *Account of New Zealand*, p. 96.

[3] Grandidier, *Ethnographie de Madagascar*, ii. 154.

[4] Holub, *Seven Years in South Africa*, ii. 160 *sq.*

[5] Bosman, 'Description of the Coast of Guinea,' in Pinkerton, *op. cit.* xvi. 480.

[6] Bastian, *Der Mensch in der Geschichte*, iii. 302. Burton, *Mission to Gelele*, ii. 67.

[7] Marco Polo, *op. cit.* ii. 268.

[8] Crooke, *Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh*, i. p. clxxxv.

people with almost superstitious veneration.[1] We hear of similar rights granted to priests. When one of the itinerant priests of Siva, known under the name of *djaugoumas*, who are mostly celibates, does an adept the honour to enter his house, every male who inhabits it is obliged to go away and lodge elsewhere, leaving wives and daughters with the holy personage, who prolongs his sojourn as seems good to him.[2] In an old monograph it is said of the Tottiyars, a Telugu agricultural caste, that "they have *Gurus* of their own caste, instead of Brahmans, one of whose privileges appears to be to lie with the wives of their disciples whenever they feel inclined."[3] Among the Maori "a man who held the power that a priest did might claim almost any girl he desired, with a very good chance of getting her." Our informant, Mr. Best, adds that he has seen the same sort of thing in Mexico.[4] Such privileges may be granted to priests not only on account of the miraculous effects attributed to their embraces, but for the purpose of gratifying their own desires, so as to avert their anger or gain their good-will or as a genuine mark of esteem.

Whether the *jus primae noctis* belonging to a chief or priest ultimately springs from ordinary persons' fear of hymeneal blood or from hope of benefits resulting from intercourse with a holy or superior person or from the sexual appetite of the man who has the right, it is always the consequence of his own personal qualities or authority and cannot, therefore, be regarded as the relic of an ancient communal right. But there are other cases in which sexual intercourse with a bride or an unmarried girl, involving defloration, is accorded to several men, who are not necessarily either chiefs or priests, and these cases have likewise been regarded as expiation for individual marriage dating from a time when women were held in common.[5]

[1] Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal*, p. 45.

[2] Reclus, *Primitive Folk*, p. 172.

[3] Nelson, *View of the Hindū Law*, p. 141.

[4] Best, 'Maori Marriage Customs,' in *Trans. and Proceed. New Zealand Inst.* xxxvi. 64.

[5] Avebury, *Origin of Civilisation*, p. 437 *sq.*

Herodotus states that "when a Nasamonian first marries, it is the custom for the bride on the first night to lie with all the guests in turn, and each, when he has intercourse with her, gives her some present which he has brought from home."[1] Of the Augilae in the Cyrenaica, another Libyan people, Pomponius Mela writes that it is a solemn custom amongst them that their women the first night they are married shall abandon themselves to the common abuse of all men who come with reward, and that it is counted the greatest honour to have had to do with many on that occasion, although ever after the women keep themselves exceedingly chaste.[2] Solinus refers to the same custom among them, saying that the wives are compelled to have adulterous intercourse the first night.[3] In the Balearic Islands, according to Diodorus Siculus, the oldest of the relatives and friends who were present at the nuptials cohabited with the bride first and then the rest, one after another according to their age, until at last the bridegroom had the honour to lie with her.[4] In some provinces of Peru, says Garcilasso de la Vega, "the nearest relations of the bride and her most intimate friends had connection with her, and on this condition the marriage was agreed to, and she was thus received by the husband." He adds that Pedro de Cieza says the same ;[5] but the statement of the latter seems to refer not to the Indians of Peru, but to those of New Granada.[6] In another chapter of his 'Commentaries' Garcilasso writes of the natives of Manta and its districts that "their marriages took place under the condition that the relations and friends of the bridegroom should enjoy the bride before her husband."[7] Among the Caribs of Cuba, as we have already noticed, the bride of a cacique or of a man of somewhat lower rank had during the

[1] Herodotus, iv. 172.

[2] Pomponius Mela, *Chorographia*, i. 46.

[3] Solinus, *op. cit.* xxxi. 4, Mommsen's edition, p. 137.

[4] Diodorus Siculus, *op. cit.* v. 1.

[5] Garcilasso de la Vega, *op. cit.* i. 59.

[6] Cieza de Leon, 'La Crónica del Perú [parte primera],' ch. 49 in *Biblioteca de autores españoles*, xxvi. 402. *Cf.* Markham in Garcilasso de la Vega, *op. cit.* i. 59 n*.

[7] Garcilasso de la Vega, *op. cit.* ii. 442.

first night intercourse, not with the bridegroom, but with his equals who were invited to the wedding.[1] Among the aborigines of Porto Rico "the right of the first night, when the bride had connection with other men of the rank of her husband, was practised not only by caciques and their dependent chiefs, but also by the common people."[2] Von Langsdorf states that in Nukahiva, one of the Marquesas Islands, "if the daughter of a person of distinction marries, a number of swine are killed, and all the friends and acquaintances are invited to the feast. Every guest at the nuptials has then a right, with the consent of the bride, to share the pleasures of the nuptial night with the bridegroom. The feasting commonly lasts two or three days, till all the swine are eaten, and from that time the wife must abstain from all intercourse with any other man except her husband."[3] Dr. Tautain mentions the existence of a similar custom among the Marquesas Islanders:—"Sur un signal du marié tous les hommes présents se réunissaient, formaient une file en chantant et en dansant, et, chacun à son tour, défilait devant l'épouse, qui, couchée dans un coin du *paepae* des *koika*,[4] la tête appuyée sur les genoux de son mari, les traitait tous en époux. Le défilé, qui avait commencé par les plus vieux, les moins nobles, se terminait par les grands chefs et, en dernier lieu, par le mari qui ensuite emmenait sa femme dans leur case."[5]

From these statements by themselves it is impossible to find the meaning of the customs they describe, but there is every reason to believe that those customs are closely connected with others which have already come under our notice. It is significant that Cieza de Leon and Garcilasso de la Vega speak of the pre-nuptial intercourse between the bride and her relatives and friends and the artificial defloration of her by her mother as alternative customs occurring

[1] *Supra*, p. 167.

[2] Fewkes, 'Aborigines of Porto Rico and Neighboring Islands,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethn.* xxv. 48.

[3] v. Langsdorf, *Voyages and Travels*, i. 153.

[4] *Koika*, "fête." *Paepae*, "plateforme élevée en pierres sèches."

[5] Tautain, *loc. cit.* p. 642.

among different tribes of the same country. The Cuban custom just referred to is mentioned together with the defloration by caciques and priests in the case of brides of the lowest class, and it is expressly said that it was incumbent upon the invited guests to have connection with the bride.[1] Among Libyan peoples we find sexual relations between the bride and wedding guests alternating with defloration by the king. If intercourse with a priest or chief is supposed to remove the danger to which the bridegroom otherwise were exposed, a similar result may be expected from intercourse with the male guests at the wedding. It will perhaps be argued that the Libyan custom according to which they had to give presents to the bride ill agrees with the idea that they rendered the bridegroom a service. But presents may be regarded as bearers of good luck—this is distinctly the case with the silver coins given at weddings in Morocco;[2] and besides, the old custom may have survived the idea from which it sprang, and a mercenary motive may have been attached to it. Those who maintain that the intercourse of the wedding guests with the bride is the relic of communal marriage would also have to explain how it is that the exercise of a right has to be paid for. With reference to Lord Avebury's interpretation of the customs in question as acts of expiation for individual marriage, McLennan remarked that they are not cases of privileges accorded to the men of the bridegroom's group only, which they should be if they referred to an ancient communal right.[3] In most cases we are not told to what group the men belonged; but in Manta they are said to have been relatives and friends of the bridegroom. Those, however, who are inclined to regard this statement as evidence of Lord Avebury's theory should notice that in other places belonging to the same region it was " the nearest relations of the bride and her most intimate friends " who had intercourse with her, or her own mother who deflowered her.

[1] Carli, *op. cit.* i. 71.

[2] See Westermarck, *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco*, particularly p. 347 and the pages referred to in n. 5.

[3] McLennan, *Studies in Ancient History*, p. 341.

Among various peoples the girls are said to be accustomed to earn a dowry by prostitution before they marry. This is, or has been, the case with the Ulad Naïd in Algeria[1] and among the ancient Phœnicians,[2] Cyprians,[3] Lydians,[4] and Etruscans,[5] as also in the New World, among the Natchez of Louisiana[6] and in Nicaragua[7] and Guatemala.[8] We have reason to believe, however, that this institution did not merely serve an economic object, but was in origin and purpose akin to the wedding ceremonies just considered. It has been especially found among races or in regions where other forms of defloration by somebody else than the husband have been prevalent. In 'The Testament of Judah' we are told that "it was a law of the Amorites, that she who was about to marry should sit in fornication seven days by the gate."[9] Among the Mfiote, on the coast of Loango, it is the custom to take marriageable girls, dressed in long robes, from village to village with dancing and singing and offer the *jus primae noctis* for sale.[10]

In this connection certain Australian customs must be mentioned. Among some Queensland tribes, when a young woman shows signs of puberty, two or three men take her away in the bush, and, throwing her down, one of them forcibly enlarges the vaginal orifice with his fingers; then "other men come forward from all directions, and the struggling victim has to submit in rotation to promiscuous coition with all the 'bucks' present. . . . She now has

[1] Soleillet, *L'Afrique occidentale*, p. 118.

[2] St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, iv. 10.

[3] Justin, *Historiae Philippicae*, xviii. 5. As regards this custom see further *infra*, i. 208.

[4] Herodotus, i. 93. Clearchus, quoted by Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae*, xii. 11, p. 516. See also Aelian, *Variae historiae*, iv. 1, though the collection of a dowry is not here mentioned as the motive for the prostitution of the girls.

[5] Plautus, *Cistellaria*, ii. 3. 20 *sq.*

[6] Le Page du Pratz, *History of Louisiana*, p. 343.

[7] Andagoya, *op. cit.* p. 33. [8] Herrera, *op. cit.* iii. 340.

[9] 'Testament of Judah,' in *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, trans. by Charles, p. 81.

[10] Soyaux, *Aus West-Afrika*, p. 161. See also Bastian, *Die deutsche Expedition an der Loango-Küste*, i. 152, 177.

attained the degree in which she is allowed to marry."[1] Similar customs are found in many parts of Australia.[2] Spencer and Gillen say that in all tribes examined by them from the Urabunna in the south right through the centre of the continent to the western shores of the Gulf of Carpentaria a woman is sooner or later after the performance of the rite of cutting open the vagina handed over to certain definite men who have access to her before she becomes the property of one man; and among these are not only men belonging to the same class as her husband, but individuals to whom she at other times is strictly forbidden, in the majority of tribes even tribal brothers.[3] We are told that these customs "certainly point back to a time when there existed wider marital relations than obtain at the present day—wider, in fact, than those which are shown in the form of group marriage from which the present system is derived," and that even if they do not afford direct evidence of the former existence of actual promiscuity "they do afford evidence leading in that direction."[4] This, however, is a mere assumption suggested by Lord Avebury's expiation theory, and as to the natives' own views we are left in the dark. Dr. Roth observes that the commonest reason assigned by the aborigines for the practice of lacerting the vaginal orifice, or female introcision, "is to make him 'big fellow,' not only for the convenience of the escaping progeny, as the men will allege, but also for the progenitor, as the women will say."[5] We are not told whether the subsequent *coitus* is considered

[1] Roth, *op. cit.* p. 174 *sq.*

[2] Schomburgk, 'Über einige Sitten und Gebräuche der tief im Innern Südaustraliens, am Peake-Flusse und dessen Umgebung, hausenden Stämme,' in *Verhandl. Berliner Gesellsch. Anthr.* 1879, p. 235 *sq.* Purcell, 'Rites and Customs of Australian Aborigines,' *ibid.* 1893, p. 288. Gillen, in *Report on the Work of the Horn Scientific Expedition*, iv. 165 (Arunta).

[3] Spencer and Gillen, *Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 133 *sqq.* *Iidem, Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 92 *sqq.*

[4] *Iidem, Native Tribes*, p. 111.

[5] Roth, *op. cit.* p. 175. See also Hill, quoted by Miklucho-Maclay, in *Verhandl. Berliner Gesellsch. Anthr.* 1880, p. 89 (natives of New South Wales); *infra*, i. 560 *sq.*

to serve similar purposes. In certain cases mentioned above it is for some curious reason held necessary that the defloration or *vaginae dilatatio* by mechanical means should be followed by cohabitation with a man. So also the sexual indulgence after introcision in Australia might be due to peculiar native beliefs, although these have escaped our informants' notice. On some other occasions magic significance is avowedly attributed to extra-matrimonial intercourse. According to Spencer and Gillen, it is very usual "to allow considerable licence during the performance of certain ceremonies when a large number of natives, some of them coming often from distant parts, are gathered together —in fact on such occasions all of the ordinary marital rules seem to be more or less set aside for the time being. . . . The idea is that the sexual intercourse assists in some way in the proper performance of the ceremony, causing everything to work smoothly."[1] With reference to the Dieri, Gason speaks of some "indescribable customs," so obscene and disgusting that he must pass them over by only thus briefly referring to them:—"that of causing a plentiful supply of wild dogs, that of creating a plenty of snakes, that of giving strength to young men."[2] Indeed, Dr. Roth expressly states that the Queensland natives ascribe curative qualities to the mixture of blood and semen in the girl who has been subject to introcision and subsequent promiscuous coition: it is drunk by any sick individual who is in camp on the occasion.[3] But besides superstition, voluptuousness may also have its share in the sexual indulgence following on the operation in question, as well as in certain other cases. Dr. Eylmann observes that although the old men have several wives each and most of these are young women, their sensuality goes so far that they from time to time arrange erotic feasts at which all the ordinary rules of morality are suspended and adultery is not only allowed but compulsory.[4]

[1] Spencer and Gillen, *Northern Tribes*, p. 136 *sq.* *Iidem*, *Native Tribes*, p. 96 *sq.*

[2] Gason, 'Manners and Customs of the Dieyerie Tribe,' in Woods, *Native Tribes of South Australia*, p. 280. [3] Roth, *op. cit.* p. 175.

[4] Eylmann, *Die Eingeborenen der Kolonie Südaustralien*, p. 152 *sq.*

Among the Dieri, " on the young women coming to maturity, there is a ceremony called *Wilpadrina*, in which the elder men claim, and exercise, a right to the young women."[1] Mr. Mathew says that among the Kabi in Queensland there were occasions when some right, analogous to the *jus primae noctis*, seems to have been exacted by the seniors in the camp ;[2] and Mr. D. Campbell states that the elders of the tribe claim the same right in the South Gregory District.[3] In Easter Island, also, the old men are said to have the right of deflowering all the girls.[4]

There are also, in Australia, cases of a different type in which a party of men have intercourse with a woman before the husband. " In New South Wales and about Riverina," says Mr. J. M. Davis, " when a young man is entitled to have a lubra, he organises a party of his friends, and they make a journey into the territories of some other tribe, and there lie in wait, generally in the evening, by a water-hole where the lubras come for water. Such of the lubras as may be required are then pounced upon, and, if they attempt to make any resistance, are struck down insensible and dragged off. There is also this peculiarity, that in any instance where the abduction has taken place for the benefit of some one individual, each of the members of the party claims, as a right, a privilege which the intended husband has no power to refuse."[5] Dr. Howitt states that among the Kuinmurbura the men of the husband's class and totem who assisted him in carrying off the woman have access to her as a right ; and this Howitt looks upon as a kind of expiation for individual marriage, " indicating a time when there was group-marriage."[6] Similar customs have been

[1] Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 664. *Idem*, ' Diery and other kindred Tribes of Central Australia,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xx. 87.

[2] Mathew, *Two Representative Tribes of Queensland*, p. 161.

[3] *Idem*, *Eaglehawk and Crow*, p. 108.

[4] Martinez, quoted by Knoche, ' Einige Beobachtungen über Geschlechtsleben und Niederkunft auf der Osterinsel,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xliv. 659.

[5] Davis, in Brough Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, ii. 316.

[6] Howitt, *Native Tribes*, p. 219.

recorded from various other Australian tribes.[1] For my own part I have, in the earlier editions of the present work, explained the access which in such cases is granted to the husband's friends as a reward for a good turn done, or, perhaps, as McLennan suggests,[2] a common war-right, exercised by the captors of the woman. Spencer and Gillen admit that there is much to be said in favour of this explanation, but try to throw doubt on it by the remark that, "so far as Australia is concerned, it is founded upon such vague statements as that quoted by Brough Smyth upon the authority of Mr. J. M. Davis."[3] By this they evidently mean that the members of the party organised by the young man, who claim access to the girl, are merely said to be his "friends"; they suspect that those friends are men belonging to the intended husband's own class, and seem to maintain that this would invalidate my explanation, since the claim made by them would be based on an ancient group-right. In a following chapter I shall try to show that no such group-rights have ever been proved to exist; whereas it is only natural that the reward in question could not be given to any men who are prohibited by tribal custom from having intercourse with the girl. The idea of reward is very conspicuous in the following statement referring to the Narrinyeri:—"In the cases of elopement the young man might call in the aid of his comrades, who then had the right of access to the girl, and his male relatives would only defend him from the girl's kindred on the condition of access to her."[4]

A custom very similar to the Australian one is found in

[1] *Ibid.* pp. 193, 205, 206, 261. Mathew, *Eaglehawk and Crow*, p. 108 (natives at the Clarence River, New South Wales). *Idem*, 'Australian Aborigines,' in *Jour. and Proceed. Roy. Soc. New South Wales*, xxiii. 404 (Kabi).

[2] McLennan, *Studies in Ancient History*, p. 337 note. *Cf.* Mathew, in *Jour. Roy. Soc. N. S. Wales*, xxiii. 404. Davis says (*loc. cit.* p. 316) that in New South Wales and about Riverina "in cases where one tribe has attacked another and carried off a lot of the lubras, those unfortunates are common property till they are gradually annexed by the best warriors of the tribe."

[3] Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes*, p. 103.

[4] Howitt, *Native Tribes*, p. 261.

East Africa. Here, however, the capture of the girl is ceremonial only. Among the Wataveta, after the girl has been bought by the bridegroom she runs away and hides. She is pursued by four of his friends whose services have been solicited by him, and is soon captured with much affectation of resistance. Then she is conveyed to the hut of the bridegroom's mother, where she is kept a close prisoner for five days, and is now accessible to the four friends. Only after they have indulged in their privilege the legitimate husband claims his bride, and they are then visible to all their acquaintances.[1] A similar custom occurs among the Wateita.[2] Among the Masai, too, according to Merker, one or two of the bridegroom's old companions in arms have often a right of access to the bride. In case he opposes their claims, he is called by insulting epithets and told that if they rob him of some of his cattle he has nothing to complain of. He may escape the danger, however, by concluding his marriage without any ceremony, simply buying the bride and taking her quietly home to his hut.[3] Mr. Crawley

[1] French-Sheldon, 'Customs among the Natives of East Africa,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxi. 366. See also Johnston, *Kilima-njaro Expedition*, p. 431.

[2] Thomson, *Through Masai Land*, p. 51.

[3] Merker, *Die Masai*, pp. 49, 232. In Abyssinia the bridegroom has a number of *arkees*, varying in number from six to twelve, who were chosen among themselves when boys. When playmates together, they agreed that when either of them marries they shall reciprocally act as *arkees*, or bridesmen, to each other. After the bridegroom has accepted the bride they are made to promise that they will "faithfully and truly fulfil towards her the part of brethren: wait on her; should she hunger, furnish her with food; or should she thirst, with drink. But they have more than this to do. Three or four of them generally sleep in the same room with the newly-married couple, to furnish them with anything they may require during the night." And, our informant adds, "they have a variety of other interesting and curious little offices to perform, which it appears are considered as not quite fit to print in English" (Parkyns, *Life in Abyssinia*, ii. 52, 56). Among certain Berbers of Morocco there are wedding customs of a somewhat similar nature, which I have recorded in my book on *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco* (see particularly p. 273). Thus in one tribe the best-man is present when the bridegroom has intercourse with the bride and jokingly claims his share of the pleasure.

sees in the Australian and East African customs "the last detail in the preparation of the bride for her husband," and regards the idea of a reward given on the part of the husband to the friends who have assisted him as a secondary development.[1] He may be right. But here again we should remember that side by side with the notion of danger there is the feeling of sexual pleasure; and this feeling may surely be as primitive a motive as any superstitious belief.

[1] Crawley, *The Mystic Rose*, p. 349.

CHAPTER VI

A CRITICISM OF THE HYPOTHESIS OF PROMISCUITY: RELIGIOUS PROSTITUTION—THE LENDING AND EXCHANGE OF WIVES—FEASTS

VERY similar to some of the practices discussed in the preceding chapter is a kind of religious prostitution, which has likewise been regarded as expiation for individual marriage.[1]

Herodotus tells us that at Babylon every woman was obliged once in her life to go and sit down in the precinct of Mylitta—that is, of Ishtar or Astarte—and there consort with a stranger. A woman who had once taken her seat was not allowed to return home till one of the strangers threw a silver coin, which might be of any size, into her lap and took her with him beyond the holy ground. The silver coin could not be refused: that was forbidden by the law, since once thrown it was sacred. The woman went with the first man who threw her money, rejecting no one. When she had gone with him and so satisfied the goddess, she returned home, and from that time forth no gift, however great, would prevail with her. The money in question was dedicated to the goddess.[2] This custom is also mentioned by Strabo,[3] but his account is simply borrowed from

[1] Avebury, *Origin of Civilisation*, p. 437. Wilutzky, *Vorgeschichte des Rechts*, p. 37 *sqq.*

[2] Herodotus, i. 199.

[3] Strabo, xvi. 1. 20.

Herodotus. Some independent evidence [1] is found in the apocryphal 'Epistle of Jeremy,' which seems to have been written about the year 300 B.C.,[2] evidently by a person who was well informed.[3] It is said there that the Babylonian women, "with cords about them sit in the ways, burning bran for incense: but if any of them, drawn by some that passeth by, lie with him, she reproacheth her fellow, that she was not thought as worthy as herself, nor her cord broken."[4] In the cuneiform literature we are told of sacred prostitution carried on at Babylonian temples by particular women, but no confirmation of Herodotus' account has hitherto been found in it. This, however, does not justify Zimmern's accusation that he was guilty of gross exaggeration.[5] Herodotus' statement derives much support from the fact that more or less similar customs have been reported from other places within the same culture area.

Herodotus says himself that the same rite was performed in Cyprus. In a later account, that by Justin, we read that "it was a custom among the Cyprians to send their daughters, on stated days before their marriage, to the sea-shore, to prostitute themselves, and thus procure money for their marriage portions, and to pay, at the same time, offerings to Venus for the preservation of their chastity in time to come."[6] This custom closely resembles certain others which have been mentioned in another connection,[7] but the reference to Venus suggests that the practice was not devoid of religious significance in spite of the mercenary motive attributed to it. This also holds good of the description given by Lactantius, who writes that Venus "first

[1] *Cf.* Naumann, *Untersuchungen über den apokryphen Jeremiasbrief*, p. 19 *sq.*

[2] *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, edited by Charles, i. 596.

[3] See Naumann, *op. cit.* p. 2.

[4] 'Epistle of Jeremy,' v. 43, in *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, i. 606.

[5] Zimmern, in Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, p. 423.

[6] Justin, *Historiae Philippicae*, xviii. 5. [7] *Supra*, p. 200.

instituted the art of courtezanship, as is contained in the sacred history, and taught women in Cyprus to seek gain by prostitution, which she commanded for this purpose, that she alone might not appear unchaste and a courter of men beyond other females."[1] With reference to the inhabitants of Heliopolis or Baalbec, in Syria, the ecclesiastical historian Socrates states that " their virgins were presented for prostitution to the strangers who visited them " ;[2] whilst Sozomenus speaks of their ancient custom of yielding up virgins to prostitution with any chance comer before being united in marriage to their betrothed. He adds that this custom was prohibited by a law enacted by Constantine, after he had destroyed the temple of Aphrodite at Heliopolis—which implies that the practice had a religious aspect.[3] So also an earlier authority, Eusebius, in a chapter of his ' Life of Constantine,' entitled ' How he destroyed the Temple of Aphrodite at Heliopolis,' says that in that city " those who dignify licentious pleasure with a distinguishing title of honour, had permitted their wives and daughters to commit shameless fornication."[4] At Byblus, where the people shaved their heads in the annual mourning for Adonis, women who refused thus to sacrifice their hair had to give themselves up to strangers on a certain day of the festival, and the money which they earned thereby was devoted to the goddess.[5] This custom bears a still closer resemblance to the practices just mentioned, if Sir James G. Frazer is right in his suggestion that it is a mitigation of an older rule which compelled every woman without exception to sacrifice her virtue in the service of religion.[6] In the worship of Anaitis the Armenians, even of the highest families, prostituted their daughters before they gave them in

[1] Lactantius, *Divinae Institutiones*, i. 17 (Migne, *Patrologiae cursus*, vi. 207).

[2] Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica*, i. 18 (Migne, *op. cit.* Ser. Graeca, lxvii. 123).

[3] Sozomenus, *Historia ecclesiastica*, v. 10 (in Migne, *op. cit.* Ser. Graeca, lxvii. 1243).

[4] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, iii. 58 (Migne, *op. cit.* Ser. Graeca, xx. 1124).

[5] Lucian, *De Syria dea* 6. [6] Frazer, *Adonis Attis Osiris*, i. 38.

marriage, and this was regarded as no bar to an honourable match; but we are also told that the girls of rich families often gave their lovers more than they received from them.[1] It has been supposed that a similar custom is alluded to in a Lydian inscription from the second century, found at Tralleis, in which a lady by name Aurelia Aemilia proclaims with pride that she had prostituted herself in the temple service at the command of an oracle, in the same manner as her female ancestors had done.[2] With reference to these statements Dr. Farnell observes that it seems as if in Armenia and Lydia there had been a fusion of two institutions which elsewhere were distinct one from another, namely, harlot service for a prolonged period in a temple, and the consecration of each maiden's virginity as a preliminary to marriage.[3]

Various theories have been set forth to explain these customs. The religious prostitution of the Babylonian type has been supposed to be nothing but ordinary immorality practised under the cloak of religion.[4] It has been represented as an act by which a worshipper sacrificed her most precious possession to the deity.[5] According to M. Cumont, it is "a modified form, become utilitarian, of an ancient exogamy": the virgin had to be given to a stranger before she was allowed to marry a man of her own race.[6] These theories seem altogether too unsatisfactory to require any special consideration. Mannhardt explained the custom as a development of vegetation-ritual,[7] and Frazer accepts his explanation.[8] "We may conclude," the latter says, "that a great Mother Goddess, the personification of all the reproductive energies of nature, was worshipped under different names but with a substantial similarity of myth

[1] Strabo, xi. 14. 16.

[2] Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, i. 95. Farnell, *Greece and Babylon*, p. 275.

[3] Farnell, *op. cit.* p. 275.

[4] Jeremias, *Izdubar-Nimrod*, p. 60.

[5] Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*, p. 155.

[6] Cumont, *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, p. 287 *sq.*

[7] Mannhardt, *Wald- und Feldkulte*, ii. 283 *sqq.*

[8] Frazer, *op. cit.* i. 36 n. 6.

and ritual by many peoples of Western Asia; that associated with her was a lover, or rather series of lovers, divine yet mortal, with whom she mated year by year, their commerce being deemed essential to the propagation of animals and plants, each in their several kind; and further, that the fabulous union of the divine pair was simulated and, as it were, multiplied on earth by the real, though temporary, union of the human sexes at the sanctuary of the goddess for the sake of thereby ensuring the fruitfulness of the ground and the increase of man and beast."[1] In the statements themselves, however, there is nothing whatever which indicates that the practices mentioned were supposed, on the principle of homœopathic magic, to ensure "the fertility of the ground and the increase of man and beast." Ishtar was no doubt a mother goddess, but her connection with vegetation was by no means prominent in the Babylonian religion.[2] And many of our authorities so emphatically represent the prostitution of the women as a preliminary to their marriage that this side of the rite cannot possibly be ignored. Frazer thinks perhaps that he meets this objection by another hypothesis which he combines with the former one. He says that if the conception of a Mother Goddess "dates, as seems probable, from a time when the institution of marriage was either unknown or at most barely tolerated as an immoral infringement of old communal rights, we can understand both why the goddess herself was regularly supposed to be at once unmarried and unchaste, and why her worshippers were obliged to imitate her more or less completely in these respects. . . . Formerly, perhaps, every woman was obliged to submit at least once in her life to the exercise of those marital rights which at a still earlier period had theoretically belonged in permanence to all the males of the tribe."[3] Here he falls back upon Lord Avebury's theory that religious prostitution is a survival from an earlier stage of "communal marriage" and an expiation for the infringement of old communal rights—the theory with which we are now in the first place concerned.

[1] Frazer, *op. cit.* i. 39. [2] Schrader, *op. cit.* p. 430.
[3] Frazer, *op. cit.* i. 39 *sq.*

Whatever else may be said against this hypothesis, there is one formidable objection which, in my opinion, deprives it of every chance of success. In many of the statements it is expressly said that the women offered themselves up to strangers; Lucian is even careful to point out that none but strangers were allowed to enjoy them. If their prostitution really had been an expiation for an infringement of old communal rights, we might at all events expect the persons with whom they had intercourse to have been representatives of the community and not individuals who even under the old *régime* had no marital rights whatsoever. This objection has previously been raised by Dr. Farnell [1] and by Dr. Hartland.[2]

Dr. Hartland's own opinion is that the Babylonian rite was a puberty rite, and that a maiden was not admitted to the status and privileges of adult life until she had thus been ceremonially deflowered. Among those privileges, and the chief of them, was the gratification of the sexual instinct; hence the rite in question was a pre-requisite to marriage.[3] This explanation presupposes that it was confined to unmarried girls—an assumption which will be examined subsequently; but even if it was so, Dr. Hartland's statement does not go to the root of the question. As Dr. Farnell justly observes,[4] it does not explain why the loss of virginity should be considered desirable in a puberty ceremony or as a preliminary to marriage. Dr. Farnell himself sees in the rite the removal of a dangerous tabu by a religious act securing the divinity's sanction for the removal; just as the ripe cornfield must not be reaped before religious rites, such as the consecration of first-fruits, have loosened the tabu upon it. "So," he says, "the Babylonian safeguards

[1] Farnell, 'Sociological Hypotheses concerning the Position of Women in Ancient Religion,' in *Archiv f. Religionswissenschaft*, vii. 81. *Idem, Greece and Babylon*, p. 278.

[2] Hartland, 'Concerning the Rite at the Temple of Mylitta,' in *Anthropological Essays presented to E. B. Tylor*, p. 191 *sq.* *Idem, Ritual and Belief*, p. 269 *sq.*

[3] *Idem*, in *Anthropological Essays presented to E. B. Tylor*, p. 189 *sqq.* *Idem, Ritual and Belief*, p. 278.

[4] Farnell, *Greece and Babylon*, p. 281.

the coming marriage by offering the first-fruits of his daughter to the goddess who presides over the powers and processes of life and birth. Under her protection, after appeal to her, the process loses its special danger; or if there is danger still, it falls upon the head of the stranger. For I can find no other way of accounting for his presence as a necessary agent, in the ritual of at least four widely separate communities of Semitic race."[1] Although I cannot agree with all the details of this statement, I think it quite probable that the bridegroom's fear of deflowering the bride was one motive for the rite. But in no case does it provide us with the full explanation of the customs concerned.

Let us consider their various aspects. In many of the statements the women who prostitute themselves are said to be virgins or girls who are about to be married. This is said of the women of Cyprus by Justin, of those of Heliopolis by Socrates and by Sozomenus, and of the Armenian women. It has been assumed that Herodotus likewise meant virgins in his description of the Babylonian rite, although he spoke of women.[2] This rite, it is argued, was an isolated act and therefore to be distinguished from temple prostitution of indefinite duration; the same rite was performed in Cyprus, where, as Justin clearly attests, the prostitution consisted in the defloration of virgins; and the accounts of the practice in other places render it fairly certain that only unmarried women were subjected to it. These arguments, however, do not seem to me to be conclusive. That every Babylonian woman was obliged once in her life to prostitute herself in the precinct of Mylitta does not necessarily imply that she had to do so while a maiden; Justin's description of prostitution in Cyprus differs so greatly from that of Herodotus that it may be doubted whether they really refer to the same

[1] *Ibid.* p. 279 *sq.* An essentially similar view was expressed by Farnell in his article in *Archiv f. Religionswiss.* (vii. 88), and was shared by Nilsson (*Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung*, p. 366 *sq.*).

[2] Hartland, *Ritual and Belief*, p. 271. Farnell, *Greece and Babylon*, pp. 271, 280 n. Nilsson, *op. cit.* p. 366.

practice; and women, not virgins, are mentioned in other statements also, referring to Cyprus, Byblus, and Babylon itself, while Eusebius expressly speaks of the fornication of matrons as well as of unmarried women at Heliopolis. This last statement has been treated far too lightly by writers who see in the Babylonian and kindred practices nothing but a defloration rite;[1] Frazer justly remarks that Eusebius was born and spent his life in Syria, was a contemporary of the practices he describes, and thus had the best opportunity of informing himself about them.[2] It may also be asked why Herodotus in the present case spoke of women if he meant maidens, although he shortly before had been describing the Babylonian custom of selling "maidens" by public auction as wives.[3] By all this I do not wish to deny that the Babylonian rite may have been essentially a preliminary to marriage, I only maintain that we cannot take for granted that it was so.[4] Nor must we assume that the prostitution of virgins was restricted to the act of defloration. It is nowhere said to have been thus restricted. Of the Armenian damsels we are told that they acted as prostitutes for a long time before they were given in marriage.[5] The Cyprian maidens, according to Justin, procured money for their marriage portions by prostituting themselves. The Amorite virgins had to "sit in fornication" seven days.[6]

The men to whom the women offered themselves are said to have been strangers, in Babylon and Cyprus by Herodotus, at Heliopolis by Socrates, at Byblus by Lucian. Justin's statement that the Cyprians sent their daughters to the sea-shore to prostitute themselves may imply the same; Dr. Farnell finds this supposition confirmed by the legend given by Apollodorus,[7] that the daughter of Kinyras,

[1] Hartland, *Ritual and Belief*, p. 271. Farnell, *Greece and Babylon*, p. 280 n. Nilsson, *op. cit.* p. 366 n. 2.

[2] Frazer, *op. cit.* i. 37 n. 2.

[3] Herodotus, i. 196. *Cf.* Corin, *Mating, Marriage, and the Status of Woman*, p. 63.

[4] *Cf.* Frazer, *op. cit.* i. 58. [5] Strabo, xi. 14. 16.

[6] *Supra*, p. 200. [7] Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca*, iii. 14. 3.

owing to the wrath of Aphrodite, had sexual intercourse with strangers.[1] According to Sozomenus, the virgins of Heliopolis were yielded up to prostitution with any chance comer, which seems to indicate that the stranger spoken of by Socrates was not necessarily a foreigner. In the 'Epistle of Jeremy' the Babylonian women are said to lie with passers-by; whilst the Amorite virgin who was about to marry should sit in fornication by the gate. In several statements payment is spoken of. The Cyprian girls, according to Justin, prostituted themselves to procure money for their marriage portions and to pay, at the same time, offerings to Venus. Herodotus states that in Babylon (and Cyprus) the money was devoted to the goddess, and the same was the case at Byblus. Of the Armenian girls we are told that they, if they were rich, often gave their lovers more than they received from them. At all the places concerned the prostitution of women is said by one or another of our authorities to be connected with the cult of the goddess of love and procreation, and in some of them, at any rate, it took place in the precinct of her temple.

When the rite consists of, or implies, the defloration of a virgin we naturally suspect that it, like other defloration practices, may have something to do with the belief that it is dangerous for the bridegroom to perform that act himself. It may be asked—indeed, in an earlier work I have myself asked[2]—Why should the stranger have been more willing than the bridegroom to expose himself to this danger? Dr. Hartland, who has raised the same objection, observes that the strangers who visited Babylon or Heliopolis could hardly have been on a plane of civilisation so far removed from that of the natives that they were either ignorant of, or indifferent to, the native ideas;[3] nay, as we have just noticed, it seems that the stranger might have been almost any traveller or chance comer. Foreigners have been asked to deflower brides in Calicut and Cochin and elsewhere, but they were white men;

[1] Farnell, *Greece and Babylon*, p. 274.
[2] Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. 446.
[3] Hartland, *Ritual and Belief*, p. 282 *sq.*

and they were often paid for doing it. So also natives have, in various countries, been induced by presents to undertake the task. But in the cases we are now discussing the man who performs the act, instead of being rewarded, has himself to pay. Why should he have to pay for rendering a dangerous service? This argument has been adduced by Hertz[1] and by Frazer.[2]

After reconsidering the whole question I cannot regard these objections as conclusive. As I observed in the last chapter, where the act is considered to be dangerous for the bridegroom to perform, it is not necessarily considered to be so for other men, since the bridegroom is commonly supposed to be in a delicate condition. Moreover, the danger attached to it might be removed by its being accomplished as a religious rite, just as it loses its perilous character by being performed by a holy individual. As for the money paid by the man, it may be said that if the act was thought to be harmless there would no doubt have been men who were quite willing to pay for it. Sometimes he even got back more than he paid. But when the money was dedicated to the goddess, it is not certain that it was really meant as a reward. It may have been a prophylactic, as money is on certain dangerous occasions in Morocco, or it may have served as a bearer of good luck, like silver coins in various Moorish ceremonies.[3] It is noteworthy that it was a silver coin "of any size" that the stranger threw into the Babylonian woman's lap. And when he did so he said to her, "I invoke the goddess Mylitta to be gracious to you."[4]

This detail in Herodotus' account is in my opinion of the greatest importance for the right interpretation of the

[1] Hertz, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, p. 217.

[2] Frazer, *op. cit.* i. 59.

[3] See *supra*, p. 190.

[4] This is the hitherto accepted meaning of the Greek phrase, ἐπικαλέω τοι τὴν θεὸν Μύλιττα (see, *e.g.*, Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, p. 535; Rawlinson [*History of Herodotus*, vol. i. 324] translates it, "The goddess Mylitta prosper thee"). Dr. Farnell maintains (*Greece and Babylon*, p. 278) that it could as naturally mean, "I claim thee in the name of the goddess." This I cannot accept.

rite, because it reveals to us something like the people's own views on the subject. The stranger confers upon the woman a blessing, invoking the Mother Goddess at her own sanctuary. By doing so he evidently meant to ensure—not "the fruitfulness of the ground and the increase of man and beast"—but the fecundity of the woman herself and probably also an easy delivery. For to promote the latter was a function of the Mother Goddess; in fact, the name Mylitta is said to come from *Mu'allidtu*, which means "midwife."[1] Now we can understand the part played by the stranger in the rite. If no danger is in the circumstances supposed to be connected with the act, it might as well be performed by somebody else; but a stranger is, according to early ideas, almost a supernatural being, his blessings are particularly efficacious, and great benefits may be expected from his love.[2] Among the Hebrew traditions there is the tale of Lot and the two angels who visited him in Sodom, and in the book of Tobit the stranger is the angel Raphael.[3] The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews writes, "Be not forgetful to entertain strangers: for thereby some have entertained angels unawares."[4] The embraces of a stranger may therefore be highly appreciated not only in the case of virgins—from whom he besides presumably removes a tabu—but also by matrons. It is worth noticing that the stranger is mentioned by Herodotus and by Lucian, who speak of women in general; and although Eusebius makes no reference to him in

[1] Schrader, *op. cit.* pp. 423 n. 7, 428.

[2] Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, i. 583 *sqq.*

[3] These facts are pointed out by Dr. Hartland, who in his essay on the Mylitta rite in *Ritual and Belief* (p. 285 *sqq.*) avails himself of my observation that a stranger is regarded as a semi-supernatural being. The explanation of the rite which I gave in my *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* was subsequently accepted by M. van Gennep (*Les rites de passage*, p. 242 *sq.*). It is in substantial agreement with the present explanation, except that I there restricted the purpose of the rite to the attainment of the blessing of fertility, entirely rejecting Dr. Farnell's suggestion that it was the removal of a tabu.

[4] *Hebrews*, xiii. 2.

connection with the fornication of matrons and virgins at Heliopolis, he figures in other accounts relating to that city.

This explanation of the Babylonian and kindred rites derives further probability from various statements quoted above which show that intercourse with a holy man is not only looked upon as a safeguard, in the case of brides, but also as a source of more positive benefits. And yet another set of practices should be noticed in this connection. From various parts of India we hear of virgins or brides being deflowered in temples by means of the phallus of an idol—according to Schouten, in order that their marriage shall be blessed;[1] and similar practices were sometimes resorted to by married women as a cure for sterility.[2] In Rome, according to Christian writers, the bride was placed on the phallus of a Priapus or, as Lactantius expresses himself, *in sinu pudendo* of Tutunus, who was identical with Priapus.[3] But Arnobius tells us that matrons also were put on "the huge members and horrent *fascinus*" of Tutunus because it was thought auspicious—that is, in order that they should become mothers.[4] Here then we have instances of sexual rites being avowedly performed at sanctuaries partly for the purpose of deflowering virgins, and partly to ensure fertility in marriage. These are close parallels to the Semitic rites, as I conceive them.

[1] Balbi, *Viaggio dell' Indie Orientali*, fol. 68; *Voyage of J. H. van Linschoten to the East Indies*, i. 224; Mocquet, *Travels and Voyages into Africa, Asia, and America*, fol. 240 b. (Goa). Schouten, *Ost-indische Reyse*, p. 161 (Canara). Barbosa, *Description of the Coasts of East Africa and Malabar*, p. 96 (Southern Deccan). Fryer (*New Account of East-India and Persia*, p. 179) states that at Semissar, in Deccan, a large number of women prostituted themselves to an idol; they "reckon it a great Honour, and the Husband thinks himself happy in his *Cornucopia*."

[2] Burnell, in *Voyages of J. H. van Linschoten to the East Indies*, i. 224 n. 3. *Cf.* Schouten, *op. cit.* p. 161.

[3] St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, vi. 9. 3; vii. 24. 2 (Migne, *Patrologiae cursus*, xli. 188, 215). Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones*, i. 20 (*ibid.* vi. 227). Rossbach, *Untersuchungen über die römische Ehe*, p. 369 *sqq*. See also Hertz, *op. cit.* p. 272.

[4] Arnobius, *Adversus gentes*, iv. 7 (Migne, *op. cit.* v. 1015).

There is also another form of religious prostitution besides that which we have now considered—not the temporary prostitution of a girl before marriage or of a matron, but the more or less permanent prostitution of women attached to a temple. Sir James G. Frazer suggests that this kind of prostitution likewise may be a survival of early communism. "In course of time," he says, "as the institution of individual marriage grew in favour, and the old communism fell more and more into discredit, the revival of the ancient practice even for a single occasion in a woman's life became ever more repugnant to the moral sense of the people, and accordingly they resorted to various expedients for evading in practice the obligation which they still acknowledged in theory. One of these evasions was to let the woman offer her hair instead of her person; another apparently was to substitute an obscene symbol for the obscene act. But while the majority of women thus contrived to observe the forms of religion without sacrificing their virtue, it was still thought necessary to the general welfare that a certain number of them should discharge the old obligation in the old way. These became prostitutes either for life or for a term of years at one of the temples: dedicated to the service of religion, they were invested with a sacred character, and their vocation, far from being deemed infamous, was probably long regarded by the laity as an exercise of more than common virtue."[1] And not only does Frazer consider these two kinds of religious prostitution as relics of the same state of ancient communism, but he also attributes to them the same function in the life of the people:—"In their licentious intercourse at the temples the women, whether maidens or matrons or professional harlots, imitated the licentious conduct of a great goddess of fertility for the purpose of ensuring the fruitfulness of fields and trees, of man and beast."[2] For my own part I believe that the two kinds of religious prostitution essentially differ from each other in origin and purpose.

Among the Ewhe- and Tshi-speaking peoples on the west coast of Africa there are priestesses or sacred women

[1] Frazer, *op. cit.* i. 40 *sq.* [2] *Ibid.* i. 71.

who are forbidden to marry, apparently because they are considered to be the wives of, or to belong to, the god they serve. But this by no means implies that they are debarred from sexual intercourse. Major Ellis tells us that among the Ewhe-speaking peoples of the Slave Coast the chief business of the female *kosi*, or wife of the god to whom she is dedicated, is prostitution. "In every town there is at least one institution in which the best-looking girls, between ten and twelve years of age, are received. Here they remain for three years, learning the chants and dances peculiar to the worship of the gods, and prostituting themselves to the priests and the inmates of the male seminaries; and at the termination of their novitiate they become public prostitutes. This condition, however, is not regarded as one for reproach; they are considered to be married to the god, and their excesses are supposed to be caused and directed by him. Properly speaking, their libertinage should be confined to the male worshippers at the temple of the god, but practically it is indiscriminate. Children who are born from such unions belong to the god."[1] So also the priestesses among the Tshi-speaking peoples of the Gold Coast "are ordinarily most licentious, and custom allows them to gratify their passions with any man who may chance to take their fancy. A priestess who is favourably impressed by a man sends for him to her house, and this command he is sure to obey, through fear of the consequences of exciting her anger. She then tells him that the god she serves has directed her to love him, and the man thereupon lives with her until she grows tired of him, or a new object takes her fancy. Some priestesses have as many as half a dozen men in their train at one time, and may on great occasions be seen walking in state, followed by them. Their life is one continual record of debauchery and sensuality, and when excited by the dance they frequently abandon themselves to the wildest excesses."[2]

In India dancing-girls are, or have been, attached to a great many temples. According to Ward, who wrote his

[1] Ellis, *Ewe-speaking Peoples*, p. 140 *sqq.*

[2] *Idem*, *Tshi-speaking Peoples*, p. 121 *sq.*

account of the Hindus a hundred years ago, there were, for example, at Jugunnat'hu-kshutru in Orissa a number of women of infamous character employed to dance and sing before the god; the Brahmans who officiated there continually had connection with them, but they also prostituted themselves to visitors.[1] With reference to Southern India, Dubois wrote that every temple, according to its size, entertains a band of so-called *dêva-dâśi*, that is, "servants or slaves of the gods." to the number of eight, twelve, or more. They perform their religious duties, consisting of dancing and singing, twice a day, morning and evening. They are also obliged to assist at all the public ceremonies, which they enliven with their dance and merry song. But as soon as their public business is over, "they open their cells of infamy, and frequently convert the temple itself into a stew." They are bred to this profligate life from their infancy. They are taken from any caste, and are frequently of respectable birth. "It is nothing uncommon to hear of pregnant women, in the belief that it will tend to their happy delivery, making a vow, with the consent of their husbands, to devote the child in the womb, if it should turn out a girl, to the service of the Pagoda. And, in doing so, they imagine they are performing a meritorious duty."[2] In the Census Report of Mysore for 1911 Mr. Thyagaraja Aiyar writes:—"The practice of dedicating girls to temples or as public women (styled as *Basavi*) obtains in a few of the 'lower' castes, but it is gradually getting into disfavour. Among Kurubas when there are no sons in a family, the eldest girl is occasionally so dedicated. . . . Among Voddas, if an adult female cannot get any one to marry her, she may be dedicated to a free life in the name of Yellamma who is their patron deity."[3] According to Buchanan, even married women who wearied of their husbands or widows who grew tired

[1] Ward, *View of the History, &c. of the Hindoos*, ii. 134.

[2] Dubois, *Description of the Character, &c. of the People of India*, p. 294 *sq.*

[3] Thyagaraja Aiyar, *Census of India*, 1911, vol. xxi. (Mysore Report, p. 99.

of a life of celibacy went to a temple and prostituted themselves.[1] Frequently the ceremony of dedication closely resembles that of a formal marriage,[2] and the woman is actually regarded as the wife of the god to whom she is devoted. Thus the dancing girls who serve in the pagodas of Kārtikeya, the Hindu God of war, are betrothed and married to him, after which they may prostitute themselves; and similarly the Murlis, or dancing girls in Marātha temples, are married to Khandoba, the Marātha god of war.[3]

There were harlots connected with many Semitic cults. In the Gilgamesh-epos, Ishtar is represented as gathering round her dissolute girls and harlots, and as a goddess of prostitution the epithet "consecrated" is applied to her.[4] Ḫammurabi makes a distinction between consecrated women, or "votaries,"[5] who evidently were the daughters of good families dedicated by their fathers to religion, and so-called *qadishtu*, or genuine temple harlots;[6] to the former class belonged the woman designated the "priestess" or "votary" of Marduk.[7] In the Canaanite cults there were *qedēshōth* consecrated to the deity with whose temple they were associated and at the same time acting as prostitutes;[8] and at the local shrines of North Israel the worship of Yahveh itself seems to have been deeply affected by these practices, which were forbidden in the Deuteronomic code.[9] We hear of women "of the congregation of the

[1] Buchanan, 'Journey to Madras,' in Pinkerton, *Collection of Voyages and Travels*, viii. 749.

[2] *Supra*, p. 186 *sq.*

[3] Russell, *Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, iii. 376.

[4] Naumann, *op. cit.* p. 21.

[5] *Die Gesetze Hammurabis*, trans. by Winckler, § 110, p. 31. *Code of Laws promulgated by Ḫammurabi*, trans. by Johns, § 110, p. 20.

[6] Winckler's translation, § 178 *sqq.*, pp. 53, 55.

[7] *Ibid.* § 182, p. 55. Johns' translation, § 182, p. 40. *Cf.* Dhorme, *La religion assyro-babylonienne*, p. 300 *sq.*

[8] Driver, *Commentary on Deuteronomy*, p. 264. Cheyne, 'Harlot,' in Cheyne and Black, *Encyclopædia Biblica*, ii. 1965.

[9] *Hosea*, iv. 14. *Deuteronomy*, xxiii. 17 *sq.* *Cf.* Cheyne, *loc. cit.* p. 1965.

people of Astarte," at Carthage,[1] and of numbers of dedicated slave women in the cult of Aphrodite at Eryx,[2] which was at least semi-Semitic; and it is likely that some of these, at any rate, were dedicated to the impure religious practice.[3] As for non-Semitic cults, it is clearly attested of the worship of Mā at Comana in Pontus[4] and of Aphrodite in Corinth;[5] but in these cases we have the right to assume Semitic influences at work.[6] The practice survived in Lydia in the later period of the Graeco-Roman culture.[7] Sir William Ramsay speaks of it as service performed to a god; but Dr. Farnell observes that the inscription referring to it neither mentions nor implies a god, and that the service in Asia Minor, so far as we know, was always to a goddess.[8]

The difference between the two types of religious prostitution which have come under our notice is obvious. In the one case a woman, most frequently a maiden, offers herself up temporarily to a stranger at the sanctuary of the Mother Goddess. In the other case a woman is more or less permanently attached to a male god as his wife or concubine or to a goddess, presumably as her servant, and offers herself up to his or her worshippers. Being regarded as sacred and inspired, a woman of the latter class may easily persuade a believer that the god has directed her to have intercourse with him, and he on his part is naturally not slow to accept the invitation. This explanation is directly suggested by statements relating to religious prostitution in West Africa, and it may have a wider application; we hear from India of dancing-girls who are considered to be possessed by the god and are consulted by the people as soothsayers.[9] But I venture to suggest that the chief explanation lies in the fact that sexual intercourse with a holy person is supposed to be beneficial, and may

[1] *Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum*, pt. i. vol. i. no. 263, p. 340.
[2] Strabo, vi. 2. 6. [3] Farnell, *Greece and Babylon*, p. 272.
[4] Strabo, xii. 3. 36.
[5] *Ibid.* viii. 6. 20. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, ii. 746.
[6] Farnell, *Greece and Babylon*, p. 272.
[7] Ramsay, *op. cit.* i. 95.
[8] Farnell, *Greece and Babylon*, p. 273.
[9] Balfour, *Cyclopaedia of India*, ii. 1012.

on that account be a regular feature of the cult. It is noteworthy that in some of the Semitic cults there was a prostitution of men. A clause in Ḫammurabi's code seems to refer to it;[1] and it is known that male prostitutes were serving Ishtar at Erech.[2] *Qedēshīm* were attached to Canaanite temples.[3] The word properly denotes men dedicated to a deity,[4] but has, no doubt for good reason, been translated "sodomites" in the English version of the Old Testament. It appears that such men were consecrated to the mother of the gods, the famous Dea Syria, whose priests or devotees they were considered to be;[5] and they are frequently alluded to by Hebrew writers, especially in the period of the monarchy, when rites of foreign origin made their way into both Israel and Judah.[6] The sodomitic acts committed with these sacred men may be explained as an outcome of the same belief which I have suggested to be the chief cause of the prostitution of the temple women. In Morocco supernatural benefits are to this day expected not only from heterosexual but also from homosexual intercourse with a holy person.[7] But I entirely fail to see how the function of the male prostitutes could be either a rite intended to ensure "the fruitfulness of fields and trees, of man and beast," or a survival of "communal marriage." That the temple prostitutes are expiating an infringement of old communal rights is a suggestion which in some cases is absolutely inconsistent with facts, and in all cases a mere guess for which no evidence has ever been produced.

[1] Winckler's translation, § 187, p. 57.

[2] Schrader, *op. cit.* p. 422 *sq.*

[3] *Deuteronomy*, xxiii. 17. Driver, *op. cit.* p. 264.

[4] Driver, *op. cit.* p. 264 *sq.* Selbie, 'Sodomite,' in Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, iv. 559. *Cf.* Frazer, *Adonis Attis Osiris*, i. 73 n. 1.

[5] St. Jerome, *In Osee*, i. 4. 14 (Migne, *op. cit.* xxv. 851). Cook's note to 1 *Kings*, xiv. 24, in his edition of *Holy Bible*, ii. 571. See also Lucian, *Lucius*, 38; Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, iii. 55 (Migne, *op. cit.* Ser. Graeca, xx. 1120).

[6] 1 *Kings*, xiv. 24: xv. 12; xxii. 46. 2 *Kings*, xxiii. 7. *Job*, xxxvi. 14. Driver, *op. cit.* p. 265.

[7] See Westermarck, *Moorish Conception of Holiness* (*Baraka*), p. 85.

Another custom which has been adduced as evidence of former communism in women is that which requires a man to offer his wife or one of his wives to a guest.[1] To Lord Avebury it seems to involve the recognition of "a right inherent in every member of the community, and to visitors as temporary members."[2] Were this so, we should certainly have to conclude that "communal marriage" has been widespread in the human race, the custom of lending wives occurring among many peoples in different parts of the world.[3] But we might as well look upon the offer

[1] Avebury, *Origin of Civilisation*, p. 107. Post, *Die Geschlechtsgenossenschaft der Urzeit*, p. 34 *sq.* Le Bon, *L'homme et les sociétés*, ii. 292. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte der Menschheit*, ii. 17. Kohler, 'Ueber das Recht der Australneger,' in *Zeitschr. vergl. Rechtswiss.* vii. 327. Wilutzky, *op. cit.* i. 44 *sqq.*

[2] Avebury, *op. cit.* p. 107.

[3] The practice of lending a wife to a guest has been found, for example, among the Guarani of Paraguay (Hernandez, *Organización social de las doctrinas Guaraníes*, i. 84), Indians of Brazil (v. Martius, *Beiträge zur Ethnographie Amerika's*, i. 118), Apache (Bancroft, *Native Races of the Pacific States*, i. 514), Comanche (Schoolcraft, *Archives of Aboriginal Knowledge*, v. 684), Californian Indians (Powers, *Tribes of California*, p. 153), Omaha (James, *Account of an Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains*, i. 233), coast tribes of British Columbia (Sproat, *Scenes and Studies of Savage Life*, p. 95), Cree (Mackenzie, *Voyages to the Frozen and Pacific Oceans*, p. xcvi.), Eskimo (Richardson, *Arctic Searching Expedition*, i. 356; Bancroft, *op. cit.* i. 65), Aleut (Veniaminof, quoted by Bogoras, *Chukchee*, p. 607, n. 1), Tungus (Patkanov, quoted by Miss Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, p. 107), Votyak (Buch, *Die Wotjäken*, p. 48), Tibetans (Marco Polo, *Kingdoms and Marvels of the East*, ii. 54; Desgodins, *Le Thibet*, p. 244; Grenard, *Tibet*, p. 260), Pathān clans of Baluchistan (formerly; Gait, *Census of India*, 1911, vol. i. [India] Report, p. 248), Sinhalese (Pridham, *Historical Account of Ceylon*, i. 250), Orang Sakai of Malacca and Dyaks of Sidin in Western Borneo (Wilken, 'Plechtigheden en gebruiken bij verlovingen en huwelijken bij de volken van den Indischen Archipel,' in *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, ser. v. vol. iv. 451), Australian aborigines (Curr, *The Australian Race*, i. 110; Angas, *Savage Life and Scenes in Australia*, i. 93; Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition*, ii. 195; Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 63; *Iidem*, *Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 140; Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, pp. 208, 224; Malinowski,

of a meal and a bed to a guest as a relic from a time when no man had any food or shelter which he could call his own. For I think there can be no doubt that the custom which requires a host to lend his wife to his guest is only an incident of the general rule of hospitality, which in some form or other seems to prevail universally at the lower stages of civilisation.[1] It is not always the wife that is offered: it may be a daughter, a sister, or a servant.[2] This sort of hospitality is frequently mentioned in Irish

The Family among the Australian Aborigines, p. 103), Melanesians of the New Hebrides (Codrington, *Melanesians*, p. 24), Caroline Islanders (Kotzebue, *Voyage of Discovery into the South Sea*, iii. 212), Marquesas Islanders (Lamont, *Wild Life among the Pacific Islanders*, p. 42), Hawaians (Jarves, *History of the Hawaiian Islands*, p. 42; Meinicke, *Die Inseln des Stillen Oceans*, ii. 305), Malagasy (Grandidier, *Ethnographie de Madagascar*, ii. 202), Masai (Merker, *Die Masai*, p. 50 n. 1; Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, p. 825; Kaiser, reviewed in *L'Anthropologie*, xvii. 710; Hobley, *Ethnology of A-Kamba*, p. 64), Akamba (*ibid.* p. 64), Nandi (Hollis, *Nandi*, p. 77), Wasania (Barrett, 'Notes on the Customs and Beliefs of the Wa-Giriama, etc., British East Africa,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xli. 31), Baganda (Felkin, 'Notes on the Waganda Tribe,' in *Proceed. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh*, xiii. 711 *sq.*), Banyankole (Roscoe, 'Bahima,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xxxvii. 105; *Idem*, *Northern Bantu*, p. 121 *sq.*), Basuto (Rolland, quoted by Theal, *History of the Boers*, p. 19), Kafirs (v. Weber, *Vier Jahre in Afrika*, ii. 218), Baya (Poupon, 'Étude ethnographique des Baya,' in *L'Anthropologie*, xxvi. 126), Yoruba (Ellis, *Yoruba-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast*, p. 182), Canarians (Cook, 'Aborigines of the Canary Islands,' in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. ii. 479 *sq.*), ancient Arabs (Wellhausen, 'Die Ehe bei den Arabern,' in *Nachrichten von der Königl. Gesellsch. f. Wissensch. Göttingen*, 1893, no. 11, p. 462). In many of these cases, however, the lending of the wife is only spoken of as a more or less frequent practice, not as a duty incumbent upon the host.

[1] See Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, i. 572 *sqq.*

[2] Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, iii. 111 (North American Indians). Coxe, *Russian Discoveries between Asia and America*, p. 245. Marco Polo, *op. cit.* ii. 54 (people of Caindu, Eastern Tibet). Sauer, *Expedition to the Northern Parts of Russia*, p. 49; Patkanov, quoted by Miss Czaplicka, *op. cit.* p. 107 (Tungus). Regnard, 'Journey to Lapland,' in Pinkerton, *op. cit.* i. 166 *sq.* Rochon, 'Voyage to Madagascar,' *ibid.* xvi. 747. Moore, *Marriage Customs, &c. of the Various Nations of the Universe*, p. 267. Post, *Die Geschlechtsgenossenschaft der Urzeit*, p. 34 *sq.*

heroic tales,[1] and M. Méray has called attention to a number of instances occurring in French mediæval literature which point to the former existence of the custom in France.[2] Among the Maori " it was a point of hospitality that when a strange chief of high rank paid a visit his entertainer should send a temporary wife or wives to his guests ; generally his own daughter as a special honour " ;[3] whereas married women were never offered to visitors.[4] When we read that among the coast tribes of British Columbia " the temporary present of a wife is one of the greatest honours that can be shown there to a guest " ;[5] or that such an offer was considered by the Eskimo " as an act of generous hospitality " ;[6] or that in the Hawaian Islands visitors who were their hosts' equals or superiors in rank were accommodated with women as a necessary exercise of hospitality[7]—I cannot see why we should look for a deeper meaning in these practices than that which the words imply. Among certain tribes the wife is said to be offered to a guest who belongs to the husband's clan[8] or who is his friend ;[9] but frequently it is represented as a particular mark of distinction,[10] or as a favour bestowed even upon European visitors.[11] And to refuse it may be considered an insult[12] or make the guest " despised by the men and scorned by the women."[13]

[1] Potter, *Sohrab and Rustem*, p. 148.

[2] Méray, *La vie au temps des Trouvères*, p. 77 *sqq.*

[3] Tregear, *The Maori Race*, p. 298.

[4] Best, ' Maori Marriage Customs,' in *Trans. and Proceed. New Zealand Institute*, xxxvi. 63.

[5] Sproat, *op. cit.* p. 95.

[6] Richardson, *op. cit.* p. 356.

[7] Jarves, *op. cit.* p. 42.

[8] Hobley, *op. cit.* p. 64 (various East African tribes).

[9] *Ibid.* p. 64 (Akamba). Roscoe, in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xxxvii. 105 (Banyankole). Poupon, *loc. cit.* p. 126 (Baya).

[10] Hernandez, *op. cit.* i. 84 (Guarani). Lamont, *op. cit.* p. 42 (Marquesas Islanders). Grandidier, *op. cit.* ii. 202 (Malagasy). d'Arbois de Jubainville, *L'epopée celtique en Irlande*, i. 7 *sq.* (referring to Conchobar, king of Ulster).

[11] James, *op. cit.* i. 233 (Omaha). Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 101 *sq.* Felkin, *loc. cit.* p. 712 (Baganda).

[12] Potter, *op. cit.* p. 147. Cook, in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. ii. 480 (Canarians).

[13] Felkin, *loc. cit.* p. 712 (Baganda).

To offer one's wife to a friend may not merely be an expression of good-will. Generally speaking, when the visitor belongs to a community with which there is reciprocity of intercourse, it is good policy to give him a hearty reception; for he who is the host to-day may be the guest to-morrow. "If the Red Indians are hospitable," says Domenech, "they also look for their hospitality being returned with the same marks of respect and consideration."[1] So, too, it may be prudent for the host to show unusual regard for a powerful or influential man, even though he cannot expect to be paid back exactly in his own coin. But, as I have shown in another work, the custom of hospitality is also associated with superstitious beliefs.[2] The unknown stranger, like everything unknown and everything strange, arouses a feeling of mysterious awe in simple minds. The Ainu say, "Do not treat strangers slightingly, for you never know whom you are entertaining."[3] According to Homeric notions, "the gods, in the likeness of strangers from far countries, put on all manner of shapes, and wander through the cities, beholding the violence and the righteousness of men."[4] It is significant that in the writings of ancient Greece, Rome, and India guests are mentioned next after gods as due objects of regard.[5] When properly treated, the stranger may bring with him great blessings; for if efficacy is ascribed to the blessings even of an ordinary man, those of a stranger are naturally supposed to be still more powerful. And there is yet another reason for pleasing him. He is regarded not only as a potential benefactor, but as a potential source of evil. He is commonly believed to be versed in magic; and the evil wishes and curses of a stranger are greatly feared, owing partly to his quasi-supernatural character, partly to his

[1] Domenech, *Seven Years' Residence in the Great Deserts of North America*, ii. 319. See also Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, i. 581 n. 2.

[2] *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, i. 582 *sqq.*

[3] Batchelor, *Ainu and their Folk-Lore*, p. 259.

[4] *Odyssea*, xvii. 485 *sqq.*

[5] Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*, v. 13. 5. *Anugitâ*, 3, 31 (*Sacred Books of the East*, viii. 243, 361). See also *Hitopadesa*, Mitralâbhâ, 65.

close contact with the host and his belongings, which makes it easy for him to transfer evil to them. In the work referred to I said that the custom which requires a host to lend his wife to a guest "becomes more intelligible when we consider the supposed danger of the stranger's evil eye or his curses, as also the benefits which may be supposed to result from his love"; but I added that I could adduce no direct evidence for my supposition.[1] The following statements, which had escaped my notice, seem to confirm it; the first one shows that superstition may induce a man to lend his wife to another man, even though he be no stranger. Concerning the North-West-Central Queensland aborigines Dr. Roth states:—"If an aboriginal requires a woman temporarily for venery he either borrows a wife from her husband for a night or two in exchange for boomerangs, a shield, food, &c., or else violates the female when unprotected, when away from camp out in the bush. In the former case, the husband looks upon the matter as a point of honour to oblige his friend, the greatest compliment that can be paid him, provided that permission is previously asked. On the other hand, were he to refuse, he has the fear hanging over him that the petitioner might get a death-bone pointed at him—and so, after all, his apparent courtesy may be only Hobson's choice."[2] The belief in the death-bone and its property of causing sickness and death is a universal superstition among those natives and one which fills them with the utmost fear.[3] With reference to the people of Caindu, in Eastern Tibet, Marco Polo wrote:—"No man considers himself wronged if a foreigner, or any other man, dishonour his wife, or daughter, or sister, or any woman of his family, but on the contrary he deems such intercourse a piece of good fortune. And they say that it

[1] *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, i. 593.

[2] Roth, *Ethnological Studies among the North-West-Central Queensland Aborigines*, p. 182. It is said that among the Tottiyars in Southern India newly-married women are compelled to cohabit with their husband's near relatives, and that ill-luck is believed to attend any refusal to do so (Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, vii. 186).

[3] Roth, *op. cit.* p. 152.

brings the favour of their gods and idols, and great increase of temporal prosperity. For this reason they bestow their wives on foreigners and other people."[1] Mr. Potter has been told that North American Indians, in lending their wives, have often been actuated by a desire to procure nobler offspring.[2]

Besides the custom of lending wives to visitors, the temporary exchange of wives, which is also a frequent, though not equally frequent, practice,[3] has been represented as a survival of ancient promiscuity.[4] Sometimes the two practices are combined. Among the Banyankole or Bahima in Central Africa, " when a man and his wife visit a friend, they invariably exchange wives during the time of the visit " ;[5] and a similar custom prevailed in the Hawaian Islands.[6]

[1] Marco Polo, *op. cit.* ii. 53 *sq.* [2] Potter, *op. cit.* p. 150.

[3] It has been found among the Jíbaros of Ecuador (Orton, *Andes and the Amazon*, p. 172 ; Simson [*Travels in the Wilds of Ecuador*, p. 89], however, says that he has not heard of this custom among them), Eskimo (Nansen, *Eskimo Life*, p. 169 ; Holm, ' Konebaads-Expeditionen til Grønlands Østkyst 1883–85,' in *Geografisk Tidskrift*, viii. 92 ; Lyon, *Private Journal during the Voyage of Discovery under Captain Parry*, p. 354), Northern Déné (Hearne, *Journey from Prince of Wales's Fort to the Northern Ocean*, p. 129 ; Morice, ' The Great Déné Race,' in *Anthropos*, ii. 33), Aleut (v. Langsdorf, *Voyages and Travels*, ii. 47 ; Jochelson, *Koryak*, p. 756), Kamchadal (Steller, *Beschreibung von Kamtschatka*, p. 347), Himalayans (Stulpnagel, ' Polyandry in the Himâlayas,' in *Indian Antiquary*, vii. 134), Nayars (*Travels of Ludovico di Varthema*, p. 145 *sq.*), pagan Arabs (*Alberuni's India*, i. 109), Baya (Poupon, in *L'Anthropologie*, xxvi. 126), Ayao (Stigand, ' Notes on the Natives of Nyassaland, N.E. Rhodesia, and Portuguese Zambezia,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xxxvii. 122), Wagiriama (Barrett, ' Notes on the Customs and Beliefs of the Wa-Giriama, etc., British East Africa,' *ibid.* xli. 22), Australian aborigines (Howitt, *op. cit.* pp. 170, 195, 216, 217, 224, 260, 276 *sq.* ; Eylmann, *op. cit.* p. 153), and various South Sea Islanders (Christian, *Caroline Islands*, p. 74 ; Guppy, *Solomon Islands*, p. 43 ; Parkinson, *Dreissig Jahre in der Südsee*, p. 267 [New Ireland and New Hanover] ; Waitz-Gerland, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, vi. 130, 131, 622). See also below.

[4] Wilutzky, *op. cit.* i. 20 *sq.*

[5] Roscoe, in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xxxvii. 105. *Idem*, *Northern Bantu*, p. 122. [6] Remy, *Ka Mooolelo Hawaii*, p. xli.

An exchange of wives may take place simply for the sake of enjoyment. Merolla da Sorrento says that the Negroes of Angola, who used to exchange their wives with each other for a certain time, excused themselves, when reproached, on the ground that "they were not able to eat always of the same dish."[1] Among the Baya of West Africa, "un camarade, qui reçoit un des ses bons amis, lui prête sa femme pour la nuit; s'ils ont chacun du goût pour la femme de l'autre, ils en font l'échange."[2] On the east coast of Greenland the natives, while living in their winter houses, often play "a wife-exchanging or lamp-extinguishing game," in which the unmarried also take part; and Holm tells us that "a good host always has the lamps put out at night when there are guests in the house."[3] Among the Eskimo of Hudson's Bay, "an exchange of wives is frequent, either party being often happy to be released for a time, and returning without concern."[4]

Among the Eskimo men also exchange their wives for purely practical reasons.[5] Of those living round Repulse Bay we are told that "if a man who is going on a journey has a wife encumbered with a child that would make travelling unpleasant, he exchanges wives with some friend who remains in camp and has no such inconvenience. Sometimes a man will want a younger wife to travel with, and in that case effects an exchange, and sometimes such exchanges are made for no especial reason, and among friends it is a usual thing to exchange wives for a week or two about every two months."[6] Murdoch speaks of a Point Barrow Eskimo of his acquaintance who planned to go to the river deer-hunting in the summer of 1882, and borrowed his

[1] Merolla da Sorrento, 'Voyage to Congo,' in Pinkerton, *op. cit.* xvi. 299.

[2] Poupon, in *L'Anthropologie*, xxvi. 126.

[3] Holm, in *Geografisk Tidskrift*, viii. 92. Nansen, *op. cit.* p. 169. *Cf.* Dalager, *Grønlandske Relationer*, p. 67 *sq.*

[4] Turner, 'Ethnology of the Ungava District,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethn.* xi. 189.

[5] See Parry, *Journal of a Second Voyage*, p. 528; Hawkes, *The Labrador Eskimo*, p. 116.

[6] Gilder, *Schwatka's Search*, p. 251.

cousin's wife for the expedition, as she was a good shot and a good hand at deer-hunting, while his own wife went with his cousin on a trading expedition to the eastward. On their return the wives went back to their respective husbands. But sometimes it happens in similar cases that the couples find themselves better placed with their new mates than with the former association and that, in consequence, the exchange is made permanent.[1] Among the Eskimo at Fury and Hekla Straits some of the young men informed Parry and his party that "when two of them were absent together on a sealing excursion, they often exchanged wives for the time, as a matter of friendly convenience."[2]

In some cases anger or disgust is said to be the motive for exchanging wives. Among the Himalayan mountaineers, according to Dr. Stulpnagel, "it is nothing extraordinary to hear that two men disgusted with their wives have agreed to interchange them, hoping that a new arrangement in their domestic affairs would conduce to greater peace and comfort."[3] Among the Bangala of the Upper Congo River, "sometimes, in anger, two men would exchange their wives, especially if one man's wife was continually running after the other man."[4] Among the Ayao, south of Lake Nyasa, if a man's wife admits that she has committed adultery, the co-respondent sometimes, instead of giving a present, lends his wife for the same number of nights as he slept with the other man's wife.[5] Among the Darling tribes of New South Wales it is an occasional custom "that two tribal brothers having quarrelled, and wishing for a reconciliation, the one sends his wife to the other's camp, and a temporary change is effected."[6]

[1] Murdoch, 'Ethnological Results of the Point Barrow Expedition,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethn.* ix. 413.

[2] Parry, *op. cit.* p. 529.

[3] Stulpnagel, in *Indian Antiquary*, vii. 134.

[4] Weeks, 'Anthropological Notes on the Bangala of the Upper Congo River,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xxxix. 442.

[5] Stigand, in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xxxvii. 122.

[6] Cameron, 'Notes on some Tribes of New South Wales,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xiv. 353.

Sometimes the exchange of wives is described as a sign of friendship. Thus among the Northern Déné, according to Father Morice, "the momentary exchange of wives was regarded, not as a breach of propriety, but on the contrary as an unsurpassed token of friendship";[1] and among the Eskimo of Davis Strait and Cumberland Sound, according to Dr. Boas, "a strange custom permits a man to lend his wife to a friend for a whole season or even longer and to exchange wives as a sign of friendship."[2] If our informants had entered more deeply into the native mind, it is possible that they would have found the practice to be something more than a mere sign of intimacy; some magic significance may have been ascribed to it. The South Sea Islanders maintain that an exchange of names, which is a common practice among them, establishes a kind of relationship, not only between the parties themselves, but between their people generally.[3] And, as we shall see subsequently, some savages have the idea that if a man commits adultery with another man's wife, the fate of the husband is thereby in a mysterious manner associated with that of the adulterer, because they have had intercourse with the same woman.[4]

In certain cases the practice of exchanging wives is undoubtedly connected with some superstition. Writing of shamanistic performances among the Eskimo of the western coast of Hudson's Bay, Dr. Boas states:—"It seems that the incantations of the *angakut* [pl. of *angakok*] are always performed in the evening. After each of these ceremonies the people must exchange wives. The women must spend the night in the huts of the men to whom they are assigned. If any woman should refuse to go to the man to whom she is assigned she would be sure to be taken sick. The man and the woman assigned to him, however, must not be near relatives."[5] Dr. Howitt tells us that among the Wiimbaio, who occupy the country at the junction of the

[1] Morice, in *Anthropos*, ii. 33.
[2] Boas, 'Central Eskimo,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethn.* vi. 579.
[3] Lamont, *op. cit.* p. 33. *Cf.* Melville, *Typee*, p. 103.
[4] *Infra*, i. 315.
[5] Boas, quoted by Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, ii 144.

Darling and Murray Rivers, wives were exchanged, not only at times when there were great tribal gatherings, but also in order to avert some great trouble which they fancied was about to come upon them, for example, a great sickness;[1] and among the Kurnai of Gippsland the old men ordered an exchange of wives when the Aurora Australis was seen, since "this was thought by them to be a sign of Mungan's anger."[2] In these cases the deeper meaning of the practice is obscure. Perhaps the Australian rite was a form of homœopathic magic, the change of wives being supposed to effect the change of a dangerous situation.

The practice of exchanging wives may thus be traced to many different causes. Most frequently it is a perfectly voluntary arrangement between the husbands or between all the parties concerned,[3] and it never has the character of a claim which one man has to another man's wife. There is consequently no reason whatever to regard it as the survival of an ancient communal right.

Among various peoples promiscuous intercourse is indulged in at certain feasts; and this, too, has been regarded as a survival of ancient promiscuity. We have previously noticed several instances of such feasts,[4] and others might be added. Sometimes they are held at definite seasons, and sometimes they are connected with particular events in the social life of the people. Speaking of the Koko-nor Tibetans, Mr. Rockhill says that, "in the lamaseries in Amdo, there is held at different times a feast known to the Chinese as *t'iao mao hui*, 'the hat-choosing festival.' During the two or three days the feast lasts a man may carry off the cap of any girl or woman he meets in the temple grounds who pleases him, and she is obliged to come at

[1] Howitt, *op. cit.* p. 195. See also Cameron, in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xiv. 353.

[2] Howitt, *op. cit.* pp. 170, 276 *sq.*

[3] Among the Wagiriama of British East Africa, for instance, two men cannot exchange their wives without the agreement of the latter (Barrett, in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xli. 22).

[4] *Supra*, ch. ii.

night and redeem the pledge."[1] In the Philippines, at the time of their discovery, marriages were celebrated with extremely obscene dances, "après quoi l'on se couchait pêle-mêle."[2] In Madagascar orgies of great licentiousness formerly accompanied the birth of a child in the royal family; on such an occasion the streets and lanes of the capital appeared like one vast brothel, and the period during which the debauchery lasted was called *àndro-tsi-màty*, that is, a time when the law could not condemn nor the penalty of death be inflicted.[3]

There is reason to believe that at some of the feasts, at least, the promiscuous intercourse has the character of a magical rite.[4] And in no case can I regard debauchery or a loosening of the marriage tie on some specific occasion as evidence of a time when there was no marriage tie at all.

[1] Rockhill, *Land of the Lamas*, p. 80 *sq.*

[2] Mallat, *Les Philippines*, i. 59.

[3] Ellis, *History of Madagascar*, i. 150 *sq.* Sibree, *The Great African Island*, p. 253. Sir James G. Frazer (*Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 638) thinks that a trace of "an older custom of sexual promiscuity, or of something like it," may perhaps be detected in these orgies.

[4] See *supra*, p. 92.

CHAPTER VII

A CRITICISM OF THE HYPOTHESIS OF PROMISCUITY: THE CLASSIFICATORY SYSTEM OF RELATIONSHIP

NEARLY fifty years ago the American anthropologist, Lewis Morgan, published the terms of relationship in use among no fewer than 139 different peoples or tribes. He divided the systems of nomenclature into two great classes, the "descriptive" and the "classificatory," which he regarded as radically distinct. "The first," he says, "which is that of the Aryan, Semitic, and Uralian families, rejecting the classification of kindred, except so far as it is in accordance with the numerical system, describes collateral consanguinei, for the most part, by an augmentation or combination of the primary terms of relationship. These terms, which are those for husband and wife, father and mother, brother and sister, and son and daughter, to which must be added, in such languages as possess them, grandfather and grandmother, and grandson and granddaughter, are thus restricted to the primary sense in which they are here employed. All other terms are secondary. Each relationship is thus made independent and distinct from every other. But the second, which is that of the Turanian, American Indian, and Malayan families, rejecting descriptive phrases in every instance, and reducing consanguinei to great classes, by a series of apparently arbitrary generalisations, applies the same terms to all the members

of the same class. It thus confounds relationships, which, under the descriptive system, are distinct, and enlarges the signification both of the primary and secondary terms beyond their seemingly appropriate sense."[1]

Since the publication of Morgan's work many fresh instances of the classificatory system have been discovered in different parts of the world. It is known to exist among the North American tribes, with the exception of the Eskimo. It is universal in Polynesia, Melanesia, New Guinea, and Australia. It is found in India and Northern Asia, and among the Bantu peoples of Africa. And vestiges of it have been discovered elsewhere, even in some parts of Europe.[2] On the other hand, objections have been made to the generally accepted distinction between descriptive and classificatory systems of terms of relationship. Every language, Professor Kroeber remarks, groups together under single designations many distinct degrees and kinds of relationship. Thus our word brother includes both the older and the younger brother and the brother of a man and of a woman; whilst the English word cousin denotes thirty-two different relationships, and if the term is not strictly limited to the significance of first cousin the number of distinct ideas which it is capable of expressing is many times thirty-two.[3] Dr. Rivers finds in particular fault with the term "descriptive system": those designations which apply to one person only may be called descriptive if you please, but when we pass beyond these our terms are no whit more descriptive than those of the classificatory system. According to him, there are really three main varieties of system of relationship in place of the two which have hitherto been recognised, one having its origin in the clan, another one in the family in the narrow sense, and a third

[1] Morgan, *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family*, p. 12.

[2] See Rivers, 'On the Origin of the Classificatory System of Relationships,' in *Anthropological Essays presented to E. B. Tylor*, p. 310. *Idem*, 'Kin, Kinship,' in Hastings, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, vii. 703 *sq.*

[3] Kroeber, 'Classificatory Systems of Relationship,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xxxix. p. 77.

in the extended or patriarchal family.[1] The first is the classificatory system, which might consequently also be called the "clan system."[2] But whatever may be said against Morgan's terminology, there can hardly be any danger in making use of it in the present discussion.

The simplest, and according to Morgan the earliest, system of the classificatory group is that which he called the "Malayan" system. As Mr. Wallace wrote to me, the term "Malayan" is badly chosen, since the system in question is not found among true Malays. It occurs among the Hawaians and the Maori of New Zealand, and probably also in other parts of Polynesia.[3] I shall call it the Hawaian system. All consanguinei, near and remote, are in this system classified into five categories. My brothers and sisters and my first, second, third, and more remote male and female cousins, are the first category. To all these without distinction I apply the same term. My father and mother, together with their brothers and sisters, and their first, second, and more remote cousins, are the second category. To all these without distinction I apply likewise the same term. The brothers, sisters, and several cousins of my grandparents I denominate as if they were my grandparents; the cousins of my sons and daughters, as if they were my sons and daughters; the grandchildren of my brothers and sisters and their several cousins, as if they were my own grandchildren. All the individuals of the same category address each other as if they were brothers and sisters.[4] Altogether there are in the Hawaian Islands only fifteen terms of relationship, if relatives by marriage are excluded. The other systems of the classificatory group are more discriminating. In nearly all of them the father's brother is classed with the father and the mother's sister with the mother, but very generally a rigorous distinction

[1] Rivers, *Kinship and Social Organisation*, p. 76 *sq.*

[2] *Ibid.* p. 71.

[3] Morgan, *op. cit.* p. 450 *sq.* Best, 'Maori Marriage Customs,' in *Trans. and Proceed. of the New Zealand Institute*, xxxvi. 28. Rivers, in Hastings, *op. cit.* vii. 702.

[4] Morgan, *Ancient Society*, p. 403 *sq.* *Idem*, *Systems*, p. 482 *sq.*

is made between relatives through the father and relatives through the mother—between the father's brother and the mother's brother, between the father's sister and the mother's sister, and between the children of brothers or of sisters and the children of brother and sister.[1] Various other details, of less frequent occurrence, will be noticed below.

From the classificatory terms of relationship far-reaching conclusions have been drawn with reference to earlier marriage customs. Morgan assumed that the Hawaian system of nomenclature was the root from which all the others belonging to the classificatory group had gradually developed; and from the Hawaian system itself he inferred the former prevalence of "marriage in a group" of all brothers and sisters and cousins of the same grade or generation—or, more strictly, his case was, that if we can explain the system in question on the assumption that such a general custom once existed, then we must believe that it did formerly exist. "Without this custom," he says, "it is impossible to explain the origin of the system from the nature of descents. There is, therefore, a necessity for the prevalence of this custom amongst the remote ancestors of all the nations which now possess the classificatory system, if the system itself is to be regarded as having a natural origin."[2] The family resulting from this custom he calls, in his later work, the "consanguine family," and in this, consisting of a body of kinsfolk, within which there prevailed promiscuity, or "communal marriage," between all men and women of the same generation, the family in its first stage is recognised. Morgan believes, however, that as a necessary condition antecedent to this form of the family, promiscuity, in a wider sense of the term, may be theoretically deduced, though, as he says, "it lies concealed in the misty antiquity of mankind beyond the reach of positive knowledge."[3]

It is needless to examine the last conclusion unless the

[1] See Rivers, in Hastings, *op. cit.* vii. 702; *Idem, Kinship and Social Organisation*, p. 66.

[2] Morgan *Systems*, p. 488.

[3] *Idem, Ancient Society*, p. 502. *Cf. Idem, Systems*, p. 487 *sq.*

hypothesis of the "consanguine family," from which it is drawn, is found acceptable; and so far as I can see, this hypothesis is not only unfounded but contrary to all reasonable assumptions. Among other things it presupposes unrestricted sexual intercourse between brothers and sisters, which is found nowhere among existing savages and is utterly inconsistent with the strict exogamy which prevails among most peoples who have a classificatory system of relationship terms. Morgan seems to assume that the fewer terms such a system contains the more ancient it must be, that a system which makes no distinction between relatives through father and mother must be earlier than one which makes such a distinction. We might just as well conclude that the present English nomenclature, which classes the brothers and sisters of the father together with the brothers and sisters of the mother, must be more ancient than the Anglo-Saxon and Latin systems, which distinguished between paternal and maternal uncles and aunts. Dr. Rivers points out instances of classificatory systems undergoing changes in the direction of the Hawaian form of nomenclature, and believes that this form, far from being primitive, "rather represents a late stage in the history of the more ordinary forms of the classificatory system"—which, indeed, we might expect from the relatively high development of Polynesian society.[1]

At the same time Dr. Rivers thinks it possible that the Hawaian system "may have had its source in promiscuity, even though this condition be late rather than primitive."[2] Still more conciliatory is his attitude towards Morgan's hypothesis as regards the form of the family following upon the "consanguine family," the so-called "Punaluan family," which was founded upon intermarriage of several sisters and female cousins with each other's husbands (or several brothers and male cousins with each other's wives) in a group, the joint husbands (or wives) not being necessarily

[1] Rivers, in *Anthropological Essays presented to E. B. Tylor*, p. 311 *sqq.* *Idem, Kinship and Social Organisation*, p. 85. *Cf.* Schmidt, *Der Ursprung der Gottesidee*, p. 184 n. 2.

[2] Rivers, *Kinship and Social Organisation*, p. 85.

akin to each other, although often so.[1] In an article published in 1907 Dr. Rivers supports the view that the features of the classificatory system of relationship as we find them at the present time have arisen out of a state of group-marriage—a form of marriage in which definite groups of men are the husbands of definite groups of women—although he points out that the classificatory system lends no support to the view that the state of group-marriage was preceded by one of wholly unregulated promiscuity.[2] In a later essay he is somewhat more cautious. He throws aside the term group-marriage as only confusing the issue, and speaks rather of a state of organised sexual communism, which he (in his latest work) defines as " a social condition in which it is recognised as legitimate that sexual relations shall take place between a group of men and a group of women."[3] But he is still of opinion that " the classificatory system has several features which would follow naturally from such a condition of sexual communism," and that " the wide distribution of the classificatory system would suggest that this communism has been very general," although it need not have been universal.[4] That the classificatory system has originated in group-marriage is a view which is held by many other writers.[5] According to Sir James G. Frazer, the classificatory terms express group-relationships, and the only reasonable and probable explanation of such a system of group-relationships is that it originated in a system of group-marriage.[6] Professor Kohler expresses the same opinion in

[1] Morgan, *Ancient Society*, p. 384.

[2] Rivers, in *Anthropological Essays presented to E. B. Tylor*, p. 323.

[3] *Idem*, *History of Melanesian Society*, ii. 127.

[4] *Idem*, *Kinship and Social Organisation*, p. 86. In his article on 'Marriage,' in Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* (viii. 432), Dr. Rivers says that " the nature of the classificatory system of relationship is most naturally explained by its origin in communistic conditions."

[5] See, *e.g.*, Fison and Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, p. 50; Howitt, 'Native Tribes in South-East Australia,' in *Folk-Lore*, xvii. 189; Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 59.

[6] Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, i. 303, 304, 501; ii. 69 *sqq*. See also *Idem*, *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament*, ii. 311 *sqq*.

words which show that he looks upon it as a scientific truth so firmly established that it allows of no doubt whatever.[1]

Morgan's hypothesis of the "consanguine family," and to some extent also the theory that the classificatory nomenclature has its origin in group-marriage, are based on the assumption that this nomenclature was originally meant to express the degree and kind of blood-relationship as definitely as the fatherhood of individuals could be known. If a person applied the same term to his father and to certain other men as well, he did so because he could not know who of them was his father. If he applied the same term to his children and to certain other persons also, he did so because he could not know who of them were his children. And the like holds true of other terms of relationship. We shall now consider the assumption which is at the bottom of these inferences. It may, first, be asked whether the meaning of the terms lends any support to it.

The answer to this question must necessarily be very incomplete, since it is only in rare cases that a term is said to have any special meaning apart from its being a designation for a certain person or a certain class of persons. But we know, at all events, one great source from which terms of relationship, whether "descriptive" or "classificatory," have been derived. Professor Buschmann has given us a list of the names for father and mother in many different tongues, and the similarity of the terms is striking. Thus *pa*, *papa*, or *baba*, means father in several languages of the Old and the New World, and *ma*, *mama*, means mother.[2] The Tupis have *paia* for father and *maia* for mother; the Uaraguaçú, respectively, *paptko* and *mamko*.[3] In other languages

[1] Kohler, 'Rechtsphilosophie und Universalrechtsgeschichte,' in v. Holtzendorff, *Enzyklopädie der Rechtswissenschaft*, i. 27. See also *Idem*, 'Zur Urgeschichte der Ehe,' in *Zeitschr. vergl. Rechtswiss.* xii. 321, &c.

[2] Buschmann, 'Ueber den Naturlaut,' in *Philologische und historische Abhandlungen der Königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1852, p. 391 *sqq*. Independently of him Lord Avebury has compiled a similar table in *The Origin of Civilisation*, p. 346 *sqq*.

[3] v. Martius, *Beiträge zur Ethnographie und Sprachenkunde Amerika's*, ii. 9, 10, 18.

the terms for father are *ab, aba, apa, ada, ata, tata*; those for mother *ama, emä, ana, ena*, &c. According to Buschmann, there are four typical forms of words for each of these ideas: for father, *pa, ta, ap, at*; for mother, *ma, na, am, an*. Sometimes, however, the meaning of the types is reversed. Thus in the language of the West Australian Kariera,[1] the Mahaga language of Ysabel,[2] the Koita language of British New Guinea,[3] and Georgian,[4] *mama* stands for father; whilst the Tuluvas of Southern India call the father *amme* and the mother *appe*.[5]

In many cases the terms used fall outside the types mentioned. In the Lifu tongue, for example, one term for father is *kaka*,[6] in the Duauru language of Baladea *chicha*,[7] in the Maréan tongue *chacha* or *cheche*.[8] Among the Chalcha Mongols and some related peoples mother is *ekè*.[9] In the Kanúri language of Central Africa the mother is called *ya*;[10] while the Kechua in Brazil call the father *yaya*.[11] Among the Bakongo, as I am informed by Mr. Ingham, *se* means father; in Finnish, *isä*. Again, in the Brazilian Bakaïrí the mother is called *ise*,[12] and in the language of Aneiteum, in the New Hebrides, *risi*.[13]

Similar terms are often used for other relationships. The Greek πάππος signifies grandfather and μάμμα grandmother. In the Umbaia tribe of Central Australia an elder brother is called *pappa*, and in the Tjingilli tribe the same word is used for children.[14] In Lifuan *mama* means brother,[15]

[1] Brown, 'Three Tribes of Western Australia,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xliii. 149.

[2] von der Gabelentz, *Die melanesischen Sprachen*, ii. 139.

[3] Seligman, *Melanesians of British New Guinea*, p. 66.

[4] Hunter, *Comparative Dictionary of the Languages of India and High Asia*, p. 122.

[5] *Ibid.* pp. 122, 143.

[6] von der Gabelentz, *op. cit.* p. ii. 52. [7] *Ibid.* i. 215.

[8] *Ibid.* i. 172. [9] Klaproth, *Asia Polyglotta*, p. 281.

[10] Barth, *Central-afrikanische Vokabularien*, p. 212.

[11] v. Martius, *op. cit.* ii. 293.

[12] von der Steinen, *Durch Central-Brasilien*, p. 341.

[13] von der Gabelentz, *op. cit.* i. 71.

[14] Spencer and Gillen, *Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 81, 84. [15] von der Gabelentz, *op. cit.* ii. 52.

and in the language of the Yánádis of the Madras Presidency it means maternal uncle.[1]

The origin of such terms is obvious. They are formed from the easiest sounds a child can pronounce. "*Pa-pa, ma-ma, tata*, and *apa, ama, ata*," Professor Preyer observes, "emerge originally spontaneously, the way of the breath being barred at the expiration, either by the lips (*p, m*), or by the tongue (*d, t*)."[2] Yet the different races vary considerably with regard to the ease with which they produce certain sounds. Thus the pronunciation of the labials is very difficult to many Indians;[3] and for this reason, it seems, their terms for father, mother, or other near kinsfolk, often differ much from the types given by Buschmann.

The terms of the type which we have now considered may be "classificatory" as well as "descriptive." To take a few instances. A West African Yoruba applies the term *baba* both to his father and to "uncles on both sides of the house."[4] A Macúsi of British Guiana names his paternal uncle *papa* as well as his father,[5] and a Maori calls by the same term his father, the brothers of his parents, and the sons of his parents' uncles.[6] In one Australian tongue, the Umbaia, *pappa* stands both for elder brother and father's elder brother's son, and in another, the Tjingilli, it stands for children, brother's children, and son's son's children.[7] In the Kariera tribe of Western Australia *mama* is used for father, father's brother, mother's sister's husband, and various other relatives.[8] Among the Koita of British New Guinea *mama* is the term for father and paternal uncle, *nena* for mother and maternal aunt, and *nana* for elder brother,

[1] Ranga Rao, 'Yánádis of the Nellore District,' in the Madras Government Museum's *Bulletin*, iv. 99.

[2] Preyer, *Die Seele des Kindes*, p. 321.

[3] Avebury, *Origin of Civilisation*, p. 349.

[4] Ellis, *Yoruba-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast*, p. 178.

[5] Schomburgk, *Reisen in Britisch-Guiana*, ii. 318. Appun, 'Die Indianer von Britisch-Guayana,' in *Das Ausland*, xliv. 447.

[6] Best, in *Trans. and Proceed. of the New Zealand Institute*, xxxvi. 28.

[7] Spencer and Gillen, *op. cit.* pp. 81, 84.

[8] Brown, in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xliii. 43.

sister, or cousin.[1] An Efatese names his father and all the "tribe brothers" of his father *ava* or *tama*.[2] The Dakota apply the term *ahta* not only to the father, but to the father's brother, to the mother's sister's husband, to the father's father's brother's son, &c., and the term *enah* not only to the mother, but to the mother's sister, to the mother's mother's sister's daughter, &c.[3]

The terms which have been derived from the babble of infants have, of course, been selected, and the use of them has been fixed, by grown-up persons.[4] They may therefore, no doubt, throw some light upon the principles of nomenclature. Terms of this kind may even, besides being designations of certain definite persons, acquire a meaning of a more general and abstract character. Mr. A. J. Swann wrote to me from Kavala Island, in Lake Tanganyika, that among the Waguha the words for father, *baba* and *tata*, also have the meaning of protector and provider. Among the Ewhe-speaking peoples of the Slave Coast, according to Major Ellis, the words now used to express "father," *to* and *fofo*, mean respectively, "he who owns" and "he who maintains," neither of them having any relation to the act of begetting.[5] The Semitic word for father, *ab* (*abu*), is used in a wide range of senses, although, to quote Robertson Smith, it is in all the dialects used "in senses quite inconsistent with the idea that procreator is the radical meaning of the word."[6] Moreover, there is a large number of terms of relationship which do not consist of sounds borrowed from the lips of infants, and some of these are known to have an independent meaning, apart from being terms of relationship, or to have been derived from words having an independent meaning. But I do not know a single classificatory term which directly refers to the act of begetting or to the fact

[1] Seligman, *op. cit.* p. 66 *sq.*

[2] Macdonald, *Oceania*, pp. 126, 186.

[3] Morgan, *Systems*, pp. 295, 313, 339, 348, 358, 362, 368, 374.

[4] *Cf.* Lang, 'Origin of Terms of Human Relationship,' in *Proceed. of the British Academy*, 1907–1908, p. 149.

[5] Ellis, *Ewe-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast*, pp. 211, 213.

[6] Robertson Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, p. 117 *sq.*

of having been begotten—in other words, the meaning of which suggests that uncles are classed together with the father, or nephews and nieces with sons and daughters, or cousins with brothers and sisters, because there is uncertainty as regards fatherhood. Such an assumption is not supported by the intrinsic meaning of terms, so far as it is known. We shall now see whether it may be deduced from the result gained by an examination of the qualities which individuals named by the same term have in common. In every classification similarities of some kind or other are grouped together. What are the similarities between the persons classed together by the classificatory terms of relationship?

The persons named by the same classificatory term are generally of the same sex. Yet there are cases in which the sex of the person is indicated by a special word added to the relationship term. In the Hawaian system father and other kinsmen of the same generation are called *makua kana*; mother, mother's sisters, father's sisters, &c., *makua waheena*; *kana* and *waheena* being the terms for male and female respectively. A son is called *kaikce kana*, a daughter *kaikee waheena*, whilst *kana* alone is applied to husband, husband's brother, and sister's husband, and *waheena* to wife, wife's sister, brother's wife, &c. Certain terms may also be influenced by the sex of the speaker. In many systems two brothers have a term or terms which they use in addressing or speaking of one another, and the same term or terms may be used by two sisters, or these may have terms special to themselves; whereas a brother and sister use a different term or different terms.[1] In the Omaha language different terms were used when a father or mother was spoken to by a son and when they were addressed by a daughter.[2]

The persons classed together generally belong to the same generation, but at the same time the term applied,

[1] Several instances of this are found in Morgan's tables. See also Rivers, *History of Melanesian Society*, i. 9; Macdonald, *Africana*, i. 143 (Eastern Central Africans).

[2] Alice Fletcher and La Flesche, 'Omaha Tribe,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethn.* xxvii. 314.

in an equal degree, depends on the generation of the other party. Within the same generation, also, difference of age very frequently influences the nomenclature. The Hawaians, according to Judge Andrews, have no definite general word for brother in common use. But *kaikuaána* signifies any one of my brothers or male cousins, older than myself, I being a male, and any one of my sisters or female cousins, older than myself, I being a female; whilst *kaikaina* signifies the younger brother of a brother, or the younger sister of a sister.[1] Such distinguishing terms applied to older and younger are very frequent in the case of the relationship between brothers and between sisters, whereas only one term, irrespective of age, is nearly always used for brother by a sister and for sister by a brother. Often, too, the brothers of the father, and less frequently the sisters of the mother, are denoted differently according as they are older or younger than the father or mother; but a similar practice is exceptional in the case of the mother's brothers or the father's sisters.[2] In the Fulfúlde tongue (Central Africa) the age of the uncles is so minutely specified that the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth uncle, on both the father's and the mother's side, are each called by a particular name.[3]

The influence of age shows itself in yet other ways, both in "classificatory" and in "descriptive" systems of nomenclature. The wider use of many terms of relationship and the meaning of certain terms, or of words related to them, bear witness in this direction. Among the North American Indians old people are very commonly named grandfathers and grandmothers.[4] The Finnish *ämmä* does not signify grandmother only, but old woman in general.[5] Among many uncivilised peoples old men are addressed as

[1] Morgan, *Systems*, p. 453 note.

[2] See Rivers, in Hastings, *op. cit.* vii. 702; *Idem*, *History of Melanesian Society*, i. 9 *sq.*

[3] Barth, *op. cit.* p. 216.

[4] Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, iii. 116. Harrington, 'Tewa Relationship Terms,' in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. xiv. 492.

[5] Ahlqvist, *Die Kulturwörter der westfinnischen Sprachen*, p. 209.

"fathers" and old women as "mothers."[1] The Swedish *far* and *mor* and the Russian *batushka* and *matushka* are often used in the same way; but the Russian of the lower classes also greets men superior to him in years by the name of "uncle,"[2] and in Swedish the word *farbror* (father's brother) is a familiar term for a man belonging to an older generation than the speaker, whilst *broder* (brother) is reciprocally used by male friends of the same generation. Among the Basuto, according to Casalis, "in addressing a person older than one's self, one says, 'My father, my mother'; to an equal, 'My brother'; and to inferiors, 'My children.'"[3] Mr. Cousins wrote to me that among the natives of Cis-Natalian Kafirland the terms for father, mother, brother, and sister are not restricted to them only, but are applied equally to other persons of a similar age, whether related or otherwise. "*Bawo*," he says, "means elder or older, *bawo-kulu* means a big-father, one older than father." The Brazilian Uainumá call a father *paii*, but also *pechyry*, which means old.[4] The Finnish *isä* and the Votyak *ai*, father, the Lappish *aja* and the Esthonian *äi*, grandfather, are evidently related to the Finnish *iso* and *äijä*, which mean big.[5] In German the parents are *die Eltern*, the older (*die Aelteren*), and they are also called familiarly *die Alten*, the father *der Alte*, and the mother *die Alte* or *Altsche*.[6] In Hungarian, where *bátya* stands for elder brother, an uncle is *nagybátya*, that is, a big elder brother.[7] In Čagatai an elder sister is called *egeči*, which, according to Vámbéry, actually means old woman (*ege*, old, big; *eči*, woman, sister).[8]

[1] Collins, *Account of the English Colony in New South Wales*, i. 544. Salvado, *Mémoires historiques sur l'Australie*, p. 277. Robertson, *Erromanga*, p. 403. Sibree, *The Great African Island*, p. 244 *sq.* (Hova). Mr. A. J. Swann, in a letter (Waguha). Hinde, *The Last of the Masai*, p. 51. Reade, *Savage Africa*, p. 248.

[2] Leroy-Beaulieu, *Empire of the Tsars*, i. 489.

[3] Casalis, *Basutos*, p. 207. [4] v. Martius, *op. cit.* ii. 247 *sq.*

[5] Ahlqvist, *op. cit.* p. 209.

[6] Deecke, *Die deutschen Verwandtschaftsnamen*, p. 79.

[7] Ahlqvist, *op. cit.* p. 212.

[8] Vámbéry, *Die primitive Cultur des turko-tatarischen Volkes*, p. 65.

In the Galibi language of Brazil *tigami* signifies young brother, son, and little child indiscriminately.[1] Several languages have no other words for son and daughter than those for lad and girl.[2] Thus in Hawaian a son is called male child, or little male, and a daughter female child or girl.[3]

It should be added that in some cases the terms are determined, not by the relative ages of those who use the terms, but by the ages of the children of some more or less distant ancestor.[4] Among the Maori, for example, a man will address another as *tŭakăna*, "elder brother" or "elder cousin," if the latter belongs to an elder branch of the family, and as *tăina*, "younger brother" or "younger cousin," if he belongs to a younger branch.[5]

Although terms belonging to classificatory systems are often used in addressing strangers, they are in the first place applied to kinsfolk. Where the clan exists, they are used to denote members of the clan. "All the men of the clan of the speaker and of his own generation are classed in terminology with his brothers. If the clan is patrilineal, all men of the previous generation of his clan are classed with his father, and all of the succeeding generation with his sons. Similarly, all the men of his mother's clan and of her generation are classed with his mother's brother, and all the men of the succeeding generation with his mother's brother's children."[6] Again, when a classificatory nomenclature is used by a people among whom the clan-organisation does not exist—as is also frequently the case—the terms are

[1] von den Steinen, *op. cit.* p. 341.

[2] Ahlqvist, *op. cit.* p. 210. von der Gabelentz, *op. cit.* i. 172.

[3] Morgan, *Systems*, p. 452 note. *Cf.* the German *Junge*.

[4] See Rivers, *History of Melanesian Society*, i. 10; *Idem*, in Hastings, *op. cit.* vii. 702.

[5] Best, *loc. cit.* p. 28.

[6] Rivers, in Hastings, *op. cit.* vii. 703. *Idem*, *History of Melanesian Society*, i. 7. In the latter work (i. 7 n. 1) Dr. Rivers defines the clan as "an exogamous group within a tribe or other community, all the members of which are held to be related to one another, and bound together by a common tie. In general, this tie is either a belief in common descent from some ancestor, real or mythical, or the common possession of a totem."

usually limited to those with whom some genealogical connection can be traced or with whom the tradition of such a connection persists.[1] This, however, does not exactly prove that the classificatory terms are, or originally were, expressions of blood-relationship. There are special rights and duties connected with kinship, and various facts indicate that the terms in classificatory systems are fundamentally influenced by such social relationships, although it is quite probable that vague ideas of consanguinity from the beginning were attached at least to some of them. Not only are different designations applied to strangers and kinsfolk, but the comprehensiveness of terms used for kindred of the same sex and generation is influenced by their social relations or functions, the terms, generally speaking, being less comprehensive the more differentiated these functions are. This was pointed out already in the first edition of the present work (p. 93 *sqq.*), and a similar view has been taken by some later writers. I wrote (p. 95) that "a maternal uncle is almost always distinguished from a father by a separate term, whilst this is not the case with an uncle on the father's side, the former generally living in another community from his nephew, and, besides, very frequently standing to him in a quite peculiar relationship through the rules of succession. It may be fairly assumed, too, that a mother's sister much oftener than a father's sister is called a mother, because sisters, among savages, keep, as a rule, far more closely together, when married, than brothers and sisters; sometimes even, especially among the North American Indians, they are the wives of the same man. If we add to this that a father's brother's son and a mother's sister's son are more commonly addressed as brothers than a father's sister's son and a mother's brother's son, it becomes obvious to how great an extent the nomenclature is influenced by external (that is, social[2]) relations. But as a certain kind of external relationship is invariably connected with a certain degree, or certain degrees, of blood-relationship, the designations

[1] *Idem, History of Melanesian Society*, i. 8.

[2] In other places (pp. 90, 93) I used the expression "social relationship."

given with reference to the former have been taken as terms for the latter."

I have made this reference to my previous writing to defend myself against an accusation which has been brought against me by Dr. Rivers. Referring to McLennan and myself, he writes that the older objections to Morgan's theory were based on the idea that the classificatory system is only a table of terms of address, "a view which by no means removes the necessity for a theory of its origin"; whereas the tendency of more recent objectors (Lang, Thomas[1]) has been to show that the terms of the system are expressive of status and duties and not of consanguinity or affinity.[2] What I had written was that the terms of relationship were most probably in their origin terms of address. As such they are used even now. "The American Indians," says Morgan, "always speak to each other, when related, by the term of relationship, and never by the personal name of the individual addressed."[3] In Melanesia also, according to Dr. Rivers, such terms are used for address, personal names often being prohibited.[4] Among the Bangerang tribe of Victoria grown-up males "invariably addressed each other either by a term of relationship, or by the name of the class in the tribe to which each person belonged";[5] and in the Kariera tribe of Western Australia a man or woman never addresses anyone except young children by a personal name, but uses the appropriate

[1] Lang, *Social Origins*, p. 102; see also *Idem*, in *Proceed. of the British Academy*, 1907–1908, pp. 141, 142, 152 *sq.* Thomas, *Kinship Organisations and Group Marriage in Australia*, p. 123 *sqq.*

[2] Rivers, in *Anthropological Essays presented to E. B. Tylor*, p. 318 *sq.* In his *History of Melanesian Society* (i. 6) Dr. Rivers writes of the classificatory system, "McLennan supposed it to be merely a system of titles of address and Westermarck and others have held the same opinion and have attached little or no weight to the value of the system as evidence of social conditions."

[3] Morgan, *Systems*, p. 132. See also Charlevoix, *Voyage to North-America*, ii. 42 (Algonkin); Whiffen, *North-West Amazons*, p. 153.

[4] Rivers, *History of Melanesian Society*, ii. 36 *sq.* See also Seligman, *Melanesians of British New Guinea*, pp. 60, 436 (Koita, Southern Massim).

[5] Curr, *Recollections of Squatting in Victoria*, p. 268.

relationship term.[1] At the same time classificatory terms are also used in speaking *of* persons, and it may be that one term is used when addressing a relative and another term when speaking of him.[2] But the question whether the classificatory terms were originally terms of address or not is of no importance in the present connection, when we are trying to find the principles according to which the classifications have been made. And this question was certainly not ignored by me, the result of my investigation (pp. 90–96) being that the names are given " chiefly with reference to sex and age, as also to the external, or social, relationship in which the speaker stands to the person whom he addresses."

I am glad to find that this conclusion, which was arrived at about thirty years ago, gains so much support from Dr. Rivers' recent indefatigable research into the classificatory system, which has led him to the conviction that " the terminology of relationship has been rigorously determined by social conditions."[3] Certain facts which he gives with reference to the terms for the mother's brother are particularly instructive. In Polynesia both the Hawaians and the inhabitants of Niue class this individual with the father, and in neither case was Dr. Rivers able to discover that there were any special duties, privileges, or restrictions ascribed to him. In the Polynesian islands of Tonga and Tikopia, on the other hand, where there are special terms for the mother's brother, this relative has also special functions. And the only place in Melanesia where Dr. Rivers failed to find a special term for the mother's brother, namely, the Western Solomon Islands, was also the only part of Melanesia where he failed to find any trace of special social functions ascribed to that relative.[4] He also observes that the general character of the classificatory system is exactly such as would be the consequence of its origin in a

[1] Brown, in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xliii. 150.

[2] Rivers, in Hastings, *op. cit.* vii. 701. *Idem, Todas*, pp. 483, 493.

[3] *Idem, Kinship and Social Organisation*, p. 1; &c.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 15.

social structure founded on an exogamous social group, and that many details of these systems point in the same direction. Thus, "the distinctions between the father's brother and the mother's brother, between the father's sister and the mother's sister and between the children of these relatives are themselves the natural consequences of the origin of the system in a clan-organisation, for owing to the practice of exogamy, the brothers of the father must always belong to a clan different from that of the brothers of the mother and so with the other examples mentioned. Whenever one finds that these distinctions do not exist, it is also found that the clan-organisation is absent or is in course of profound modification."[1] Among some North American Indians distinct terms are found for relatives of the uncle- and aunt-group after the death of a parent; and the reason for this is no doubt, as Professor Kroeber observes, that the uncle's relation to his orphaned nephew tends to be somewhat different from his relation to the same boy while his natural protector, his father, was alive.[2]

The social factor has also presumably made itself felt in the distinctions between persons of different sex and of different age. As Wundt remarks in his discussion of the classificatory system, persons of the same sex are more closely associated than are men and women. "In the men's houses a companion of the same group is a brother, one of the next elder group, a father. Together with these men the individual goes to war and to the hunt."[3] That the terms for brother and sister in many cases depend on the sex of the speaker as well as on the sex of the person addressed is explained by Dr. Rivers as a consequence of the early separation of brothers and sisters, which is a frequent custom among savage peoples. While two brothers are thus constant companions, and also two sisters, a brother and sister will at an early age come to belong to different social

[1] *Ibid.* p. 71 *sqq.* Rivers, *History of Melanesian Society*, i. 8.

[2] Kroeber, *loc. cit.* p. 79.

[3] Wundt, *Elemente der Völkerpsychologie*, p. 42 (English translation, p. 41).

groups within the clan; and this separation will be accentuated when the girl marries and, perhaps at an early age, moves to and becomes for all practical purposes a member of another clan.[1] As to the distinctions of age, it should be noticed that among uncivilised peoples old age commands respect and gives authority, and that, apart from this, there are rights incident to superiority of age as well.[2] The Australian natives have a well-regulated order of precedence and authority. "When the individual reaches the full development of puberty, he or she undergoes a ceremony which entitles him or her on its successful completion to a certain social rank or *status* in the community. As life progresses, other and higher ranks are progressively attainable for each sex, until the highest and most honourable grade, that enjoyed by an old man, or an old woman, is reached."[3] Of another race which in its entirety has the classificatory system, the North American Indians, it is said that "superior age gives authority; and every person is taught from childhood to obey his superiors and to rule over his inferiors. The superiors are those of greater age; the inferiors, those who are younger."[4] The same influence makes itself felt in the relations between elder and younger brothers and sisters; the eldest brother comes next to the father in authority, and, in case of his death, succeeds him as the head of the family. Dr. Jochelson observes that the distinct denomination of the elder brother and sister among the Koryak shows their position in the family,[5] and that the case is similar with the inclusion of the mother's elder brother or the father's elder sister in one term with the grandfathers or grandmothers among the Yukaghir. "Among the female members of a family, the father's elder sister occupies the first position, after the father's

[1] Rivers, *History of Melanesian Society*, i. 9.

[2] See Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, i. 603 *sqq.*

[3] Roth, *Ethnological Studies among the North-West-Central Queensland Aborigines*, p. 169.

[4] Powell, 'Sociology,' in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. i. 700. *Cf. Idem*, in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethn.* iii. p. lviii.

[5] Jochelson, *Koryak*, p. 760.

mother, in respect to the household; and the mother's elder brother, after the mother's father, is the head of the family."[1] Among many Ural-Altaic peoples the same term is applied to an elder brother as to an uncle, and the same term to an elder sister as to an aunt.[2]

In an earlier work I have emphasised the immense influence which living together, apart from any blood-relationship, has exercised upon social relations; when unsupported by local proximity kinship itself loses much of its social strength, nay we may even say that the social force of kinship is ultimately derived from near relatives' habit of living together.[3] The local influence may therefore also be expected to show itself in the nomenclature. In fact, there can be little doubt that the classifications, even though directly associated with a clan-organisation, are often influenced by certain relatives' habit of living in the same or in a different locality. We shall see that the clan-organisation itself is probably in a large measure dependent on local connections.[4] Moreover, there are instances of classificatory terms being regularly applied to all persons of a certain class in the same locality, even though they are not kindred. In the Central Provinces of India, according to Mr. Russell, it is commonly found that a man will address all the men in his village who belong to the generation above his own as uncle, though they may be of different castes, and the children of the generation below his own as nephew or niece. Moreover, when a girl is married, all the old men of the village call her husband " son-in-law." And this extends even to the impure castes who cannot be touched.[5] In Erromanga a man may call another " his brother " if they as children lived and played together in the same village.[6]

The importance of the social factor is also evident in the

[1] *Idem, Yukaghir*, p. 72. [2] Ahlqvist, *op. cit.* p. 211.
[3] *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. 197 *sqq.*
[4] *Infra*, on Exogamy.
[5] Russell, *Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, i. 155.
[6] Robertson, *op. cit.* p. 403 *sq.*

terms often used in addressing strangers. The Yoruba of the Slave Coast apply the terms *baba*, father, and *iya*, mother, to strangers of the generation next above the speaker, "when it is desired to show respect."[1] Among the Hovas of Madagascar the words for brother and sister "are also used widely for any person whom one meets and desires to act towards in a friendly manner."[2] In Erromanga, "to call a man your father, *nate*, your brother, *avugsai*, or your son, *netug*, is the greatest token of your love or respect."[3] Concerning the Algonkin Indians, Charlevoix states that "when there is between them no relation or affinity, they use the term of brother, uncle, nephew, or cousin, according to each other's age; or according to the value they have for the person they address."[4] The Yahgans of Tierra del Fuego, according to Mr. Bridges, form certain kinds of friendships, and "speak of aunts, uncles, brothers, sisters, cousins, nieces and nephews, &c., which are only so through the friendships established."[5] At the same time they have different appellations for nephews and nieces on the brother's side and nephews and nieces on the sister's side, and their words for uncle and aunt differ according as this relationship is paternal or maternal.[6] Dr. von den Steinen was called by the Brazilian Bakaïrí sometimes "elder brother," sometimes "grandfather," and by the Mehinakú "maternal uncle"; whilst his travelling companions were addressed as "younger brothers" or "cousins."[7] While living in a Pueblo village Miss Freire-Marreco was called "grandmother" by the younger generation and "aunt" or "female cousin" by the older people.[8] Mr. Hartshorne was called by the Veddas *hura*,

[1] Ellis, *Yoruba-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast*, p. 178.

[2] Sibree, *op. cit.* p. 247. [3] Robertson, *op. cit.* p. 404.

[4] Charlevoix, *op. cit.* ii. 42.

[5] Bridges, 'Manners and Customs of the Firelanders,' in *A Voice for South America*, xiii. 212.

[6] *Idem*, in a letter to the author dated Downeast, Tierra del Fuego, August 28th, 1888.

[7] von den Steinen, *Unter den Naturvölkern Zentral-Brasiliens*, p. 331.

[8] Harrington, *loc. cit.* p. 492.

or cousin.[1] When the natives of Botany Bay, Port Jackson, and Broken Bay, in the time when Sydney was established, perceived the authority with which Governor Phillip commanded, and the obedience which he exacted, they bestowed on him the distinguishing appellation of *be-anna*, or father.[2] Facts like these testify that classificatory terms embody feelings of friendliness or respect, normally felt towards kindred, and consequently are expressive of relations of a social character.

Yet, however greatly the nomenclature may have been influenced by social conditions, the correlation between the presence of a term of relationship and special social relations or functions associated with it is by no means complete. There are cases in which the same term is applied to relatives who stand in considerably different social relations to the speaker. Dr. Rivers points out that while in Tonga and Tikopia the father's sister is denoted by a special term, because she has very definite rights and duties, there is no special term for her in the Banks Islands, although there also she has very definite and important functions; she is here classed with the mother, as is the case in most Polynesian islands, "although she possesses rights and privileges and is subject to restrictions quite different from those of the mother."[3] Father Egidi informed Dr. Rivers that in Mekeo the mother's brother has the duty of putting on the first perineal garment of his nephew; yet he has no special term, but is classed with the father.[4] But besides such minor cases in which relatives with special functions are not denoted by special terms, we are confronted with the extremely frequent custom of classing the father's brother with the father and the mother's sister with the mother, and with the occasional custom of

[1] Hartshorne, 'Weddas,' in *Indian Antiquary*, viii. 320. According to Mr. Le Mesurier ('Veddás of Ceylon,' in *Jour. Roy. Asiatic Soc. Ceylon Branch*, ix. 347), the Rock or Hill Veddas use the word for brother, *aluwa*, when they speak of or to any person with whom they are in friendship.

[2] Collins, *op. cit.* i. 544.

[3] Rivers, *History of Melanesian Society*, ii. 21, 45. *Idem*, *Kinship and Social Organisation*, p. 16.

[4] *Idem*, *Kinship and Social Organisation*, p. 16.

classing all uncles with the father and all aunts with the mother. This is done in spite of the very special functions of the father and the mother. Dr. Rivers himself admits that " in general, it would seem that the relations between parents and children associated with the classificatory system are much like those which exist among ourselves. The father and mother provide for the child, feed, clothe, and train him, while the child obeys his parents and assists them in their occupations."[1] In the Kariera tribe, where, according to Mr. Brown, the relationship system is " pre-eminently a system of reciprocal rights and duties," though a man owns certain duties to all the men he calls " father," he must observe them more particularly in regard to his real father or his father's brothers than in regard to a distant cousin of his father; and the case is similar with every other relationship.[2]

This remarkable lack of discrimination in the terms used for father and mother may possibly be due to the fact that these terms have been particularly influenced by the babble of infants, who are apt to use the same sounds for any man of their father's age and for any woman of their mother's age. Another explanation, suggested by two American writers with special reference to the Omaha Indians, is that those terms were applied to " what may be called potential relationships, that is, relationships that would be established through marriage made in accordance with tribal custom. If the wife had sisters, these women held a potential relationship to her husband, as they might become his wives either during his wife's lifetime or at her death "; whilst a man was under obligation to marry his brother's widow. " Because of these potential relationships the children of the wife called all those whom their father might marry 'mother' and all their father's brothers 'father.' "[3] All that we can say with a fair amount of certainty is that the classifications in question are connected with that greater strength of kinship ties beyond the family

[1] *Idem*, in Hastings, *op. cit.* vii. 705.
[2] Brown, in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xliii. 157.
[3] Alice Fletcher and La Flesche, *loc. cit.* p. 313.

in the strictest sense of the word which is found among most uncivilised peoples when compared with ourselves and which lessens the difference in status between the members of the family and other kindred. But we are by no means entitled to conclude that they are survivals of a social organisation where there was no difference between the social functions of a father and an uncle and between those of a mother and an aunt—in other words, where there was no family of the present type. Existing social conditions may throw light on the terms of relationship, but to infer, *vice versâ*, the earlier existence of certain social conditions from certain terms of relationship can in most cases be nothing more than a guess.

It should, first, be noticed that if some term or terms of relationship are regularly found together with some special social institution, it may be that the latter is no more the cause of the former than the lightning is the cause of the thunder: they may both be effects of a common cause. The frequent co-existence of classificatory terms with exogamic marriage prohibitions may be an instance of this: the terms are not necessarily caused by the prohibitions, but the strong feeling of kinship which has, for example, led to the classification of cousins with brothers and sisters may also have led to the rule which treats sexual intercourse between them as incest. If a classificatory nomenclature thus co-exists with a certain social rule or institution as an effect of the same cause as has produced the latter, we can never be certain that where we find one of the effects the other one must also have occurred in former times. Nor does an established causal connection between the presence of a term of relationship and some special function associated with the relationship prove the earlier existence of the social function whenever the term is found alone, since the latter may have a different origin in different cases. Suppose that in Mekeo the mother's brother, whose duty it is to put on the first perineal garment of his nephew, instead of being classed with the father had a special term, as he ought to have according to the general law formulated by Dr. Rivers, that would not prove that whenever the

mother's brother has a special term—even if it happened on a neighbouring island—it is or has been his duty to put on the perineal garment of his nephew. The special term merely suggests in a broad way that the relation in which he stands to his nephew differs somehow, or has differed somehow, from the relation in which the father stands to his son. But this is a very empty suggestion, which practically teaches us nothing about the present or the past.

In certain respects, however, classificatory terms have been supposed to give us very definite information about earlier social conditions. I shall first deal with a case to which Dr. Rivers attaches much importance from the point of view of method. In some Melanesian islands he has found the practice of the cross-cousin marriage—that is, the marriage of a man with the daughter either of his mother's brother or of his father's sister—combined with a nomenclature which is "just such as would follow from this form of marriage."[1] In the Mbau dialect of Fiji, for example, the word *vungo* is applied to the mother's brother, the husband of the father's sister, and the father-in-law. The word *nganei* is used for the father's sister, the mother's brother's wife, and the mother-in-law. The term *tavale* is used by a man for the son of the mother's brother or of the father's sister as well as for the wife's brother and the sister's husband. *Ndavola* is used not only for the child of the mother's brother or father's sister when differing in sex from the speaker, but this word is also used by a man for his wife's sister and his brother's wife, and by a woman for her husband's brother and her sister's husband. "Every one of these details of the Mbau system," says Dr. Rivers, "is the direct and inevitable consequence of the cross-cousin marriage, if it become an established and habitual practice." He then concludes that if there be found among any other people all the characteristic features of this system, there could be no reasonable doubt as to the former existence of the cross-cousin marriage, since "it would seem almost inconceivable that there should ever have existed any other conditions, whether social or psychological, which could have

[1] *Idem, Kinship and Social Organisation*, p. 22 *sq.*

produced this special combination of peculiar uses of terms of relationship."[1] So also the terms of relationship used in three of the chief languages spoken by the people of South India " are exactly such as would follow from the cross-cousin marriage." So far as we know, this kind of marriage is not now practised by the vast majority of the peoples who use those terms, but it still persists in many parts of South India; and we are told that there can be no doubt that the terminology is a survival of an ancient social condition in which the cross-cousin marriage was habitual.[2]

Dr. Rivers bases his conclusions on the assumption that when the cross-cousin marriage is found together with a nomenclature which is " just such as would follow from this form of marriage," the nomenclature must necessarily be the result of the cross-cousin marriage. Now it seems to me difficult to admit that the terminology in question exactly corresponds with the consequences of a cross-cousin marriage. Dr. Rivers says himself that although all the peoples who are known to practise this kind of marriage use the classificatory system of relationship, the marriage is not usually between cross-cousins in the wide classificatory sense, but between the children of " own brother and sister."[3] If an ancient Arab called his beloved one *bint 'amm*, that is, father's brother's daughter, and his father-in-law *'amm*, father's brother, even though they were not related to each other by blood,[4] it is obvious that he did so because a man was held to have a right to his *bint 'amm's* hand;[5] but it is not equally obvious that a Fijian calls a large number of men (mother's brother, father's sister's husband, father-in-law) *vungo* and a large number of women (father's sister, mother's brother's wife, mother-in-law) *nganci* because he marries, or is likely to marry, the daughter of one definite member of the group. I venture to believe that the terminology allows of a more natural explanation than that given by Dr. Rivers. In Fiji and other places where the

[1] *Ibid.* p. 43. [2] *Ibid.* p. 47 *sqq.*

[3] Rivers, 'Marriage,' in Hastings, *op. cit.* viii. 426.

[4] Goldziher, 'Endogamy and Polygamy among the Arabs,' in *Academy*, xviii. 26.

[5] Westermarck, *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco*, p. 55 *sq.*

cross-cousin marriage exists, a man is not allowed to marry the daughter either of his father's brother or of his mother's sister, whereas marriage between cross-cousins in the classificatory sense is permitted, although a man usually marries the actual daughter of his father's sister or of his mother's brother. Persons to whom a man may become related by marriage and others to whom he may not become thus related stand in a different relation to him and are therefore apt to be distinguished from each other by different terms. In other words, the terminology may, instead of being due to habitual cross-cousin marriage, be simply connected with the marriageability of cross-cousins in the classificatory sense. This explanation reconciles the existence of classificatory terms in a wide sense with the prevalence of marriages between cross-cousins in our sense of the term. It further accounts for the fact that a terminology similar to that which occurs among the peoples who have the cross-cousin marriage is also found among many peoples to whom this institution is unknown, but who share with the former the same rules as to the legitimacy or illegitimacy of marriages between different kinds of cousins; and it accounts for this fact without postulating the earlier existence of habitual cross-cousin marriage among them. This I consider to be a great advantage; a theory which can in a satisfactory manner explain a social phenomenon by existing conditions must certainly take precedence of one which explains it as a survival of something hypothetical in the past. It is interesting to note that a terminology of relationship which according to Dr. Rivers "bears evidence of the cross-cousin marriage" has been found among many North American Indians, although this form of marriage is known by him to occur only among one or two of their tribes. He consequently admits that the existing evidence is inconclusive.[1]

[1] Rivers, *Kinship and Social Organisation*, p. 49 *sqq.* Frazer, who has in detail studied the prevalence of cross-cousin marriage among different peoples, observes (*Folk-Lore in the Old Testament*, ii. 145 *sq.*) that the Western Tinne present "the only clear case of preference for marriage with a first cousin, the daughter of a mother's brother, which has been recorded in the whole of North America."

It may seem that I have devoted too much space to a detail of comparatively small importance. In this connection, however, it is not the facts themselves that are of interest, but the method of dealing with them. I think I have done justice to the school of Morgan by choosing for my criticism the case which one of its most careful and painstaking exponents considers to demonstrate more clearly and conclusively than anything else the dependence of the classificatory terminology upon forms of marriage. Indeed, Dr. Rivers doubts whether, apart from quantitative verification, " it would be possible in the whole range of science to find a case where we can be more confident that one phenomenon has been conditioned by another."[1] For my own part, I have endeavoured to show that even the co-existence of a common nomenclature for two or more relatives with a form of marriage which more or less agrees with it does not prove that the form of marriage is the cause of the nomenclature. What, then, if the common nomenclature is found alone ? According to Dr. Rivers, " one may say that the probability that the common nomenclature for two relatives is the survival of a form of marriage becomes the greater, the more similar is the general culture in which the supposed survival is found to that of a people who practise this form of marriage."[2] But this is, in my opinion, a very insufficient precaution, in the first place because co-existence is not causation, and in the second place because a classificatory term may have a different origin in different cases. It shows, however, like many other statements by Dr. Rivers, that he is aware of the perplexity of a subject which most of Morgan's followers, like the master himself, have treated with the greatest nonchalance.[3] When

[1] Rivers, *Kinship and Social Organisation*, p. 25. [2] *Ibid.* p. 46.

[3] At the same time Dr. Rivers seems to maintain that we have a right to infer the existence of a certain form of marriage from certain features of terminology, even though we are ignorant of its existence anywhere. For he says (*Kinship and Social Organisation*, p. 26) that Morgan lost a great opportunity by not predicting the cross-cousin marriage although he knew such features of terminology as follow from it. " He might have predicted a form of marriage which would soon afterwards have been independently

Professor Kohler, for example, finds that among the Wadshagga a man uses the same term for his father's sister as for his own sister, he at once concludes that this must be a survival from a time when nephews were in the habit of marrying their aunts.[1] It would be interesting to learn what inferences would, according to the same principle, be made from the following facts with reference to early European marriage customs. In English the word "nephew" was in the seventeenth century frequently used for a grandson, and the word "niece" for a granddaughter.[2] In Dutch the term *neef* is applied to a nephew (brother's or sister's son), a male cousin (uncle's or aunt's son), and a descendant of any such relative or of a niece or a female cousin; and the term *nicht* is applied to a niece (brother's or sister's daughter), to a female cousin (uncle's or aunt's daughter), and to the descendant of any such relative or of a nephew or male cousin.[3] Here the same terms are thus used for persons belonging to three or more different generations. The Latin *nepos* meant both grandson and nephew; and Herodotus used the word ἀνεψιός both for a nephew [4] and a cousin.[5]

discovered. Such an example of successful prediction would have forced the social significance of the terminology of relationship upon the attention of students in such a way that we should have been spared much of the controversy which has so long obstructed progress in this branch of sociology." For my own part I believe that the progress of sociology is more hampered by the use of an illegitimate method than by the absence of predictions, even though these sometimes happen to be true; and I sincerely hope that the new impetus given by Dr. Rivers' investigations to the study of the terms of relationship will not lead sociologists to waste their time on forming all sorts of hypotheses on ancient marriage customs because the terms of relationship are "just such as would follow" from them. There are unfortunately signs that the temptation to do so is strong.

[1] Kohler, 'Das Banturecht in Ostafrika,' in *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Rechtswiss.* xv. 13.

[2] Craigie, in *New English Dictionary on Historical Principles*, vol. vi. pt. iv. 91, 135.

[3] van Dale, *Groot Woordenboek der Nederlandsch taal*, pp. 1176 1183

[4] Herodotus, vii. 5. [5] *Ibid.* v. 30.

If a common nomenclature for persons representing two or more relationships really were an indication of a certain form of marriage in the past, the English terminology might lead to the interesting discovery that the English have been in the habit of marrying their sisters. The same term, "uncle," is used for the father's brother and the mother's brother; the same term, "aunt," for the father's sister and the mother's sister; the same term, "grandfather," for the father's father and the mother's father; the same term, "grandmother," for the father's mother and the mother's mother; the same term, "cousin," for the father's brother's son or daughter and for the mother's brother's son or daughter, as also for the father's sister's son or daughter and for the mother's sister's son or daughter; the same term, "nephew," for the brother's son and the sister's son; the same term, "niece," for the brother's daughter and the sister's daughter; the same term, "grandson," for the son's son and the daughter's son; the same term, "granddaughter," for the son's daughter and the daughter's daughter. If we assume that the common nomenclature indicates the former combination of two relationships in one and the same person, we come to the conclusion that the father's brother and sister have also been the mother's brother and sister, the father's parents also the mother's parents, the father's brother's children also the mother's brother's children, the father's sister's children also the mother's sister's children, the brother's children also the sister's children, the son's children also the daughter's children. It is true that the English have the terms father- and mother-in-law, brother- and sister-in-law, and son- and daughter-in-law. But these terms would also have been necessary in the days of the brother-and-sister marriage, because a man who had no sister to marry, and a woman who had no brother, could not on that account be expected to remain celibates. The Hawaians, too, have terms for relatives by marriage,[1] in spite of their prehistoric "consanguine family," which really ought to have made such terms unnecessary; indeed, in place of our word "brother-in-law" they have two

[1] Morgan, *Systems*, p. 561 *sqq*.

expressions, one used by a man for his wife's brother and his sister's husband, and another used by a woman for her husband's brother and her sister's husband.[1] But even now the father- and mother-in-law are in familiar English often called "father" and "mother," the brother- and sister-in-law "brother" and "sister" (Dr. Rivers, however, seems to connect this expression with the prohibition of marrying the deceased wife's sister),[2] and the son- and daughter-in-law "son" and "daughter," and if a man wants to be on good terms with his wife's uncles and aunts, he may call them "uncle" and "aunt." Not the least interesting fact connected with the brother-and-sister marriage deduced from the English terms of relationship is that it would have occurred in comparatively recent times, since both the Anglo-Saxon and the Latin systems, as has been mentioned above, distinguished between paternal and maternal uncles and aunts. This, however, is rather awkward, because it also gives the historian a voice in the matter. He who studies the history of a savage society need not fear any such interference in his deductions from the systems of relationship, in which, according to Dr. Rivers, he has, "like fossils, the hidden indications of ancient social institutions."[3]

Why is it a fallacy to conclude that a term which may be applied to persons representing different relationships proves the previous existence of a certain form of marriage? The fallacy lies in the assumption that the use of such a term combines the different relationships in one and the same person. A classificatory term is taken to be used as if it stood for two descriptive terms. If I say that a man is the father's brother and the mother's brother of another person, we may at once draw the conclusion that the latter is the offspring of brother and sister; but the case is different if I say that a man is another person's uncle, simply because uncle means father's brother *or* mother's brother, not father's brother *and* mother's brother. Some of those who maintain that the classificatory system proves the former

[1] Morgan, *Systems*, p. 565.
[2] Rivers, *Kinship and Social Organisation*, p. 65.
[3] *Idem*, *History of Melanesian Society*, i. 3.

existence of a "consanguine family" or of group-marriage have been guilty of an even worse confusion. They have practically assumed that a classificatory term stands for *one* descriptive term, which, however, is applied to different relatives because any one of them may actually represent the relationship expressed by the term. The same term, it is argued, is applied to the father and to the father's brother and cousins, or (in the Hawaian system) to the mother's brothers and cousins as well, because it is uncertain who of them is the father, in our descriptive sense of the term. The same terms are applied to brothers and sisters and to paternal or maternal cousins or to both paternal and maternal cousins, because it is uncertain who are brothers or sisters and who are cousins. And so forth. The whole of this argument, however, 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 Hawaian 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.[1]

Dr. Rivers, however, thinks that there may be two answers to this objection. "It may be," he says, "that there was once a definite term for the individual relation between mother and child, and that the term became extended at a later stage of evolution so as to fall into line with other kinship terms." The other answer, which he considers to be more likely to be true, is that, in such a state of society as that we must assume, when the system of relationships was in process of development, the special relationship between mother and child would hardly have persisted beyond the time of weaning. The separation would then have occurred

[1] *Cf.* Darwin, *Descent of Man*, ii. 391; McLennan, *Studies in Ancient History*, p. 259; Macdonald, *Oceania*, p. 188; Thomas, *op. cit.* p. 123.

before the age at which the child began to learn the terms of relationship to any great extent; and " it is even possible that in this early stage of culture the duty of suckling may have been shared by other women of the group, and that at the time of weaning, the child might not have been in the position to differentiate between its own mother and the other child-bearing women of the group."[1] The first answer is merely a guess, and the second is almost worse. Where in the world 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? And even if it were worth while inventing such a society in the interest of the cherished institution of group-marriage, it would be impossible to find mothers who were equally ignorant of their children as the children were of their mothers.[2]

Sir James Frazer, again, thinks that group-marriage may be saved without the support of Dr. Rivers' suggestions. He says that the difficulty of understanding how a person should ever come to be treated as the child of many mothers " only exists so long as we confuse our word ' mother ' with the corresponding but by no means equivalent terms in the languages of savages who have the classificatory system. We mean by ' mother ' a woman who has given birth to a child; the Australian savages mean by ' mother ' a woman who stands in a certain social relation to a group of men and women, whether she has given birth to any one of them or not. She is ' mother ' to that group even when she is an infant in arms."[3] But if the term for " mother " has nothing to do with the idea of consanguinity, why should the term for " father " have anything to do with it? If the former is applied to a woman who is known not to have given birth to the child, why should the latter term be applied to a man because he may possibly have begotten it? Frazer's explanation is, in fact, an admission that the classificatory terms are not indications of blood-ties; he says himself

[1] Rivers, in *Anthropological Essays presented to E. B. Tylor*, p. 317.
[2] *Cf.* Lang, in *Proceed. British Academy*, 1907–1908, p. 140.
[3] Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, i. 304.

that "the classificatory system is based on the marital, not on the parental, relation."[1]

Much stress has been laid upon the fact that the Australian savage applies the same term to the woman or women whom he actually marries and to all the women whom he might lawfully marry, that is, who "belong to the right group."[2] This has been interpreted as a consequence of earlier group-marriage; and the same is the case with the more general fact that in the classificatory systems of many peoples in different parts of the world the wife's sisters and the brothers' wives (male speaking) are classed in nomenclature with the wife, and reciprocally, the sisters' husbands (woman speaking) and husband's brothers are classed with the husband. But Frazer's warning with reference to the classificatory term for "mother" applies with equal strength to the classificatory term for "wife": we must not confuse our word "wife" with "the corresponding but by no means equivalent terms in the languages of savages who have the classificatory system." When they use the same term for a wife, in our sense of the word, and for certain other women as well, they do so, not on account of earlier group-marriage, but simply because the women who may be a man's wives and those who cannot possibly be so stand in a widely different relation to him. This circumstance, to which I shall revert in the chapter on group-marriage, corroborates the explanation I have given above of the co-existence of certain classificatory terms and cross-cousin marriage. And in the present case Dr. Rivers seems on the whole to agree with me.[3]

Dr. Rivers' attitude towards the dependence of the classificatory system upon group-marriage or sexual communism is somewhat different from that of most other anthropologists who believe in such a dependence. As we have already noticed, he has expressed the view that the features of the classificatory system have arisen out of a state of

[1] *Ibid.* i. 305.

[2] Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 57.

[3] Rivers, *History of Melanesian Society*, ii. 128 *sq.* I had expressed this view already in the second edition of the present work (p. 56).

group-marriage, and maintains still, at any rate, that this system has several features which would follow naturally from a condition of sexual communism. But in spite of his suggestion as regards the origin of the classificatory terms for "mother," he says that the view which explains the classificatory system as the result of group-marriage implies that this system was in its origin expressive of status rather than of consanguinity and affinity: "the terms would stand for certain relations within the group to which only the vaguest ideas of consanguinity need have been attached."[1] And Sir James Frazer thinks that he is probably right in this contention.[2] Then we come back to our old problem how far we may infer the earlier existence of certain social conditions from certain terms of relationship. We have seen how dangerous any such inference is even if the terms of relationship are regularly found together with some special institution. But in the present case there is no such regular coincidence. Whilst the classificatory system is extremely common, "group-marriage" or sexual communism is comparatively very rare. Dr. Rivers says that he has evidence from Melanesia "which places beyond question the former presence of such a condition, with features of culture which become readily explicable if they be the survivals of such a state of sexual communism as is suggested by the terminology of the classificatory system."[3] Other anthropologists have in Australia found evidence of the dependence of the classificatory nomenclature upon "group-marriage" still in existence. But, as I shall show in another place, neither the Melanesian nor the Australian terminology corresponds with those particular forms of "group-marriage," or sexual communism, which exist or are supposed to have existed among the peoples who have the terminology.[4] Nay, even if they did correspond, it would be a great error of method to conclude that the classificatory system has everywhere originated in "group-marriage" or sexual communism.

[1] *Idem*, in *Anthropological Essays presented to E. B. Tylor*, pp. 319, 322.

[2] Frazer, *op. cit.* i. 307.

[3] Rivers, *Kinship and Social Organisation*, p. 86.

[4] See *infra*, on Group-marriage and other Group-relations.

It would not be legitimate even according to the principles laid down by Dr. Rivers, as this is certainly one of those cases in which " differences of culture or the absence of intermediate links make it unjustifiable to infer the ancient existence of the forms of marriage from which features of terminology might be derived."[1] Yet he has himself asserted that the classificatory system has probably had its origin in some universal, or almost universal, stage of social development characterised by group-marriage ;[2] although he has subsequently somewhat modified this opinion.[3]

For the rest, I entirely fail to understand how the classificatory system can be regarded as the result of sexual communism if, as Dr. Rivers maintains,[4] the classificatory terms for husband and wife lend no support to the hypothesis that they are survivals of such communism, but are more naturally explained as the result of the status of certain men and women as potential husbands and wives. What other terms, then, could be expected to tell us that a certain group of men have, or have had, the right of access to a certain group of women ? The conclusion that the classificatory system is caused by group-marriage or sexual communism is not justified if the terms stand for certain social relations to which " only the vaguest ideas of consanguinity " have been attached. They must have expressed the degree and kind of blood-relationship as definitely as the fatherhood of individuals could be known. Although fundamentally influenced by social relations, as already said, they probably from the beginning expressed in a general way the idea of consanguinity as well, being in the first place used as terms for kindred ; but it is simply impossible to believe that they were ever meant to be " descriptive " of one definite kind of relationship—fatherhood, motherhood, and so forth—either actual or hypothetical.

It has been argued that if the classificatory terms do not denote definite relationships, then those who use them have

[1] Rivers, *Kinship and Social Organisation*, p. 59.
[2] *Idem*, in *Anthropological Essays presented to E. B. Tylor*, p. 323.
[3] See *supra*, p. 241.
[4] Rivers, *History of Melanesian Society*, ii. 129.

no terms at all for such relationships.[1] This argument has no weight. The English use classificatory terms for all except the nearest degrees of relationship, but if they want to define any particular relationship they have always means of doing so. And so have savages. Mr. Washington Matthews writes of the Hidatsa Indians, belonging to the Dakota :—" When they wish to distinguish between an actual father and a father's brothers, they use the adjective *ka'ti*, true, real, in speaking of the former. . . . There is a special word to designate the real mother, although she is commonly called by the terms which apply as well to her sisters. There are two names for wife ; one for a wife by actual marriage, the other for an actual wife as well as what might be called a potential wife, *i.e.*, a wife's sisters. . . . It must not be supposed, from the wide significance of some of their terms, that they do not discriminate between all grades and conditions of kinship. When they have no single word to define the relationship, they employ two or more words."[2] In Mota, one of the Banks Islands, according to Dr. Codrington, the terms *tamai* and *veve* are used for father and mother respectively, but are also applied " to all of the same generation with the parents who are ' near ' and belong to the family connection." Yet this wide use of the terms " does not at all signify any looseness in the actual view of proper paternity and maternity ; they are content with one word for father and uncle, for mother and aunt, when the special relation of the kinship of the mother's brother does not come in ; but the one who speaks has no confusion as to paternity in his mind, and will correct a misconception with the explanation, ' my own child, *tur natuk ;* his real father, *tur tamana ; tur tasina*, his brother not his cousin.' "[3] The Maori, who apply the term *pāpā* to the father, the uncles, and the sons of the parent's uncles, have also the term *papara*, denoting the real father, although

[1] Fison, ' Classificatory System of Relationship,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxiv. 369.

[2] Matthews, *Ethnography and Philology of the Hidatsa Indians*, p. 57.

[3] Codrington, *Melanesians*, p. 36 *sq.*

it is not often heard.[1] In the Kariera tribe, according to Mr. Brown, each term has what we may call a primary or specific meaning, which corresponds very closely with the use of relationship in English. Thus, although a given person applies the name *mama* to a large number of individuals, if he is asked "Who is your *mama?*" he immediately replies by giving the name of his actual father, unless his own father died during his infancy, in which case he gives the name of his foster father, a man's nearest relative of this kind being not necessarily the man who gave him birth, but the man under whose care he lived as a child.[2] Messrs. Spencer and Gillen emphatically assert that among the Central Australian natives described by them there is no "special term applied to the special wife, apart from the general one given in common to her and other women of her group whom it is lawful for a man to marry and outside of whom he may not marry."[3] But Strehlow says that whilst the Arunta apply the term *noa* both to an actual wife and to a potential wife, they use the term *nōatja* (contraction of *noa* and *atja*) for the former only;[4] and the Finke River natives, according to Schulze, call the actual wife *noa iltja*.[5]

Finally I beg to recommend to the consideration of those who maintain that the classificatory system of the Australian savages has originated in group-marriage the interesting statement made by Spencer and Gillen and other writers, that in many of their tribes procreation is not known to be the result of sexual intercourse.[6] If the same ignorance prevailed in those days when their classificatory terms were formed, it is obvious that the terms for the father and the men classed with him and, generally, all terms of relationship

[1] Best, *loc. cit.* p. 28.

[2] Brown, in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xliii. 150. See also *ibid.* p. 157.

[3] Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 95, 96, 106. *Iidem, Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 140.

[4] Strehlow, *Die Aranda- und Loritja-Stämme in Zentral-Australien*, vol. iv. pt. i. 65.

[5] Schulze, 'Aborigines of the Upper and Middle Finke River,' in *Trans. Roy. Soc. South Australia*, xiv. 224. See Eylmann, *Die Eingeborenen d. Kolonie Südaustralien*, p. 171. [6] See *infra*, i. 288 *sqq.*

through a male, cannot possibly have any reference to consanguinity, either actual or hypothetical. The theory of group-marriage is thereby deprived of the last shadow of support which it could conceivably derive from the classificatory terms used for blood-relatives.

If the classificatory system, for the reasons which I have set forth in this chapter, is no indication of earlier group-marriage or sexual communism, it is no more an indication of a "consanguine family" or a previous state of absolute promiscuity. But even if it really were so—contrary to all our arguments—that would not prove that such a state ever has been universal in the social development of mankind; for we do not know that the classificatory system has prevailed among all the races of the world, although it has been suggested that it has.[1] Nor do we know that it is the earliest system of nomenclature among those peoples who have it. On the contrary, if man originally lived in families or small family groups, the classificatory system could hardly have been primitive, but would only have emerged after the families had expanded into larger bodies.

It has recently been vindicated with great fervour that "systems of relationship furnish us with a most valuable instrument in studying the history of social institutions," including the institution of marriage, and that the study of those systems "is essential for advance in our knowledge of prehistoric sociology."[2] For my own part, however, I cannot help thinking that the endeavour hitherto made to use the classificatory terms of relationship as a means of disclosing the secrets of ancient marriage customs has, in spite of all the labour and ingenuity bestowed upon it, been a source of error rather than knowledge.

[1] *E.g.*, by Rivers, in *Anthropological Essays presented to E. B. Tylor*, p. 310.

[2] *Idem, Kinship and Social Organisation*, p. 1, and *passim*. *Idem, History of Melanesian Society*, i. 3, and *passim*.

CHAPTER VIII

A CRITICISM OF THE HYPOTHESIS OF PROMISCUITY: MOTHER-RIGHT

IN a work of prodigious learning, published in 1861,[1] the Swiss jurist, Dr. Bachofen, directed attention to the fact that a system of *Mutterrecht*, "mother-right," prevailed among several ancient peoples. Moreover, partly from actual statements of old writers, partly from traditions and myths, he drew the conclusion that such a system everywhere preceded the rise of "father-right." A few years later, though quite independently of him, McLennan set forth the same hypothesis, being led to it chiefly by his studies in modern ethnology. But whilst Bachofen explained the mother-right as a consequence of the supremacy of women, McLennan regarded what he called "kinship through females only" as due to uncertain paternity resulting from early promiscuity or polyandry. "It is inconceivable," he says, "that anything but the want of certainty on that point could have long prevented the acknowledgment of kinship through males; and in such cases we shall be able to conclude that such certainty has formerly been wanting—that more or less promiscuous intercourse between the sexes has formerly prevailed. The connection between these two things—uncertain paternity and kinship through females only, seems so necessary—that of cause and effect—that

[1] Bachofen, *Das Mutterrecht*.

we may confidently infer the one where we find the other."[1] This opinion has been shared by various later writers. Dr. Bloch, for instance, who is one of the latest, says that mother-right " was the typical expression of the uncertainty of paternity which resulted from sexual promiscuity."[2]

The term "mother-right" has in recent years been adopted by English anthropologists, and there can be no harm in using it in the present connection if it is clearly understood that it is not identical with " matriarchy," or mother-rule. It always implies that descent is reckoned exclusively through the mother ; a person belongs by birth to the social group—the clan or whatever it may be—of his mother, not to that of his father, and this, of course, carries with it specific rights and duties. Inheritance and succession, however, do not always follow the line of descent. Where descent is matrilineal, a man's nearest heir is certainly very often his brother by the same mother or his mother's sister's son, not his own son ; but there are also cases of mother-right in which property and rank are transmitted from father to son.

Among various peoples with mother-right the mother's brother is said to have greater rights over a child than the father, or the latter's authority is said to be very slight or even *nil* ; but, as I have pointed out before, it is necessary to receive with some caution statements which attribute unqualified power to the maternal uncle to the exclusion of the father.[3] There can be no doubt that among most peoples with matrilineal descent the father is distinctly the head of the family.[4] On the other hand, there are also peoples with patrilineal descent among whom the maternal uncle plays a prominent part. This is, for instance, the case in various parts of India, where a special bond between maternal uncle and nephew is to be found, particularly in the part taken by the former in ceremonial connected with his nephew.[5] Among the Koita of British New Guinea,

[1] McLennan, *Studies in Ancient History*, p. 88.
[2] Bloch, *Sexual Life of Our Time*, p. 189.
[3] *Supra*, p. 40 *sqq*. [4] See *supra*, p. 43 *sq*.
[5] See Rivers, ' Marriage of Cousins in India,' in *Jour. Roy. Asiatic Soc.* 1907, p. 611 *sqq*.

though the descent is reckoned through the father, a boy helps his maternal uncle in his garden work, and a maternal uncle is supposed to exert more authority than the father or paternal uncle; a man or boy might refuse to accompany his father or paternal uncle, but would always go with his maternal uncle without demur.[1] Among the patrilineal Thonga in South-East Africa, although "father's right is paramount," the uterine nephew is all through his career the object of special care on the part of his uncle. When weaned, he goes to stay in the village of his mother's relatives for many years, and a girl sometimes stays there till she is grown up; and when she marries, the maternal uncle claims a right on the total amount of the bride price.[2] Frequently matrilineal descent is combined with matrilocal marriage, which implies that the married couple live with the wife's people; but in very many cases the marriage is patrilocal although the descent is matrilineal.

Thus the only permanent feature of "mother-right," as I understand it, is that descent is reckoned through the mother, not through the father; and as I have said before, there is no reason whatever to assume that all the peoples who now have matrilineal descent in earlier times also had the other customs which are often, but by no means invariably, combined with it. Nor must we take for granted that a certain prominence given to the maternal uncle by a people with patrilineal descent is an indication of the former prevalence of maternal descent. The reckoning of descent either through the father or through the mother does not imply that the nearest blood-ties on the other side are ignored.

Mother-right is very widespread in the savage world[3]—

[1] Seligman, *Melanesians of British New Guinea*, pp. 49, 67.

[2] Junod, *Life of a South African Tribe*, i. 253.

[3] See, besides the works of Bachofen and McLennan, Avebury, *Origin of Civilisation*, p. 121 *sqq.*; Giraud-Teulon, *Les origines du mariage et de la famille*, chs. vii.–x.; *Idem*, *La mère chez certains peuples de l'antiquité*, *passim*; Bastian, *Die Rechtsverhältnisse bei verschiedenen Völkern der Erde*, p. 183 *sq.*; Lippert, *Die Geschichte der Familie*, sec. i.; *Idem*, *Kulturgeschichte der Menschheit*, vol. ii. ch. ii.; Dargun, *Mutterrecht und Vaterrecht*, *passim*; Post, *Die*

and so is father-right;[1] whilst a large number of low tribes may be said to be neither matrilineal nor patrilineal or, rather, both at the same time.[2] In many areas either father-right or mother-right predominates or prevails exclusively; but it also happens quite frequently that of two neighbouring tribes of the same race and on the same level of civilisation one has father-right and the other mother-right. Many later writers have followed Bachofen and McLennan in assuming that mother-right has everywhere preceded father-right;[3] and Dr. Hartland, as said above, has even declared

Geschlechtsgenossenschaft der Urzeit, p. 93 *sq.*; *Idem, Der Ursprung des Rechts*, p. 37 *sq.*; *Idem, Bausteine für eine allgemeine Rechtswissenschaft*, i. 77 *sq.*; *Idem, Grundriss der ethnologischen Jurisprudenz*, i. 71 *sqq.*; Starcke, *Primitive Family*, sec. i. chs. i.–v.; Wilken, 'Over de primitieve vormen van het huwelijk en den oorsprong van het gezin,' in *De Indische Gids*, 1881, vol. ii. p. 244 *sqq.*; Friedrichs, 'Ueber den Ursprung des Matriarchats,' in *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Rechtswiss.* viii. 382 *sq.*; Letourneau, *L'évolution du mariage et de la famille*, chs. xvi.–xviii.; Wake, *Development of Marriage and Kinship*, ch. viii. *sq.*; Potter, *Sohrab and Rustem*, p. 113 *sqq.*; Gasquoine Hartley (Mrs. Gallichan), *Position of Woman in Primitive Society*, p. 103 *sqq*; Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, ch. iv. *sq.*; Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, *passim*; Rivers, 'Mother-right,' in Hastings, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, viii. 852 *sqq.*

[1] When I wrote the first edition of the present work the prevalence of mother-right was so much emphasised by most of the leading anthropologists of the time that I thought it desirable to give a list of uncivilised peoples among whom descent is reckoned through the father or property or rank is transmitted from father to son (p. 98 *sqq.*). As the general distribution of father- and mother-right does not affect the question I am here discussing, I have not included any such list in the present edition.

[2] *Cf.* Swanton, review of Frazer's *Lectures on the Early History of Kingship*, in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. viii. 160; Rivers, in Hastings, *op. cit.* viii. 852.

[3] Haberlandt, *Ethnology*, p. 52. Wilutzky, *Vorgeschichte des Rechts*, i. 23. Bloch, *op. cit.* p. 194. W. I. Thomas, *Sex and Society*, p. 67. Wundt, *Elemente der Völkerpsychologie*, p. 172 (English translation, p. 173). Kohler, 'Rechtsphilosophie und Universalrechtsgeschichte,' in Holtzendorff, *Enzyklopädie der Rechtswissenschaft*, i. 27. Russell, *Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, i. 139. Andrew Lang says (*Social Origins*, p. 21) he is inclined to the opinion that the reckoning of descent through the woman is the more archaic method.

that the result of anthropological investigations during the past half-century has been to show that this assumption is correct.[1] My own impression is that the assumption of a universal stage of mother-right, against which I fought in the previous editions of this work, is at present rather losing than gaining ground,[2] owing partly to our extended knowledge of facts and partly to a more general reluctance to unmethodical conclusions in anthropology as in other sciences.

Dr. Hartland writes :—" It may be said without fear of contradiction that while no case is known where matrilineal reckoning betrays evidence of having been preceded by paternal descent, the converse has been observed in every part of the world. Cases may exist of tribes reckoning descent through the father in which no trace remains of reckoning through the mother. The mere existence of such cases is wholly insufficient to disprove a prior stage of motherright, or even to shift the burden of proof."[3] I should have thought that the burden of proof lies on him who asserts the former existence of something which does not exist at present, and not on him who professes ignorance as regards the past ; otherwise any fiction might claim to be

[1] Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, i. 256 *sq.*

[2] See, *e.g.*, Crawley, *Mystic Rose*, p. 460 *sq.*; Schmidt, *Der Ursprung der Gottesidee*, p. 182 ; *Idem*, review of Buschan's *Illustrierte Völkerkunde*, vol. i., in *Anthropos*, v. 586 ; Swanton, ' Social Organization of American Tribes,' in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. vii. 664 *sqq.* ; *Idem*, *ibid.* N.S. viii. 160 ; *Idem*, review of Thomas' *Kinship Organisations and Group Marriage in Australia*, *ibid.* N.S. ix. 743 ; Goldenweiser, review of Hartland's *Primitive Paternity*, *ibid.* N.S. xiii. 603. Mr. Horatio Hale (*Science*, xix. 30) thinks that in North America father-right and mother-right are both primitive ; and M. van Gennep (*Mythes et légendes d'Australie*, p. xxxii.) believes that the same is the case in Australia. Mr. N. W. Thomas (*Kinship Organisations and Group Marriage in Australia*, p. 15) admits that " patrilineal descent may have been directly evolved without the intermediate stage of reckoning through females," although he seems to consider it more probable that it has everywhere been preceded by female descent.

[3] Hartland, *op. cit.* ii. 3. See also *Idem*, ' Matrilineal Kinship, and the Question of its Priority,' in *Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association*, iv. 87.

true if it cannot be actually disproved. As regards the statement that cases where father-right betrays evidence of having been preceded by mother-right have been observed in every part of the world, I must confess that, although there are such cases, I only too often find the so-called evidence to consist of more or less arbitrary inferences drawn from customs which are interpreted as relics of earlier mother-right. And although it may be true that no conclusive evidence has been produced of a transition in the opposite direction, American ethnologists maintain that cases exist in which such a transition has taken place or in which a clan system with matrilineal descent has evolved where there was previously no clan organisation at all.

Thus the Kwakiutl present us, according to Dr. Boas, with a tribe who had formerly a purely paternal organisation, but under the influence of matrilineal neighbours have adopted a purely female law of descent, although only through the medium of the husband: "the woman brings as a dower her father's position and privileges to her husband, who, however, is not allowed to use them himself but acquires them for the use of his son."[1] Dr. Swanton writes that "instead of being primitive, a study of the north Pacific area convinces one that the maternal clan system is itself evolved, for there is every indication that it there grew up in one small area at the mouths of the Nass and Skeena rivers and was spreading northward, southward, and inland at the time these tribes first came to the notice of Europeans. That an evolution has taken place in the Southwest is indicated by Fewkes' study of Hopi clans, as well as everything that we have learned of the relation of Navaho culture to that of the Pueblos."[2]

If mother-right had everywhere preceded father-right, we might expect to find it particularly prevalent among the lowest savages. But this is not the case. Father Schmidt observes that the Pygmy tribes, so far as we have

[1] Boas, 'Social Organization and the Secret Societies of the Kwakiutl Indians,' in *Ann. Rep. Smithsonian Institution*, 1895, p. 334 *sq.* *Cf.* Rivers, in Hastings, *op. cit.* viii. 858 *sq.*

[2] Swanton, in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. vii. 670 *sq.*

any information about their social organisation, seem to have father-right.[1] Among the Auin, belonging to the Kalahari Bushmen, a man's property—which is never considerable—is inherited by his eldest son.[2] Among the Pygmies of Central Africa children inherit their father.[3] Among the wild tribes of the Malay Peninsula I have found no trace of mother-right. "Les Sakayes," says de Morgan, "vivent à l'état patriarcal. Le groupe de la famille est soumis à l'autorité du père de famille, qui a tous les droits sur ses enfants, sauf celui de les tuer."[4] Among the Negritos of the Philippines, according to Schadenberg, family life is likewise patriarchal, and the father has unlimited power over the members of his family.[5] Among the Kubus of South Sumatra a husband inherits his wife and *vice versa*, or the children inherit their parents.[6] Among the Veddas Dr. Seligman found in some places matrilineal descent, and in others, although less often, patrilineal descent, or in the same place sometimes one and sometimes the other. "It seemed that adult sons inherited most of their fathers' personal property, but certainly the sons-in-law had the right to receive something."[7] According to Dr. P. Sarasin, it is really not possible to speak either of father-right or mother-right among the Veddas, but if a choice has to be made the balance is more in favour of father-right.[8] In

[1] Schmidt, *op. cit.* p. 182. *Idem, Die Stellung der Pygmäenvölker in der Entwicklungsgeschichte des Menschen*, pp. 181, 187.

[2] Kaufmann, 'Die Auin,' in *Mittheil. Deutsch. Schutzgeb.* xxiii. 155.

[3] Hutereau, *Notes sur la vie familiale et juridique de quelques populations du Congo Belge*, p. 6 *sq.*

[4] de Morgan, 'Mœurs, coutumes & langages des Négritos de l'intérieur de la presqu'île Malaise,' in *Bull. Société normande de Géographie*, vii. 421. See also *Idem*, 'Négritos de la presqu'île Malaise,' in *L'homme*, ii. 558.

[5] Schadenberg, 'Ueber die Negritos der Philippinen,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xii. 137.

[6] Volz, 'Zur Kenntniss der Kubus in Südsumatra,' in *Archiv f. Anthrop.* N.S. vii. 104.

[7] Seligman, *Veddas*, pp. 74, 76 *sqq.*, 118.

[8] Sarasin, in *Verhandlungen des II. Intern. Kongr. f. Allgem. Religionswiss. Basel*, 1905, vol. ii. 134, quoted by Schmidt, *Der Ursprung der Gottesidee*, p. 182.

Australia the area inhabited by tribes with a " dichotomous kinship organisation "—broadly speaking, the tribes of the whole of the known area of Australia, certain coast regions of comparatively small extent excepted—is, according to Mr. Thomas, divided almost equally between matrilineal and patrilineal tribes; whilst in the small remainder of the continent the rule of descent is mostly matrilineal.[1]

With reference to the Yahgans of Tierra del Fuego Mr. Bridges wrote to me :—" A child belongs equally to the clan of its father and mother as regards duty of revenge, but is always reckoned a member of the father's clan only. Children are generally named after their grandparents, paternal or maternal indifferently. They are quite as much attached to their mother's relatives, and these to them, as to their paternal relatives; the only difference is that they are integral parts of the father's clan, not of the mother's." Speaking of the same people, M. Hyades remarks, " L'héritage se transmet à l'époux survivant, ou à défaut, au fils aîné."[2] In North America, according to Dr. Goldenweiser, we find no correlation between higher culture and tribes with patrilineal descent and between lower culture and matrilineal tribes, but the reverse is true. The two groups of tribes whose culture ranks among the highest of the continent, the Indians of the North-West Coast and the Iroquois—he might have added most of the Pueblo tribes—[3] count descent through the mother. The Eskimo, on the other hand, the North Athapascans (excepting those affected by the culture of the coast), the Interior and part of the Coast Salish, the tribes of Washington and Oregon, the Shoshoni—all tribes of a relatively low culture—are either patrilineal or reckon descent " in the modern civilised fashion through both parents."[4] In North America mother-right is often connected with a comparatively high development of agriculture; Dr. Swanton states that typical matrilineal

[1] N. W. Thomas, *op. cit.* p. 38 *sq.*

[2] Hyades, ' Ethnographie des Fuégiens,' in *Bull. Soc. d'Anthr. Paris*, ser. iii. vol. x. 334.

[3] Hodge, *Handbook of American Indians*, ii. 323.

[4] Goldenweiser, in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. xiii. 603.

clan systems are found especially in the maize country.[1] And Dr. Rivers observes that in Africa mother-right seems to be present especially among peoples who live chiefly by agriculture, while father-right is associated with pastoral life, although the association is by no means universal.[2] Professor Hobhouse, Mr. Wheeler, and Mr. Ginsberg, again, by statistically investigating the prevalence of mother- and father-right among hunting, pastoral, and agricultural savages, came to the conclusion that the maternal principle predominates among the hunting peoples, the paternal in the pastoral stage, while among agricultural peoples the two are nearly balanced.[3] The statement referring to hunters, however, is distinctly open to criticism. The large majority of " lower hunters " included in the list are Australian tribes, and of these Australian cases eighteen are represented as matrilineal and only eight as patrilineal. Under the latter heading there are no other cases at all, whilst the non-Australian matrilineal peoples are the Punans, Fuegians, Batua, Lushongo Batua, and Veddas.[4] A comparison between these statements and those which I have given above shows a considerable discrepancy, which must substantially affect the conclusions drawn from them. But there can be no doubt, I think, that Professor Hobhouse and his collaborators are right in their inference that the patrilineal system is much more common among pastoral than among agricultural savages. This fact certainly lends no support to the view that the matrilineal system is the more primitive of the two systems.

The prevalence of mother-right among a large number of simple peoples cannot, then, be regarded as evidence of a universal stage of promiscuity even on the assumption that mother-right is due to uncertain paternity. Nor would the accuracy of this assumption justify the conclusion that promiscuity was the primitive condition of those peoples

[1] Swanton, in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. vii. 671.

[2] Rivers, in Hastings, *op. cit.* viii. 857.

[3] Hobhouse, Wheeler, and Ginsberg, *Material Culture and Social Institutions of the Simpler Peoples*, p. 153.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 152.

who have mother-right. Nay, it would not even prove that they ever lived in a state of promiscuity. The separation of husband and wife, adultery on the part of the woman, and the practice of lending wives to visitors are among many savages frequent enough to make good the saying, "It is a wise child that knows his own father." Mr. Ingham wrote to me from Banza Manteka that the Bakongo, who reckon descent through the mother, assert uncertain paternity as a reason for this custom;[1] but nevertheless he says that they would be horrified at the idea of promiscuous intercourse. Uncertainty of fatherhood is the cause which has been assigned for the mother-right of various other peoples either by the natives themselves or by those who have written on their customs, in spite of the fact that marriage does exist among them.[2] With reference to the Alibamu, for example, Bossu writes that "all the Indians deduce their lineage from the women, alledging that they may be sure of their origin on that side, and accordingly of their having their mother's blood in their veins; but that claiming their descent from the men was uncertain."[3] A similar explanation has been given by old travellers of the rules of inheritance among the Nayars,[4] and of the succession to the throne on the Coast of Malabar;[5] and in these cases it might have been justified by the extreme looseness of the sexual relations of the Nayars and by the intercourse which Brahmans had with the queens of Malabar.

No one, however, has yet exhibited any general coincidence of what we consider moral and immoral habits with the

[1] *Cf.* Phillips, 'Lower Congo,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xvii. 229.

[2] Bosman, 'Description of the Coast of Guinea,' in Pinkerton, *Collection of Voyages and Travels*, xvi. 421. Grade, in *Aus allen Welttheilen*, xx. 5. Solinus, *Collectanea rerum memorabilium*, xxx. 2 *sq.* Jarves, *History of the Hawaiian Islands*, p. 18. Powell, *Wanderings in a Wild Country*, p. 60.

[3] Bossu, *Travels through Louisiana*, i. 232.

[4] Schouten, *Ost-Indische Reyse*, p. 168.

[5] Balbi, *Viaggio dell' Indie Orientali*, foll. 75 b, 76 a, 137 a. Baldaeus, 'Description of the East-India Coasts of Malabar and Coromandel,' in Churchill, *Collection of Voyages and Travels*, iii. 561 *sq.*

prevalence of father- and mother-right among existing savages. Among the Barea[1] and the Negroes of Loango,[2] inheritance goes through the mother only, although adultery is said to be extremely rare; whereas father-right prevails or preponderates among the Chukchee[3] and the Todas of Southern India,[4] although paternity could nowhere be more uncertain than among these peoples. The former have cicisbeism and group-relations,[5] and among the latter there is little restriction of any kind on sexual intercourse either before or after marriage.[6] Other instances have been given by Dr. Hartland, who shares my view, expressed in the earlier editions of this work, that we have no right to ascribe mother-right to uncertain paternity, "nay, that such an assumption is not even probably true." He writes:—"Motherright then is found not merely where paternity is uncertain, but also where it is practically certain. Fatherright on the other hand is found not merely where paternity is certain, but also where it is uncertain and even where the legal father is known not to have begotten the children. Nay, the institutions of fatherright often require provision for, and very generally permit, the procreation by other men of children for the nominal father.[7] It follows therefore that the uncertainty of paternity cannot be historically the reason for the reckoning of descent exclusively through the mother."[8]

If mother-right has not originated in uncertainty of fatherhood, how is it to be explained? One answer might perhaps be that it is due to ignorance of the fact that the birth of a child is the result of sexual intercourse between man and woman. Paternity, as Sir Henry Maine remarks, is "matter of inference, as opposed to maternity, which is

[1] Munzinger, *Ostafrikanische Studien*, pp. 484, 490.

[2] Proyart, 'History of Loango,' in Pinkerton, *op. cit.* xvi. 571.

[3] Bogoras, *Chukchee*, p. 537 *sq.*

[4] Rivers, *Todas*, p. 546 *sq.*

[5] See *infra*, on Polyandry and on Group-marriage and other Group-relations.

[6] Rivers, *Todas*, p. 529 *sqq.*

[7] On this subject see *infra*, on Polyandry.

[8] Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, i. 301 *sqq.*, particularly p. 325.

matter of observation."[1] Hence it is almost beyond doubt that the father's participation in parentage was not recognised as soon as the mother's.[2] When I first dealt with the subject of mother-right, I was anxious to learn whether savages might still be found who preserved this primitive ignorance, and I made an inquiry about it in letters addressed to more than a hundred gentlemen, mostly missionaries, living in different parts of the world. I received only a few answers, and none of them bore testimony to ignorance of fatherhood. In reply to my question whether the natives of Tierra del Fuego believe that a child descends exclusively or predominantly from either of the parents, Mr. Bridges wrote that, according to his idea, the Yahgans "consider the maternal tie much more important than the paternal, and the duties connected with it of mutual help, defence, and vengeance are held very sacred." It is doubtful, however, whether this refers to the mere physiological connection between the child and its parents, in spite of the statement made by the same authority which I have quoted above, that a Yahgan child is always reckoned a member of the father's clan only. Dr. Sims informed me from Stanley Pool on the Congo that among the Bateke the

[1] Maine, *Dissertations on Early Law and Custom*, p. 202.

[2] *Cf.* Lippert, *Die Geschichte der Familie*, pp. 5, 8, 9, &c. I have preserved the statement in the text from the earlier editions of this work, as it contains nothing about the time when the discovery of a connection between child-birth and sexual intercourse may have been made. If our early ancestors had a yearly pairing season, the regular appearance of pregnancy after a definite interval may, together with a natural association of child-birth with sexual intercourse on anatomical grounds, have led to the recognition of a causal connection between them. Mr. Heape asks (*Sex Antagonism*, p. 87) if it is to be believed that the women did not, year after year, associate impregnation, when confined to certain times, with the symptoms they experienced a month later; and he thinks that even many of the lower animals anticipate the birth of their young and many nesting birds the result of mating. In his opinion "it is undoubtedly much simpler to connect the two facts of sexual congress and the birth of young than it is to invent any other theory whatever" (*ibid.* p. 92). See also Prof. Carveth Read's article, 'No Paternity,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xlviii. 146 *sqq.*, which appeared after the present chapter was written.

function of both parents in generation is held alike important. Mr. A. J. Swann wrote that the Waguha of West Tanganyika also recognise the part taken by both; and the same was asserted by Archdeacon Hodgson concerning certain other tribes of Eastern Central Africa, among whom descent is matrilineal. Mr. Cousins, again, informed me that according to the idea of the Cis-Natalian Kafirs a child descends chiefly, though not exclusively, from the father.

Certain customs found among a large number of savage peoples indicate plainly that they are well aware of the broad fact that pregnancy or child-birth is caused by sexual intercourse. In some cases a marriage does not become definite until a child is born, in other cases sexual relations which lead to pregnancy or child-birth make marriage obligatory or render the seducer liable to punishment. The custom of the couvade, which compels the father to take certain precautions at the birth of the child, undoubtedly implies the idea that there is an intimate relationship between the two. There are also, in the ethnological literature, various statements which directly tell us that sexual intercourse is known to have something to do with the production of a child, however defective this knowledge often is.

The tribes near Fort Johnston in British Central Africa believe that "the child is formed only from what the man introduces into the woman—the semen."[1] In Fiji there is a widespread belief "that when a woman has been cohabiting with more than one man before conception the paternity of her child is shared equally by all her paramours."[2] The Maori of the Tuhoe tribe, according to Mr. Best, "would appear to have grasped the idea of active and passive agents in generation," although they, like many other peoples, employed various methods to cause married women to conceive when they were apparently barren, such as the invocations of a priest or the use of the *mana*, or supernatural power, ascribed to certain trees or stones.

[1] Stannus, 'Notes on some Tribes of British Central Africa,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xl. 310.

[2] Thomson, *Fijians*, p. 239.

According to their ideas it is during a certain stage of menstruation and immediately after it that the sexual act is fruitful—a belief which may be connected with the view which an old native said was held by his ancestors and elders, that the marriage of man and wife was a matter of no moment, the moon being the real husband.[1] Some North American Indians believed that children receive their soul from their father and their body from their mother.[2] When a Brazilian Bakaïrí wants to inform a stranger that he is another person's father, he takes hold of the organ of procreation.[3] The Coroados even are of opinion that a child is exclusively indebted to its father for its existence, the mother only preserving and taking care of it.[4] A similar idea prevails among various Australian tribes; Dr. Howitt repeatedly heard the remark that a woman is nothing but a nurse who takes care of a man's children for him.[5] With reference to the natives of some part of Australia, not specially mentioned, Mr. Purcell states that after the third initiation into the *bora* ceremony "the youth is made to drink semen that is taken from six or as many young clean gins and blacks, as may be in the camp at the *bora* ground," and that the same is done to an old man who is dying. For "they hold, that as semen brought them into the world, it should keep them alive and from dying."[6]

Very different views are held by many other Australian tribes. The Arunta believe that there were certain great

[1] Best, 'Lore of Whare-Kohanga,' in *Jour. Polynesian Soc.* xiv. 211, 214; xv. 4 *sqq.*

[2] Lahontan, *New Voyages to North-America*, p. 461 (Canadian Indians). Carver, *Travels through the Interior Parts of North America*, p. 378 (Dakota).

[3] von den Steinen, *Unter den Naturvölkern Zentral-Brasiliens*, p. 191.

[4] Teschauer, 'Die Caingang oder Coroados-Indianer im brasilianischen Staate Rio Grande do Sul,' in *Anthropos*, ix. 22.

[5] Howitt, 'Australian Group Relations,' in *Smithsonian Report*, 1883, p. 813. *Idem*, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, pp. 195, 198, 255, 263, 284. Cameron, 'Notes on some Tribes of New South Wales,' in *Jour. Anthr. Soc.* xiv. 352.

[6] Purcell, 'Rites and Customs of Australian Aborigines,' in *Verhandl. Berliner Gesellsch. Anthrop.* 1893, p. 288.

men and women, leaders of the various groups in the far past times, called Alcheringa, who carried with them and deposited in certain places numbers of spirit children, and that it is these who now enter women and are born in the shape of human beings, as well as the spirits of the great leaders themselves.[1] The belief that children enter women in the form of minute spirits is widely spread over the Central, Northern, and Western parts of the continent, although there are variations in details.[2] In North Queensland, according to Dr. Roth, it is believed that "infants may be fashioned by spirits and then inserted in the mother."[3] Some of the aborigines there, the Tully River blacks, say that a woman begets children because she has been sitting over the fire on which she has roasted a particular species of black bream, "which must have been given to her by the prospective father"; or because she has purposely gone a hunting and caught a certain kind of bull-frog; or because some man may have told her to be in an interesting condition; or because she may dream of having had the child put inside her. But Dr. Roth adds that "although sexual connection as a cause of conception is not recognised among the Tully River blacks so far as they themselves are concerned, it is admitted as true for all animals:—indeed this idea confirms them in their belief of superiority over the brute creation."[4] So also the Arunta and Loritja, according

[1] Spencer, *Native Tribes of the Northern Territory of Australia*, p. 264 *sq.* Spencer and Gillen, *Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 150.

[2] Spencer, *op. cit.* pp. 23–25, 263 *sq.* Spencer and Gillen, *Northern Tribes*, p. 145 *sqq.* Schulze, 'Aborigines of the Upper and Middle Finke River,' in *Trans. and Proceed. Roy. Soc. South Australia*, xiv. 237. Strehlow, *Die Aranda- und Loritja-Stämme in Zentral-Australien*, i. 14; ii. 52 *sqq.*; vol. iii. pt. i. 7 n. 1. Mrs. Bates, quoted by Lang, 'Questiones Totemicæ,' in *Man*, 1906, p. 180 (West Australian natives). Mrs. Langloh Parker, *Euahlayi Tribe*, p. 50 *sqq.* Bischofs, 'Die Niol-Niol in Nordwest-Australien,' in *Anthropos*, iii. 35. See also Hartland, *op. cit.* i. 236 *sqq.*; van Gennep, *op. cit.* p. xliv. *sqq.*

[3] Roth, *North Queensland Ethnography: Bulletin No.* 5. *Superstition, Magic, and Medicine*, p. 23.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 22.

to Strehlow, are aware of the causal connection between copulation and procreation in the case of animals.[1] And even in the case of human beings the ignorance of such a connection is not complete. Spencer and Gillen say that, according to the beliefs of the Arunta, Loritja, and Ilpirra tribes, and probably also of others, sexual intercourse "merely as it were prepares the mother for the reception and birth also of an already formed spirit child who inhabits one of the local totem centres."[2] Strehlow agrees with them in this respect: the Arunta and Loritja believe that the sexual act puts the vagina in such a condition as to enable it to receive a *ratapa*, or spirit child, whereas without coitus it remains "closed."[3]

Dr. Malinowski has found a similar belief among the natives of Kiriwina in Trobriand Islands (British New Guinea). Their state of knowledge, he says, "is just at the point where there is a vague idea as to some *nexus* between sexual connection and pregnancy, whereas there is no idea whatever concerning the man's contribution towards the new life which is being formed in the mother's body."[4] The real cause of pregnancy is always a *baloma*, or the soul of a dead person, who enters into the body of a woman or is inserted into it in the form of a *waiwaia*, or "spirit child," by another *baloma*.[5] But a woman who is a virgin cannot conceive and give birth to a child, because nothing can enter or come out of her. She must be opened up or pierced through; hence a woman who has much intercourse will be easier for a spirit child to enter than one who is fairly continent. Sexual intercourse is thus quite unnecessary except for its mechanical action, and in default of it any other means of widening the passage may be used to enable a *baloma* to enter the woman or to insert a *waiwaia* into her.[6] In the case of animals, however, copulation is recognised as the cause of pregnancy, in Kiriwina as well as among

[1] Strehlow, *op. cit.* ii. 52 n. 7.
[2] Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes*, p. 265.
[3] Strehlow, *op. cit.* vol. iii. pt. i. p. x. *sq.*
[4] Malinowski, 'Baloma,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xlvi. 407.
[5] *Ibid.* p. 403 *sqq.* [6] *Ibid.* p. 412.

Australian tribes; Dr. Malinowski was told of the pigs, "They copulate, copulate, presently the female will give birth."[1] Most of the Papuans of Kaiser Wilhelm Land are said to know that pregnancy is connected with sexual intercourse, although there are women among the Kai people who in earnest deny the existence of any such connection. But the man is supposed to play only a secondary part in the matter. He merely liberates the child which is already formed in the woman's womb, by "tearing it off," just as when the rind is torn off a cocoa-nut.[2] The western tribes of the Bakongo, according to Mr. Torday, explain the phenomenon of conception by saying that the soul of a deceased person enters the woman and is reincarnated when it is wetted with the *semen virile*.[3]

We must not expect from savages too accurate explanations of a physiological process so complicated and hidden as that of conception. What do the uneducated classes among ourselves know about the subject, beyond the facts that sexual commerce is often followed by pregnancy, and that there is no pregnancy without previous sexual commerce? Nor must we infer that people are ignorant of the ordinary course of events because they maintain that children may also be produced in other ways. Among the Northern Massim of British New Guinea, according to Mr. Bellamy, "intercourse is recognised as the cause of children, although single girls who become pregnant have a curious habit of blaming some or other portion of their diet"; [4] and this may very well be something more than a bare excuse. Stories of "supernatural birth" are by no means inconsistent with the belief that in normal cases children owe their origin to sexual relations between men and women, nor do they prove the former absence of such a belief. Generally

[1] *Ibid.* p. 411.

[2] Neuhauss, *Deutsch Neu-Guinea*, i. 149; iii. 26.

[3] Torday and Joyce, *Les Bushongo*, p. 111. According to Mr. Weeks (*Among the Primitive Bakongo*, p. 115), the Bakongo believe that "the only new thing about an infant is its body," the spirit or soul of the child being thought to have belonged either to a deceased person or to a living person or to a water-spirit.

[4] Seligman, *Melanesians of British New Guinea*, p. 704.

speaking, I do not think that existing ideas about reproduction take us back to a period when man was completely ignorant of the connection between coitus and pregnancy. Dr. Hartland maintains that not only ancient stories but superstitious practices still very frequently resorted to even at higher stages of culture for the purpose of getting offspring justify the conclusion that "it was a widespread belief in early times that pregnancy was caused otherwise than by sexual intercourse";[1] but, so far as I can see, these practices—bathing, the drinking of water, the eating of eggs, &c.—only show that sexual intercourse alone is often considered insufficient to secure fecundity.[2]

Dr. Malinowski, again, in his brilliant essay, attaches some importance to the fact that the natives of Kiriwina belong to the most advanced Papuo-Melanesians: their ignorance, he says, "seems to indicate a much wider range of distribution and a much greater permanence through the higher stages of development than could be assumed hitherto."[3] He explains himself, however, this ignorance by the fact that "for the native of Kiriwina sexual intercourse is almost as common an occurrence as eating, drinking, or sleeping. What is there to guide the native observation, to draw his attention to the nexus between a perfectly normal, everyday occurrence, on the one hand, and an exceptional, singular event on the other? How is he to realise that the very act which a woman performs almost as often as eating or drinking will, once, twice or three times in her life, cause her to become pregnant?"[4] This explanation might apply to

[1] Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, ch. i. *sq.*, particularly vol. i. 154

[2] *Cf. supra*, p. 16. [3] Malinowski, *loc. cit.* pp. 415, 418.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 417. A similar explanation has, as Dr. Malinowski points out, been previously put forward by some other authors. See especially Roth, *op. cit.* p. 23; Spencer, *Native Tribes of the Northern Territory*, p. 25; Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, ii. 253 *sqq.* Dr. Roth says with reference to the North Queensland aborigines that "when it is remembered that as a rule in all these Northern tribes a little girl may be given to and will live with her spouse as wife long before she reaches the stage of puberty—the relationship of which to fecundity is not recognised—the idea of conception not being necessarily due to sexual connection becomes partly intelligible."

savages like those of Kiriwina, among whom "the unmarried girls from six upwards are generally supposed to practise licence well nigh every night." But then we must not expect that savages, even of a lower intellect, whose girls remain chaste until they marry—and this, as we have seen, is the case with the girls of many savage races of a very rude type—should be equally ignorant of the cause of pregnancy as are the Kiriwinians. And even the latter know, as we have seen, that pregnancy is not quite independent of sexual intercourse, nay for animal impregnation they have no other explanation at all. How is it that in the case of animals "the physiological aspect," as Dr. Malinowski says, "is well known"; are their sows and bitches more continent than their girls? "When you ask about the animals, you get the answer that it is necessary that the physiological conditions should exist," whereas in the case of man "copulation is quite unnecessary except for its mechanical action."[1] The difference, then, is not merely, as Dr. Malinowski says, that with regard to animals "the other side, the real problem of how life is created in the womb, is simply ignored"—unless indeed the expression "physiological conditions" in the case of animals also implies such conditions as may be produced by mechanical action. I am not quite sure, after all, that the Kiriwinian theory of human reproduction may not have to some extent been influenced by superimposed animistic ideas, although Dr. Malinowski is of another opinion.[2] Nor does Dr. Roth's statement that the Tully River blacks find their belief in their own superiority over the brute creation confirmed by their knowledge of sexual connection being a cause of conception in animals suggest that their views of human procreation are really primitive. Nay, it even makes me suspect that their ignorance of the man's share in procreation is not quite so absolute as it is said to be.

I must confess, then, that I have some doubts as to the present existence of any savage tribe where child-birth is considered to be completely independent of sexual intercourse. But it is obvious that there are simple peoples who

[1] Malinowski, *loc. cit.* p. 413. [2] *Ibid.* p. 416.

regard the man's participation in reproduction as entirely subordinate, whereas among others he seems to be regarded as the chief or even the only parent. The question now arises how far ideas of this sort have influenced the method of counting descent.

When Lahontan asked some Canadian Indians the reason for their mother-right, they replied that the children having received their soul from their father and their body from their mother, it was but reasonable that the maternal name should be perpetuated; and when he represented to them "that it was more reasonable to derive the original of that custom from the certainty that they had of the mother beyond that of the father," they positively affirmed that this reason was absurd.[1] We are also told that the mother-right of the Papuans of Kaiser Wilhelm Land is due to the paramount importance they ascribe to the mother's share in reproduction; but it is not clear whether this is the native view of the subject or the observer's own inference.[2] In any case it is necessary to receive with cautiousness the explanations which savages give of their social institutions. Speaking of the natives of Kiriwina, Dr. Malinowski observes that such knowledge as the natives have in the matter of reproduction is of no sociological importance and "does not influence the native ideas of kinship."[3] Nor can I find any facts which show that among the Australian tribes the method of counting descent is dependent upon theories relating to pregnancy and child-birth.[4] Of the tribes that consider the child to be derived from the father alone there are some which have female descent, and among which, in addition, the right of betrothal lies with the mother or mother's brother.[5] So also the tribes near Fort Johnston in British Central Africa, who believe that the child is formed only from what the man introduces into the woman, reckon descent through the

[1] Lahontan, *op. cit.* p. 461 *sq.* [2] Neuhauss, *op. cit.* i. 149.
[3] Malinowski, *loc. cit.* p. 413.
[4] *Cf.* N. W. Thomas, *op. cit.* p. 23.
[5] Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 195. Cameron, *oc. cit.* p. 352.

mother.[1] Suppose that the practice of counting descent originated at a time when absolutely no connection was known to exist between pregnancy and sexual intercourse, and that mother-right was the consequence of this ignorance—might we not expect that a change in the ideas relating to consanguinity would have been accompanied by a change in the method of counting descent? Or why should the latter only in the beginning have depended upon ideas of consanguinity and then remained unchanged when the principle on which it was based was given up? I do not deny that mother-right may have directly something to do with child-birth, with the fact that the child comes from the mother, whatever ideas be held about fatherhood. Yet I think that there can be little doubt that not only father-right, but mother-right as well, at least in a large measure depends on social conditions. However impossible it might be to explain its prevalence in each separate case, even if our knowledge of the lower races were far less incomplete than it is at present, we can, I believe, with a considerable degree of probability indicate in a general way the chief causes, or at least some of them, which have led to the system of mother-right, apart from any consideration of blood-relationship.

Among savages in particular the tie between mother and child is much stronger than that which binds the child to its father.[2] The savage mother is for a long time seen carrying the child at her breast, the sucking period lasting two, three, or four years or even more. In cases of separation, which occur frequently at lower stages of civilisation, the infant children always follow the mother, and so, very often, do the children more advanced in years. In polygynous families it is a customary arrangement that each wife has a hut for herself, where she lives with her children; and even where this is not the case, mother and children naturally keep together as a little sub-family. All over Equatorial Africa, says Mr. Connolly, the wives never eat with their husbands, but always with the children. With special

[1] Stannus, in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xl. 310.

[2] *Cf.* Avebury, *op. cit.* p. 121.

reference to the Fantis, he adds that polygyny has not been without effect on succession to property, the rightful heir being the eldest nephew of the eldest sister.[1] Indeed, speaking of certain negro tribes, Winterbottom suggested long ago that the prevalence of the female line was to be explained by the practice of polygyny, "which makes it easier among a number of children of the same family to distinguish them by their mothers' names, than if each had his father's prefixed"; [2] and Dr. Starcke has more recently directed attention to the same point.[3] The Rev. D. Macdonald likewise remarks, in his account of the Efatese of the New Hebrides, that the idea that children are more closely related to the mother than to the father is an idea perfectly natural among a polygynous people.[4] Concerning the Basuto, a Bechuana tribe, Casalis observes that the authority of the eldest maternal uncle preponderates to excess especially in polygynous families, where the children have no strong affection for their father.[5]

Among many peoples in different parts of the world it is the custom for a man on marrying to quit his home and go to live with his wife's people. In nearly all these cases mother-right prevails,[6] and, as Tylor has pointed out, it generally does so more fully among peoples whose custom is for the husband not to take his wife to his own home.[7] It seems therefore that mother-right in various cases is the result of matrilocal marriage. This conclusion is corroborated by the fact that when matrilocal and patrilocal marriages occur side by side among the same people, descent

[1] Connolly, 'Social Life in Fanti-Land,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxvi. 145 *sq.*

[2] Winterbottom, *Account of the Native Africans in the Neighbourhood of Sierra Leone*, i. 151 *sq.*

[3] Starcke, *Primitive Family*, pp. 27, 28, 35, 36, 40, 41, &c.

[4] Macdonald, *Oceania*, pp. 184, 192 *sq.*

[5] Casalis, *Basutos*, p. 181.

[6] Hobhouse, Wheeler, and Ginsberg (*op. cit.* p. 151) have only found two cases in which patrilineal descent is combined with matrilocal marriage. To these may be added the Yukaghir (Jochelson, *Yukaghir*, pp. 92, 112 *sq.*).

[7] Tylor, 'On a Method of investigating the Development of Institutions,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xviii. 258.

is—at least in some instances—reckoned through the mother if the husband goes to live with his wife's people and through the father if he takes her to his own home.[1] In Japan, should there be only daughters in the family, a husband is procured for the eldest, who enters his wife's family and at the same time takes its name.[2] In this case the family wants to acquire a new member; but generally matrilocal marriage is undoubtedly, as Dr. Starcke remarks, due to the unwillingness of the woman's family to part with any of its members.[3] This form of marriage seems particularly to occur among agricultural peoples, and is in such cases most probably connected with the fact that among simple peoples agriculture very largely devolves on the women.[4] Among the Australian tribes, who are hunters and food-collectors, there is but the very slenderest evidence of matrilocal marriage, even where descent is reckoned through the mother.[5] And pastoral tribes, as we have seen, are mostly patrilineal, and, of course, patrilocal; which well agrees with the fact that cattle-rearing is largely a masculine pursuit[6] and consequently makes the woman less valuable and more readily dispensed with.

I have now dealt with the chief facts which have been adduced as evidence of the hypothesis of promiscuity. They have been found to be no evidence at all. Not one of the customs alleged as relics of an ancient state of indiscriminate cohabitation of the sexes, or "communal marriage," presupposes the former existence of such a state. The numerous facts put forward in support of the hypothesis do not entitle us to assume that promiscuity has ever been the prevailing

[1] Robertson Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, p. 74 *sq.* Marsden, *History of Sumatra*, p. 225. *Cf.* Forbes, *Eleven Years in Ceylon*, i. 333.

[2] Küchler, 'Marriage in Japan,' in *Trans. Asiatic Soc. Japan*, xiii. 115.

[3] Starcke, *op. cit.* p. 79 *sq.*

[4] Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, i. 634.

[5] N. W. Thomas, *op. cit.* p. 16 *sq.*

[6] Westermarck, *op. cit.* i. 634.

form of sexual relations among a single people, far less that it has constituted a general stage in the social development of man, and least of all, that such a stage formed the starting-point of all human history.

It may seem to the reader that this question has received more attention than it deserves. But I have discussed some of the problems connected with it more fully than might have been strictly necessary for my purpose, partly because a criticism carries more weight if it is not merely destructive but substitutes other explanations for those it refutes, and partly because I have here found the most convenient place for discussing various customs and problems which cannot be ignored in a history of human marriage. And even now my criticism has not come to an end. Having shown that the hypothesis of promiscuity is unsupported by any evidence, I shall in the next chapter endeavour to demonstrate that it is contrary to certain facts which may be assumed to have been positive obstacles to a state of promiscuity in any period of the history of mankind.

CHAPTER IX

A CRITICISM OF THE HYPOTHESIS OF PROMISCUITY: MASCULINE JEALOUSY

DARWIN remarks that from what we know of the jealousy of all male quadrupeds, armed, as many of them are, with special weapons for battling with their rivals, promiscuous intercourse is utterly unlikely to prevail in a state of nature. "Therefore," he continues, "looking far enough back in the stream of time, and judging from the social habits of man as he now exists, the most probable view is that he originally lived in small communities, each with a single wife, or if powerful with several, whom he jealously guarded against all other men." Yet it seemed certain to Darwin, from the lines of evidence afforded by Morgan, McLennan, and Lubbock, that almost promiscuous intercourse at a later time was extremely common throughout the world;[1] and a similar view is held by some other writers.[2]

If the facts adduced as evidence of former promiscuity really had proved that it was general at some stage of human development, we should, of course, be compelled to admit that jealousy on the part of the men could have been no

[1] Darwin, *Descent of Man*, ii. 394 *sq.* Already before Darwin, Virey argued (*De la femme*, p. 148) that promiscuity would have caused perpetual fighting between the men.

[2] Le Bon, *L'homme et les sociétés*, ii. 289 *sq.* Kautsky, 'Die Entstehung der Ehe,' in *Kosmos*, xii. 262.

serious hindrance to it. But the case is entirely different if we have no reason whatever to believe that there was a stage of promiscuity at any time. Then the prevalence of male jealousy both among the anthropoid apes and the existing races of men constitutes a strong *primâ-facie* evidence of its prevalence in mankind in earlier ages as well. And this would have made general promiscuity exceedingly improbable, to say the least.

It has, however, been asserted by certain writers, such as Giraud-Teulon[1] and Dr. Le Bon,[2] that jealousy is almost unknown among nearly all uncivilised peoples, and recently Dr. Hartland has produced a long list of savages who are said to be little addicted to it.[3] According to him, the sense of ownership has been the seed-plot of jealousy, and in consequence this feeling operates only feebly in conditions where the sense of ownership is undeveloped or imperfect.[4] This is to my mind a more than doubtful proposition. It is true that a savage often regards his wife as a kind of property and an adulterer as a thief.[5] The Kiwai Papuans of British New Guinea,[6] like the Western Islanders of Torres Straits,[7] say of a man who commits adultery with another man's wife that he "steals" her. The Arunta call such a man *atna nylkna*, which means *vaginae fur*, or *inbiltja*, which means "thief."[8] In some parts of Africa he is punished as a thief,

[1] Giraud-Teulon, *Les origines de la famille*, p. 79 note.

[2] Le Bon, *op. cit.* ii. 293.

[3] Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, ii. 103 *sqq.* [4] *Ibid.* ii. 102 *sq.*

[5] See Casalis, *Basutos*, p. 225; Junod, *Life of a South African Tribe*, i. 194; Rochon, 'Voyage to Madagascar,' in Pinkerton, *Collection of Voyages and Travels*, xvi. 747; Weeks, *Among Congo Cannibals*, p. 181 (Bolobi); Lumholtz, *Among Cannibals*, p. 126 (natives of Northern Queensland). Guevara, 'Folklore Araucano,' in *Anales de la Universidad de Chile*, cxxvii. 626; Letourneau, *L'évolution du mariage*, p. 258 *sq.*; Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. 449 n. 5.

[6] Landtman, *Nya Guinea färden*, p. 82. [7] *Supra*, p. 147.

[8] Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 99. Strehlow, *Die Aranda- und Loritja-Stämme*, vol. iv. pt. i. 92. These epithets are given if the woman belongs to the class within which the adulterer is allowed to marry; otherwise a much more opprobrious term is applied to him.

having his hands, or one of them, cut off.[1] In the 'Laws of Manu' it is said that "seed must not be sown by any man on that which belongs to another."[2] But if jealousy has anything to do with the sense of ownership, the reason is that it is primarily connected with the desire of possession, which is something different.

Ownership implies that a certain person or certain persons are recognised as having a *right* to the exclusive disposal of a certain thing. It owes its origin to the desire of an individual to keep and dispose of what he has appropriated or produced, but it is by no means identical with mere possession.[3] The male animal jealously keeps for himself the female he has appropriated and is enraged if his possession of her is interfered with, but we cannot say that his jealousy depends on a "sense of ownership." Sexual jealousy, as Mr. Shand remarks, springs from sexual love. "But sexual love cannot be separated from self-love, with which it constantly interacts; and it is due to the desire of self-love to possess certain things exclusively for self, such as women, power, and reputation, that jealousy principally arises. Thus La Rochefoucauld observes: 'Il y a dans la jalousie plus d'amour propre que d'amour.'"[4] The jealousy of a man, particularly a civilised man, differs from that of a male animal, apart from any feeling of injured rights—ownership or any other right. It is coloured by the nature of his love. It is accompanied with humiliation, because "the loss of possession to which jealousy refers, or the failure to obtain it, is of such a nature as carries with it a lowering of a man's self-valuation."[5] There may also be fear of another man's offspring being born into the family.[6]

[1] Reade, *Savage Africa*, p. 61 (Fernando Po). Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, ii. 472 (Fulah).

[2] *Laws of Manu*, ix. 42.

[3] See Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. 1, 51 *sqq.*

[4] Shand, *Foundations of Character*, p. 258. [5] *Ibid.* p. 258.

[6] It was a doctrine of the Roman jurists that adultery is a crime in the wife, and in the wife only, on account of the danger of introducing strange children to the husband (Hunter, *Exposition of Roman Law*, p. 1071)

But there is one characteristic common to sexual jealousy in all its forms, namely, that it is an angry feeling aroused by the loss, or the fear of the loss, of the exclusive possession of an individual who is the object of one's sexual desire. And this dominant feature of sexual jealousy, which is found in brute and man, savage and civilised alike, is strongly opposed to the idea of promiscuous intercourse. The variations of jealousy are therefore of no moment in the present connection. In polemising against me, Mr. Finck complains that " language should be so crude as to use the same word jealousy to denote three such entirely different things as rage at a rival, revenge for stolen property, and anguish at the knowledge or suspicion of violated chastity and outraged conjugal affection."[1] But language has coined a word which excellently suits our purpose, and its different shades of meaning do not concern us.

We shall now see how far male jealousy can be said to be prevalent among the lower races. Let us start with the lowest. Nearly all authorities on the Pygmy peoples agree that they are very faithful in their marriages, and that adultery, if it does occur among them, is mostly punished with death.[2] As regards the Bushmen, Dr. Hartland quotes a statement by Alexander, indicating a considerable lack of jealousy,[3] but other writers picture them in a very different light. Speaking of both men and women, Theal says that " their passionate tempers prevented the presence of rivals in the same abode."[4] According to von François, the Bushman is very jealous of the exclusive possession of his wife, and avenges an encroachment on his marital rights in the Italian manner.[5] Among the Auin the seducer of another man's wife is killed, and the woman

[1] Finck, *Primitive Love and Love-Stories*, p. 88 n. 1.

[2] Schmidt, *Die Stellung der Pygmäenvölker in der Entwicklungsgeschichte des Menschen*, p. 162. *Cf.*, however, Johnston, *George Grenfell and the Congo*, ii. 674.

[3] Hartland, *op. cit.* ii. 214.

[4] Theal, *Yellow and Dark-skinned People of Africa south of the Zambesi*, p. 47.

[5] v. François, *Nama und Damara Deutsch-Süd-West-Afrika*, p. 237.

is beaten ; [1] and among the Namib Bushmen adultery is said to be very rare.[2] Among the wild tribes of the Malay Peninsula Dr. Martin saw obvious signs of jealousy in the men.[3] The Veddas of Ceylon are represented by various writers as exceedingly jealous of their wives,[4] and infidelity seems to be hardly known among them ;[5] " nothing short of murder," says Nevill, " would content the injured party."

The Australian aborigines—in spite of the prevalence among them of customs such as the lending and exchange of wives and, in some tribes, of group-relations—are by no means lacking in jealousy, as appears from the statements of a great many of our authorities.[7] Summing up the evidence, Dr. Malinowski observes that if by jealousy is meant a natural aversion of an individual towards an encroachment on his sexual rights, it is, on the contrary, a feeling which is very strongly developed among them.[8] Messrs. Spencer and Gillen are much less positive. They say that among those Australian natives with whom they

[1] Kaufmann, ' Die Auin,' in *Mittheil. Deutsch. Schutzgeb.* xxiii. 156.

[2] Trenk, ' Die Buschleute der Namib,' in *Mittheil. Deutsch. Schutzgeb.* xxiii. 169.

[3] Martin, *Die Inlandstämme der Malayischen Halbinsel*, p. 874.

[4] Bailey, ' Account of the Wild Tribes of the Veddahs of Ceylon,' in *Trans. Ethn. Soc.* N.S. ii. 292. Nevill, ' Vaeddas of Ceylon,' in *Taprobanian*, i. 178. Sarasin, *Ergebnisse naturwissenschaftlicher Forschungen auf Ceylon*, iii. 462 *sq.*

[5] Bailey, *loc. cit.* ii. 291 *sq.* Hartshorne, ' Weddas,' in *Indian Antiquary*, viii. 320.

[6] Nevill, *loc. cit.* p. 178.

[7] Curr, *The Australian Race*, i. 100, 109. Waitz-Gerland, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, vi. 774. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition*, ii. 195. Salvado, *Mémoires historiques sur l'Australie*, p. 280. Grey, *Journals of Two Expeditions of Discovery in North-West and Western Australia*, ii. 252. Withwell, *Customs and Traditions of the Natives of North Western Australia*, p. 17. Mathew, ' Australian Aborigines,' in *Jour. and Proceed. Roy. Soc. N. S. Wales*, xxiii. 404. Breton, *Excursions in New South Wales, &c.*, p. 231. Schuermann, ' Aboriginal Tribes of Port Lincoln,' in Woods, *Native Tribes of South Australia*, p. 223. Eylmann, *Die Eingeborenen der Kolonie Südaustralien*, pp. 130, 138. Strehlow, *Die Aranda- und Loritja-Stämme*, vol. iv. pt. i. 94.

[8] Malinowski, *The Family among the Australian Aborigines*, p. 125. See *ibid.* p. 124 *sqq.*

have come in contact "the feeling of sexual jealousy is not developed to anything like the extent to which it would appear to be in many other savage tribes." Now and again it will come into play, "but as a general rule this is a feeling which is undoubtedly subservient to that of the influence of tribal custom, so far as the latter renders it obligatory for a man to allow other men, at certain times, to have free access to his wife, or so far as it directs him to lend his wife to some other individual as a mark of personal favour to the latter."[1] Mr. Gason states that among the Dieri it is set down by the law of the tribe, under pain of strangulation, that no jealousy shall be shown or exist between persons who have entered into group-relations with each other; but he adds that in spite of this strict law he is positive from his own observations that nearly all their quarrels spring just from those relations.[2]

We are told that the Fuegians "are exceedingly jealous of their women and will not allow any one, if they can help it, to enter their huts, particularly boys."[3] The Botocudos, who are known to change wives very frequently, are nevertheless much addicted to jealousy; they have a horror of adultery and punish severely any woman found guilty of it.[4] Concerning the Coroados, v. Spix and v. Martius say that revenge and jealousy are the only passions that can rouse their stunted soul from its moody indifference.[5] Castelnau wrote of the Guatós, "La jalousie est la passion qui agite le plus fortement l'âme de ces sauvages, et la garde de leurs nombreuses femmes paraît les absorber entièrement."[6] The Guarayos of South-West Amazonia "are

[1] Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 99.

[2] Gason, 'Of the Tribes, Dieyerie, &c.,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxiv. 169.

[3] Wilkes, *op. cit.* i. 125. *Cf.* Skottsberg, 'Observations on the Natives of the Patagonian Channel Region,' in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. xv. 596 (West Patagonians).

[4] v. Martius, *Beiträge zur Ethnographie Amerika's*, i. 322. Keane, 'On the Botocudos,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xiii. 206. de Lodi, 'Extrait d'une lettre,' in *Annales de la propagation de la Foi*, xvii. 415.

[5] v. Spix and v. Martius, *Travels in Brazil*, ii. 241.

[6] Castelnau, *Expédition dans les parties centrales de l'Amérique du Sud*, iii. 13.

extremely jealous" and punish adultery by death of both man and woman.[1] The Jíbaros and Napo Indians of Ecuador are likewise said to be very jealous of their women; among the former, the women are very frequently not allowed to talk to strangers and, "with Oriental exclusiveness, not even to show themselves."[2] Of another tribe in Ecuador, the Záparos, it is stated that "they are not at all jealous, but allow their women great liberty," although this is "entirely contrary to other neighbouring tribes."[3] The Indians of Peru[4] and the Arawaks[5] are said to commit horrible crimes out of jealousy.

Concerning the Huichol of Mexico Dr. Lumholtz writes, "That jealousy is highly developed among them is shown by their strenuous resentment of matrimonial indiscretion."[6] Of the Sia, one of the Pueblo peoples, we are told that although it is common among them both for the married and the unmarried to live promiscuously with one another, they nevertheless "have their share of latent jealousy," which is evident from the secrecy observed on the part of a married man or woman to prevent the anger of the spouse.[7] Among the Creeks "it was formerly reckoned adultery if a man took a pitcher of water off a married woman's head, and drank of it."[8] The Illinois, according to La Salle, "are very jealous, and punish the infidelity of their wives with a great severity."[9] The Alibamu, says Bossu, "are jealous to excess."[10] In his description of "a vast country between New France and New Mexico" Hennepin observes that

[1] Church, *Aborigines of South America*, p. 114 *sq.*

[2] Simson, *Travels in the Wilds of Ecuador*, pp. 90, 158. Rivet, Les Indiens Jibaros,' in *L'Anthropologie*, xviii. 605.

[3] Simson, *op. cit.* p. 173.

[4] v. Schütz-Holzhausen, *Der Amazonas*, p. 70.

[5] v. Martius, *op. cit.* i. 693.

[6] Lumholtz, *Unknown Mexico*, ii. 91.

[7] Mrs. Stevenson, 'Sia,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethnol.* xi. 20.

[8] Adair, *History of the American Indians*, p. 143.

[9] La Salle, 'Last Expedition and Discoveries in North America,' in *Collections of the New York Historical Society, for the Year* 1814, ii. 238.

[10] Bossu, *Travels through Louisiana*, i. 231.

" the men of the hot country are more jealous of their wives than those of the north; the first are so jealous in this matter, that they wound themselves, and sometimes kill themselves in a blind passion of love, which prompts them to this fury."[1] Speaking of the Hurons, Charlevoix remarks that " what most commonly disturbs domestic peace among the people of Canada is jealousy, which is equal on both sides. The Iroquois boast that they are never troubled with it: but those who are most acquainted with them, affirm that they are jealous to excess."[2] Lahontan, on the other hand, says of Canadian Indians that the men are cold and incapable of jealousy; but this hardly agrees with his statement that the married women " had as good be dead as be guilty of adultery."[3] Of some Californian Indians we are told that if a married woman is seen even walking in the forest with another man than her husband, she is chastised by him, whilst a repetition of the offence is generally punished with speedy death.[4] Among the Indians of San Diego in Upper California, according to a Mission record, " the men pursue one another with death for jealousies and other vexations."[5] A considerable degree of jealousy was found among the Cree by Richardson,[6] among the Takulli by Harmon,[7] among the Haida by Dixon,[8] among the Kutchin by Richardson and Hardisty,[9] among the

[1] Hennepin, *New Discovery of a Vast Country between New France and New Mexico*, p. 483. *Cf.* Perrin du Lac, *Travels through the Two Louisianas*, p. 80.

[2] Charlevoix, *Voyage to North-America*, ii. 37 *sq.*

[3] Lahontan, *New Voyages to North-America*, pp. 453, 460.

[4] Powers, *Tribes of California*, p. 412.

[5] Kroeber, 'Mission Record of the California Indians,' in *University of California Publications in American Archæology and Ethnology*, viii. 6.

[6] Franklin, *Journey to the Shores of the Polar Sea*, p. 67.

[7] Harmon, *Journal of Voyages and Travels in the Interior of North America*, p. 293.

[8] Dixon, *Voyage round the World*, p. 225 *sq.* *Cf.* Swanton, *Haida*, p. 51.

[9] Richardson, *Arctic Searching Expedition*, i. 383. Hardisty, 'Loucheux Indians,' in *Smithsonian Report*, 1866, p. 312.

Atkha Aleut by Father Yakof.[1] The Indians on the eastern side of the Rocky Mountains visited by Harmon, in their fits of jealousy, "often cut off all the hair from the heads of their wives, and, not unfrequently, cut off their noses also; and should they not in the moment of passion have a knife at hand, they will snap it off at one bite, with their teeth. . . . The man is satisfied in thus revenging a supposed injury; and having destroyed the beauty of his wife, he concludes that he has secured her against all future solicitations to offend."[2] According to a Tlingit myth, the jealousy of man is older than the world itself. There was an age, it is supposed, when men groped in the dark in search of the world. At that time a Tlingit lived who had a wife and a sister; and he was so jealous of his wife that he killed all his sister's children because they looked at her.[3]

Among the Eskimo the jealousy of the men seems to be feebler than among most other natives of America; but it is not absent. Speaking of the curious amusements of the Greenlanders, Dalager says that the men are too jealous to allow their wives to take part in any debauchery in case they have borne to them children.[4] Cranz, who had no high opinion of the sexual morality of those natives, admits that if any infidelity occurs in the wife, the injured husband revenges himself in a similar way when an opportunity occurs, and that the disagreement "frequently costs the wife a black eye, which is rather surprising, as the Greenlanders are not at all quarrelsome or addicted to blows."[5] Dr. Boas knows of instances of quarrels arising from jealousy among the

[1] Yakof, quoted by Petroff, 'Report on the Population, &c. of Alaska,' in *Tenth Census of the United States*, p. 158. For other instances of jealousy among North American Indians see Waitz, *op. cit.* iii. 328; Hearne, *Journey from Prince of Wales's Fort to the Northern Ocean*, p. 310; Mackenzie, *Voyages from Montreal to the Frozen and Pacific Oceans*, p. 147.

[2] Harmon, *op. cit.* p. 343.

[3] Holmberg, 'Ethnographische Skizzen über die Völker des russischen Amerika,' in *Acta Soc. Scient. Fennicae*, iv. 332 *sq.* Dall, *Alaska*, p. 421. [4] Dalager, *Grønlandske Relationer*, p. 67 *sq.*

[5] Cranz, *History of Greenland*, i. 147.

Eskimo of Davis Strait and Cumberland Sound, although Lyon states that this passion is unknown among the Iglulirmiut of Baffin Land.[1] Among the Eskimo of Hudson's Bay jealousy, resulting from laxity of morals, produces so much disagreement that one or the other of the parties usually leaves with little ceremony.[2] Among the Eskimo about Bering Strait a man who finds that his wife is unfaithful may beat her or send her away; but he rarely revenges himself on the adulterer.[3]

From Siberia and other parts of the former Russian empire, inhabited by more or less uncivilised tribes, we hear little about jealousy but a great deal about disregard of chastity in married as well as unmarried women, which, as we have seen, is partly at least the result of Russian influence. Among the Koryak, who have been comparatively little subject to this influence, adultery is, according to Dr. Jochelson, less frequently met with than among civilised peoples. The injured husband does not touch the adulterer, but casts out or thrashes the faithless wife without mercy, and formerly many wives were killed by passionate husbands. It is said that a married woman had to go in a dirty dress and with unwashed face, so as not to attract the attention of strange men.[4] Captain Arnesen noticed great jealousy among the Samoyed.[5] Dr. A. O. Heikel informs me that a Tartar may repudiate his wife if he sees her shaking hands with another man. On the other hand, we are told that the Burut[6] and Ostyak[7] know little of jealousy, and that among the Kirghiz husbands even encourage their friends to close intimacy with their wives.[8]

[1] Boas, 'Central Eskimo,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethn.* vi. 579.

[2] Turner, 'Ethnology of the Ungava District,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethn.* xi. 188 *sq.* See also *ibid.* p. 178.

[3] Nelson, 'Eskimo about Bering Strait,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethn.* xviii. 292.

[4] Jochelson, *Koryak*, p. 756. Georgi, *Beschreibung aller Nationen des Russischen Reichs*, p. 348 *sq.*

[5] Arnesen, 'Från Gyda-viken till Obdorsk,' in *Ymer*, iii. 144.

[6] Valikhanof, &c., *Russians in Central Asia*, p. 85.

[7] Miss Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, p. 128.

[8] Valikhanof, &c., *op. cit.* p. 85.

Among the savages of Formosa "unfaithfulness on the part of a wife is unheard of."[1] Among the Sakai of Sumatra the men are said to be addicted to jealousy,[2] and the same is the case among various other tribes in the Malay Archipelago,[3] as also in Yap (one of the Pelew Islands),[4] the Shortland Islands,[5] New Caledonia,[6] and New Guinea.[7] In Mailu, British New Guinea, according to Dr. Malinowski, "sexual jealousy is very pronounced, and this sentiment is not based only upon the sense of ownership established by marriage, since it exists very markedly in respect to the *Ui'ui* relationships"—that is, preconjugal intrigues without intention to marry.[8] Among the Southern Massim Dr. Seligman repeatedly heard that in the old days a man might be killed for even talking to another man's wife if he met her alone in the bush or on the sea-shore, and that no married woman would speak to a stranger unless other women were present.[9] In the Santa Cruz Islands, says Dr. Speiser, "masculine jealousy seems to have reached its climax . . ., for no man from another village even dares look at a woman."[10] In the Sandwich Islands, where there seems to have been some kind of sexual communism, jealousy was nevertheless,

[1] Davidson, *Island of Formosa*, p. 583.

[2] Moszkowski, *Auf neuen Wegen durch Sumatra*, p. 105.

[3] Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua*, pp. 5, 335, 448. Modigliani, *Un viaggio a Nias*, p. 471.

[4] Krämer, 'Studienreise nach den Zentral- und Westkarolinen,' in *Mittheil. Deutsch. Schutzgeb.* xxi. 178.

[5] Ribbe, *Zwei Jahre unter den Kannibalen der Salomo-Inseln*, p. 142.

[6] Moncelon, in *Bull. Soc. d'Anthr. Paris*, ser. iii. vol. ix. 368. Brainne, *La Nouvelle-Calédonie*, p. 251. Lambert, *Mœurs et Superstitions des Néo-Calédoniens*, p. 96.

[7] Vetter, 'Bericht über papuanische Rechtsverhältnisse,' in *Nachrichten über Kaiser Wilhelms-Land*, 1897, p. 87 (natives of Simbang). Moszkowski Die Völkerstämme am Mamberamo in Holländisch-Neuguinea,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xliii. 339.

[8] Malinowski, 'Natives of Mailu,' in *Trans. Roy. Soc. South Australia*, xxxix. 572.

[9] Seligman, *Melanesians of British New Guinea*, p. 567 *sq.*

[10] Speiser, *Two Years with the Natives in the Western Pacific*, p. 284.

according to Lisiansky, extremely prevalent ;[1] and in Nukahiva, where polyandry was practised, the men punished their wives with severity upon the least suspicion of infidelity.[2] The Areois of Tahiti, too, although given to every kind of licentiousness, are described by Ellis as utterly jealous.[3] The Maori, who treated incontinence lightly in the case of a young girl, looked upon it as a serious offence in a married woman, who was sometimes punished with death for adultery.[4]

With reference to the Negroes of Fida, Bosman states that a rich man will not suffer any other man to enter the houses where his wives reside, and on the least suspicion will sell them to Europeans. The natives of the Gold Coast, says Cruickshank, "watch over the objects of their affection with a jealous eye"; and he speaks of "the spirit of jealousy, which in the African takes the form of a strong instinct."[6] In the Nile countries and various other parts of Africa it is customary for the men to preserve the fidelity of their wives in a way not unlike a method used in the age of the Crusades.[7] Among the Beni Mzab a man who speaks in the street to a married woman of quality is punished with a fine of two hundred francs and banishment for four years.[8]

That jealousy is a powerful agent in the social life of civilised nations is a fact which it is unnecessary to dwell upon. In the Muhammadan world it is, strictly speaking, unlawful for a man to see the faces of any other women than those whom he is forbidden to marry and his own wives and female slaves ;[9] but the feminine custom of wearing a veil is

[1] Lisiansky, *Voyage round the World*, p. 128. [2] *Ibid.* p. 82.

[3] Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, i. 239.

[4] Best, 'Maori Marriage Customs,' in *Trans. and Proceed. New Zealand Institute*, xxxvi. 51 *sqq.* For the jealousy of South Sea Islanders see also Macdonald, *Oceania*, p. 194.

[5] Bosman, 'New Description of the Coast of Guinea,' in Pinkerton, *op. cit.* xvi. 479.

[6] Cruickshank, *Eighteen Years on the Gold Coast of Africa*, ii. 195, 212.

[7] Bastian, *Die Rechtsverhältnisse bei verschiedenen Völkern der Erde*, p. xx. Waitz, *op. cit.* ii. 516.

[8] Chavanne, *Die Sahara*, p. 315.

[9] Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, i. 138.

by no means universally observed there,[1] and as I have pointed out elsewhere, may not only be due to masculine jealousy, but serve the object of protecting the woman against the evil eye.[2] A man who penetrates into the harem of another man may easily lose his life; and Dr. Polak states that in Persia a European physician cannot, without being considered indecent, even ask about the health of a Muhammadan's wife and daughter although they are ill.[3] In Japan, as I am told by a native of that country, it was customary for women, when getting married, to have their eyebrows shaved off, because thick and beautiful eyebrows are considered one of a woman's greatest attractions. This reminds us of the widespread practice of depriving a woman of her ornaments as soon as she is married.

It is not, however, statements directly referring to jealousy that are our chief source of information with regard to its prevalence in mankind. It is mentioned only when it, for some reason or other, attracts the attention of the traveller; and if it is said to be lacking, this statement seems generally to be an inference from the fact that a man under certain conditions permits, or is by custom compelled to permit, some other man to have intercourse with his wife. The real evidence of the general prevalence of masculine jealousy is found in the customs or laws concerning adultery, which make the seducer or the unfaithful wife or both liable to punishment of some sort, inflicted either by the injured husband himself or by the society of which he is a member, or at all events give him power to divorce the wife. In a monogamous or polygynous marriage the husband has, in ordinary circumstances at least, an exclusive right of access to his wife, and in the case of polyandry or

[1] It is not strictly observed among the lower classes in Arabia (Palgrave, *Journey through Central and Eastern Arabia*, i. 271 *sq.*) nor by the Muhammadans of Africa (Munzinger, *Ostafrikanische Studien*, p. 511; d'Escayrac de Lauture, *Die afrikanische Wüste*, p. 63; Chavanne, *Die Sahara*, p. 349). Among the country people of Morocco the veil is used in some tribes but not in others.

[2] Westermarck, 'Magic Origin of Moorish Designs,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxiv. 211.

[3] Polak, *Persien*, i. 224.

group-relations a similar right belongs to the husbands or recognised cicisbeos jointly. I doubt whether there really are any exceptions to this rule, although we are told that among a few peoples adultery is not held to be wrong.[1] Dr. Rivers suspects that among the Todas, instead of adultery being considered wrong, immorality is rather attached to the man who grudges his wife to another;[2] but according to his own statement the consent of the husband or husbands is required if a woman is to become the formal mistress of a man who is not her husband.[3] The disapproval of adultery varies greatly in degree among different peoples. Some savages are said to regard it as a venial offence, others as a most heinous crime. Among many the seducer escapes by paying a fine to the injured husband; among others he is beaten or has his head shaved, his ears cut off, one of his eyes destroyed, or his legs speared. Sometimes he is merely paid in his own coin, or the punishment falls on his wife, who in that case seems to be looked upon as the real cause of her husband's unfaithfulness.[4] Very frequently he has to pay with his life. Among the Mishmis in Assam adultery committed against the consent of the husband was punished with death, although all other crimes, including murder, were punished only by fines.[5] The Baganda also, in former days, punished adultery more severely than murder.[6] In the south-eastern extremity of British New Guinea there is a much stronger public feeling against adultery than against homicide, and the white man's law which provides that the former shall be punished by a fine or imprisonment instead of exposing the perpetrator to being killed by the aggrieved husband, as was formerly the case, seems to the native inadequate.[7]

[1] Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. 447 n. 1.

[2] Rivers, *Todas*, p. 529 *sq.* [3] *Ibid.* p. 527.

[4] Moncelon, in *Bull. Soc. d'Anthr. Paris*, ser. iii. vol. viii. 361 (New Caledonians).

[5] Griffith, 'Journal of a Visit to the Mishmee Hills in Assam,' in *Jour. Asiatic Soc. Bengal*, vi. 332.

[6] Wilson and Felkin, *Uganda*, i. 201.

[7] Seligman, *op. cit.* p. 567 *sq.* *Cf.* Waitz-Gerland, *op. cit.* vi. 661.

Winwood Reade remarks that among savages generally it is the seducer who suffers, not the unfaithful wife.[1] This is more or less true of many uncivilised peoples in different parts of the world, in Africa in particular,[2] but it can certainly not be laid down as a general rule. More commonly the unfaithful wife is also treated as an offender, being discarded, beaten, or ill-treated in some way or other, and not infrequently killed; and among some peoples she is the only one who has to suffer.[3] Often, too, she is disfigured by her enraged husband in such a way as to be deprived of her attractions: he bites or cuts off her nose, or cuts off one or both of her ears or her hair, or shaves her head.[4] A similar

[1] Reade, *Savage Africa*, p. 61.

[2] Delafosse, 'Les Agni,' in *L'Anthropologie*, iv. 429 *sq.* Clozel and Villamur, *Les coutumes indigènes de la Côte d'Ivoire*, pp. 102, 103, 319. Klose, *Togo unter deutscher Flagge*, p. 256. Ward, *A Voice from the Congo*, p. 253 (if the act is committed outside the village boundary). Weeks, *Among Congo Cannibals*, p. 127 *sq.* (Bolobi on the Upper Congo). Monteiro, *Angola and the River Congo*, i. 243 (Mussurongo, Ambriz, and Mushicongo). Kohler, 'Das Recht der Herero,' in *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Rechtswiss.* xiv. 309. Magyar, *Reisen in Süd-Afrika*, p. 281 (Kimbunda). Junod, *op. cit.* i. 194 (Thonga). Gouldsbury and Sheane, *Northern Rhodesia*, p. 57 (Awemba). Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, p. 689. Roscoe, *Northern Bantu*, p. 279 (Nilotic Kavirondo). O'Sullivan, 'Dinka Laws and Customs,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xl. 188. Scaramucci and Giglioli, 'Notizie sui Danakil,' in *Archivio per l'antropologia e la etnologia*, xiv. 26. Macpherson, *Memorials of Service in India*, p. 133 (Kandhs). Watt, 'Aboriginal Tribes of Manipur,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xvi. 355 (Kaupuis). Moore, *Marriage Customs*, p. 187 (Ladrone Islanders). Batchelor, *Ainu and their Folk-Lore*, p. 285. Powers, *Tribes of California*, pp. 75, 246, 270. Schoolcraft, *Information respecting the History, &c. of the Indian Tribes of the United States*, ii. 132 (Comanche). de Herrera, *General History of the West Indies*, iv. 140 (ancient inhabitants of Honduras). Azara, *Voyages dans l'Amérique méridionale*, ii. 95 (Guanas). Falkner, *Description of Patagonia*, p. 126.

[3] Morgan, *League of the Iroquois*, p. 331. James, *Account of an Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains*, i. 233 (Omaha). Jochelson, *Koryak*, p. 756.

[4] Schoolcraft, *op. cit.* i. 236, ii. 132, v. 167, 683, 684, 686; Adair, *op. cit.* p. 144 *sq.*; Carver, *Travels through the Interior Parts of North America*, p. 375; Hennepin, *op. cit.* p. 482; Bradbury, *Travels in the Interior of America*, p. 168 *sq.*; Bancroft, *Native Races of the Pacific States of North America*, i. 514; Kohler, 'Die Rechte der

punishment has figured even in European law-books. According to a law of Cnut, an adulteress shall have her nose and ears cut off;[1] whilst in the 'Uplands-lag,' an old Swedish provincial law, it is prescribed that an adulteress who cannot pay the fine of forty marks shall lose her hair, ears, and nose.[2] This is, in a manner, a punishment inflicted on "the offending member"; and so is in a still higher degree the custom prevalent among some North American Indians of compelling an adulteress to "pass through the meadow," that is, to submit to the embraces of a large number of men successively.[3]

Adultery may be condemned as wrong and be subject to punishment for various reasons. It is sometimes supposed to mar the fertility of the earth and to blight the crops.[4] But this belief, like the kindred belief which attributes the same injurious effects to incest and fornication, undoubtedly springs from the fact that it is illicit love and therefore regarded as polluting.[5] Such a belief naturally increases the gravity of the offence in the eyes of those who hold

Urvölker Nordamerikas,' in *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Rechtswiss.* xii. 386 *sq.* (various North American tribes). James, *op. cit.* i. 233 (Omaha). Marston, 'Letter to Rev. Dr. J. Morse,' in Blair, *Indian Tribes of the Upper Mississippi Valley, &c.*, ii. 167 (Potawatomi). Forsyth, 'Manners and Customs of the Sauk and Fox Nations,' *ibid.* ii. 214 *sq.* Bossu, *op. cit.* i. 234 (Alibamu). ten Kate, *Reizen en onderzoekingen in Noord-Amerika*, p. 175 (Apache). Waitz, *op. cit.* iv. 367 (Chibchas). Thomas, *Anthropological Report on Sierra Leone*, i. 100 (Timne). Bowdich, *Mission from Cape Coast Castle to Ashantee*, p. 302 (Ashantees). Wilson, *Western Africa*, p. 182. Fülleborn, *Das Deutsche Njassa- und Ruwuma-Gebiet*, p. 307 (Konde people) Lobo, 'Voyage to Abyssinia,' in Pinkerton, *op. cit.* xv. 25 *sq.* Forsyth, *Highlands of Central India*, p. 149 (Gonds and Korkús). Watt, in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xvi. 358 (Kolyas). Smith, *Five Years' Residence at Nepaul*, i. 153. Pennell, *Wild Tribes of the Afghan Frontier*, p. 193. Krauss, *Sitte und Brauch der Südslaven*, p. 569 *sq.* (South Slavonians).

[1] *Laws of Cnut*, ii. 54.

[2] *Uplands-Lagen*, Aerfdæ Balkær, ch. 6.

[3] Bossu, *op. cit.* i. 308 *sq.* (Chactaw). James, *op. cit.* i. 243 (Omaha).

[4] Frazer, *Magic Art*, ii. 107 *sqq.* *Idem*, *Psyche's Task*, p. 44 *sqq.*

[5] See Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. 417, 747; *infra*, i. 407.

it, but it presupposes that there is some primary reason for censuring adultery.

The Southern Bambala in Congo maintain that adultery is generally the cause of the deaths of infants. Mr. Torday says that it is only when a child is expected that the marriage of a couple seems to become definite and conjugal fidelity becomes obligatory on both parties, as the child is otherwise supposed to die. Nay, even previous intercourse with a lover may kill a child born in wedlock; when a married woman perceives that she is pregnant, she must confess all her former lovers to her husband, and if she forgets the name of a single one it is believed that the child will die.[1] The Thonga in South-Eastern Africa fear terrible complications at the birth of a child when adultery has had something to do with it; a protracted and difficult birth at once proves that the child is not legitimate. But adultery may also, in their opinion, be dangerous to the husband. The whole punishment, says M. Junod, falls on the man, first, because he is a thief, and secondly, because of the so-called *matlulana*. "*Tlulana* means to jump over each other, to compete with each other. In the sexual domain it is said of two men who have relations with the same woman, 'They have met together in one life through the blood of that woman; they have drunk from the same pool.' This establishes between them a most curious mutual dependence: should one of them be ill, the other must not visit him; the patient might die. If he runs a thorn into his foot, the other must not help him to extract it. It is taboo. The wound would not heal. If he dies, his rival must not assist at his mourning or he would die himself. . . . It is a frightful taboo!"[2] Señor Guevara mentions the prevalence of a very similar belief among the Araucanians of Chili. They look upon adultery as a most heinous offence, both because it is theft and because it makes the husband's existence in a mysterious manner dependent upon that of the adulterer through the medium of the woman: if the adulterer falls ill or dies, the same may easily happen to the husband.[3]

[1] Torday, *Camp and Tramp in African Wilds*, p. 203.
[2] Junod, *op. cit.* i. 194 *sq.*
[3] Guevara, in *Anales de la Universidad de Chile*, cxxvii. 626.

We do not know how widely spread ideas of this sort are, but in the prohibition of adultery they could only have played a subsidiary part. Like the belief that adultery has an injurious effect on the harvest, so the belief that it has an injurious effect on the offspring could in fact never have arisen unless the act had been disapproved of. There can be no doubt that the customs and laws which prohibit the seduction of another man's wife and unfaithfulness on her part are in the first place due to the facts that a man desires to keep for himself a woman whom he has got possession of, and that the society of which he is a member sympathises with him and consequently feels resentment on his behalf if his possession is interfered with.[1] In other words, the prohibition of adultery is mainly due to the jealousy of the injured husband and to the society's readiness to sympathise with it. Its readiness to do so depends, of course, upon the disposition for jealousy in its men in general—you cannot sympathise with a feeling which you are incapable of experiencing; and thus customs or laws forbidding adultery may be taken as evidence of the general prevalence of male jealousy in the societies where they are found. I do not say that this is the only factor which determines the society's attitude towards adultery; the faithfulness which a wife owes her husband is also very closely connected with the power he possesses over her. But without jealousy there would be no crime of adultery at all. It may be contended that adultery is a crime against property, an offence against a man's honour, a breach of faith. But it would be neither the one nor the other if there were not that desire of exclusive possession which is the root of all jealousy.

There may even be jealousy with reference to the past. We have seen that among many peoples a husband not only requires chastity from his wife, but demands that the woman whom he marries shall be a virgin; and there can be little doubt that this demand partly owes its origin to the

[1] In my work on *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* I have endeavoured to show that this is the usual way in which individual rights originate. See especially vol. i. ch. v. *sq.*

same powerful feeling as keeps watch over the purity of the marriage-bed. And a husband's claims may go farther still. He often demands that the woman he chooses for his wife shall belong to him, not during his lifetime only, but after his death. So strong is the idea of a wife belonging exclusively to her husband that among several peoples she has to die with him. He may want her in the other world; or, in any case, she shall not be able to become the wife of another man.[1]

Thus among the Comanche, when a man died his favourite wife was killed at the same time.[2] In certain Californian tribes widows were sacrificed on the pyre with their deceased husbands;[3] and Mackenzie was told that this practice sometimes occurred among the Cree.[4] When one of the Incas died, says Acosta, the woman whom he loved best, and also his servants and officers, were put to death, "that they might serve him in the other life."[5] Among the Guarani widows were not killed, but they "used to throw themselves from some eminence high enough to cripple them for the remainder of their lives."[6] In various African tribes widows were buried alive with their husbands or otherwise put to death[7]—according to Dr. Nassau, either that the dead might not be without companionship in the spirit world or as a punishment for not having cared better for him in the preservation of his life.[8] In Dahomey, on the death of a king, a large number of his widows were put into the tomb living, with broken legs, and cautioned to treat their lord well.[9] In Uganda there is a tradition that at one time some of the widows of kings and hereditary

[1] See Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, i. 472.
[2] Schoolcraft, *op. cit.* ii. 133.
[3] *Ibid.* iv. 226; v. 217.
[4] Mackenzie, *op. cit.* p. xcviii.
[5] Acosta, *Natural and Moral History of the Indies*, ii. 313.
[6] Charlevoix, *History of Paraguay*, i. 204.
[7] Dennett, *Folklore of the Fjort* (*French Congo*), p. 20 *sq.* Poupon, 'Étude ethnographique des Baya de la circonscription du M'Bimou,' in *L'Anthropologie*, xxvi. 128. Reade, *Savage Africa*, p. 359. Waitz, *op. cit.* ii. 192, 193, 419.
[8] Nassau, *Fetichism in West Africa*, p. 9.
[9] Labarthe, quoted by Ling Roth, *Great Benin*, p. 41 n. 1.

chiefs were tied up in the enclosures round their husbands' graves and starved to death.[1] In various Polynesian and, especially, Melanesian islands wives often died with their husbands.[2] In Fiji, for instance, they were either buried alive or strangled, often at their own desire, because they believed that in this way alone could they reach the realms of bliss, and that she who met her death with the greatest devotedness would become the favourite wife in the abode of spirits. On the other hand, a widow who did not permit herself to be killed was considered an adulteress.[3] In Pentecost it has until recently been the custom to strangle all the widows of a chief at the death-feast. This custom is now dying out owing to the influence of the planters and missionaries; but "strange to say, the women were not altogether pleased with this change, many desiring to die, for fear they might be haunted by the offended spirit of their husband."[4] We are told that in the New Hebrides a wife was strangled even when her husband was long absent from home.[5]

Among the Tartars, according to Navarette, on a man's death one of his wives hanged herself "to bear him company in that journey."[6] In China the funeral sacrifice of human beings was abolished even for members of the imperial family in the fourteenth century, but still maintains itself in a modified shape: widows often take their lives in order

[1] Felkin, 'Notes on the Waganda Tribe,' in *Proceed. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh*, xiii. 745.

[2] Codrington, *Melanesians*, p. 289 (natives of Aurora Island, New Hebrides). Ribbe, *op. cit.* p. 273 (natives of Rubiana, Solomon Islands). Polack, *Manners and Customs of the New Zealanders*, i. 156 *sqq.* Best, 'Maori Marriage Customs,' in *Trans. and Proceed. New Zealand Institute*, xxxvi. 62. Waitz-Gerland, *op. cit.* vi. 130, 640 *sq.*

[3] Wilkes, *op. cit.* iii. 96. Zimmermann, *Die Inseln des indischen und stillen Meeres*, i. 359, 377. Seemann, *Viti*, pp. 192, 398. Williams, *Missionary Enterprises in the South Sea Islands*, p. 557. Pritchard, *Polynesian Reminiscences*, p. 372.

[4] Speiser, *op. cit.* p. 118.

[5] Inglis, 'Missionary Tour in the New Hebrides,' in *Jour. Ethn. Soc. London*, iii. 63.

[6] Navarette, 'Account of the Empire of China,' in Churchill, *Collection of Voyages*, i. 77.

to follow their husbands into the next world, and although it has been enacted that no official distinctions shall be awarded to such suttees, the old custom still meets with the same applause as ever, and many a woman is no doubt prevailed upon, or even compelled, by her own relations to become a suttee.[1] In India widows were sacrificed until recently on the funeral piles of their husbands. It has been argued, it is true, that the burning of widows begins rather late in India.[2] Yet, although the modern ordinance of suttee-burning be a corrupt departure from the early Brahmanic ritual, the practice seems to be, not a new invention by the later Hindu priesthood, but the revival of an ancient rite belonging originally to a period even earlier than the Veda.[3] In the Vedic period the widow, in some cases at any rate, married her husband's younger brother ;[4] but in the Atharva-Veda the practice of burning the widow on the funeral pile of her dead husband is referred to as an " ancient custom,"[5] and in the Vedic ritual there are ceremonies which indicate the previous existence of such a rite.[6] From Greece we have the instances of Evadne throwing herself into the funeral pile of her husband,[7] and of the suicide of the three Messenian widows mentioned by Pausanias.[8] Sacrifice of widows occurred, as it seems as a regular custom, among the Scandinavians,[9] Heruli,[10] and Slavonians.[11] " The fact," says Mr. Ralston, " that in

[1] de Groot, *Religious System of China* (vol. ii. book) i. 724, 735, 748, 754. [2] Hopkins, *Religions of India*, p. 274.

[3] Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 331. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, i. 465 *sqq*. Risley, *People of India*, p. 182 *sq*.

[4] Zimmer, *op. cit.* p. 329. Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*, i. 476 *sq*.

[5] *Atharva-Veda*, xviii. 3, 1, quoted by Zimmer, *op. cit.* p. 331.

[6] *Rig-Veda*, x. 18. 8 *sq*. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 165. Hillebrandt, ' Eine Miscelle aus dem Vedaritual,' in *Zeitschr. d. Deutschen Morgenländ. Gesellsch.* xl. 711. Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, p. 587. [7] Euripides, *Supplices*, 1000 *sqq*.

[8] Pausanias, *Descriptio Graeciae*, iv. 2. 7.

[9] Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer*, p. 451.

[10] Procopius, ii. 14.

[11] Dithmar of Merseburg, *Chronicon*, viii. 2 (Pertz, *Monumenta Germaniae historica*, v. 861). Zimmer, *op. cit.* p. 330.

Slavonic lands, a thousand years ago, widows used to destroy themselves in order to accompany their dead husbands to the world of spirits, seems to rest on incontestable evidence."[1]

In other cases the dead husband is less exacting. Among the Takulli the widow is compelled by the kinsfolk of the deceased to lie on the funeral pile where the body of her husband is placed, whilst the fire is lighting, until the heat becomes unbearable. Then, after the body is consumed, she is obliged to collect the ashes and deposit them in a small basket, which she must always carry about with her for two or three years, during which time she is not at liberty to marry again.[2] Among the Kutchin the widow, or widows, are bound to remain near the body for a year to protect it from animals, &c.; and only when it is quite decayed and merely the bones remain are they permitted to remarry, "to dress their hair, and put on beads and other ornaments to attract admirers."[3] Among the Mosquito Indians "the widow was bound to supply the grave of her husband with provisions for a year, after which she took up the bones and carried them with her for another year, at last placing them upon the roof of her house, and then only was she allowed to marry again."[4] Among the Pima Indians of Arizona, during the time of mourning—which rarely was observed for the full period of four years—the widow was compelled to remain at home, to refrain from washing her hair, and to cry aloud the name of the deceased every morning at daybreak.[5] Among the Minas on the Slave Coast the widows are shut up for six months in the room where their husband is buried.[6] Among the Nsakara north of the Mubangi, where the marriage tie is very loose and married women are most unchaste, chastity is expected of the widow—and even of the daughters and

[1] Ralston, *Songs of the Russian People*, p. 327 *sq.*

[2] Wilkes, *op. cit.* iv. 453. *Cf.* Richardson, *op. cit.* ii. 31.

[3] Hardisty, in *Smithsonian Report*, 1866, p. 319.

[4] Bancroft, *op. cit.* i. 731.

[5] Russell, 'Pima Indians,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethn.* xxvi. 195.

[6] Bouche, *La Côte des Esclaves*, p. 218. *Cf.* Ellis, *Ewe-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast*, p. 160.

sisters—of dead chiefs of importance; and they have to spend their lives maintaining a perpetual fire on the dwelling-tomb of the deceased potentate.[1] A somewhat similar custom prevailed formerly in Uganda.[2] Among the Betsi-misaraka of Madagascar the widow was obliged to lie with her dead husband's body during the time it was exposed.[3] In Pentecost, in the case of ordinary people, who are buried in their own houses, the widow often had to sleep beside the decaying body of her deceased husband for one hundred days.[4] Among the Papuans in the neighbourhood of Finschhafen, in Kaiser Wilhelm Land, she lies down beside his grave and is covered up with a mat, and a roof of branches is erected over her; here she has to mourn for three months.[5] Among the Kukis of the Chittagong Hills a widow was compelled to remain for a year beside the tomb of her dead husband, her family bringing her food.[6]

Among various peoples custom requires that a widow shall never remarry. This is the rule in Tikopia,[7] Rotuma,[8] and the Marquesas Islands,[9] among the gentry of the Line Islanders of the Gilbert group,[10] the Biduanda Kallang in Johor (occupying the extremity of the Malay Peninsula),[11] and the savages of Formosa,[12]; and it seems formerly to have been the rule among the Ainu of Japan.[13] Among the Masai, too, widows may not remarry, but they are allowed

[1] Johnston, *George Grenfell and the Congo*, ii. 674.
[2] *Ibid.* ii. 674 n. 2.
[3] Grandidier, *Ethnographie de Madagascar*, ii. 240.
[4] Speiser, *op. cit.* p. 118 *sq.*
[5] Schellong, 'Weitere Mitteilungen über die Papuas (Jabim) der Gegend des Finschhafens,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xxxvii. 618, *Cf.* Neuhauss, *op. cit.* i. 168.
[6] Rennel, quoted by Lewin, *Wild Races of South-Eastern India*, p. 280.
[7] Rivers, *History of Melanesian Society*, i. 310.
[8] Waitz-Gerland, *op. cit.* vol. v. pt. ii. 191. [9] *Ibid.* vi. 130.
[10] Tutuila, 'Line Islanders,' in *Jour. Polynesian Soc.* i. 267.
[11] Logan, 'Biduanda Kallang of the River Pulai in Johore,' in *Jour. Indian Archipelago*, i. 300.
[12] Davidson, *op. cit.* p. 583. Müller, 'Ueber die Wildenstämme der Insel Formosa,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xlii. 230.
[13] Batchelor, *op. cit.* p. 565.

to live together with men belonging to the age-class of their deceased husband.[1] Among the Baganda, "if a widow had children she did not remarry, but devoted herself to her children, and continued to live at the grave of her late husband."[2] In ancient Peru, according to Garcilasso de la Vega, very few widows who had no children ever married again, and even widows who had children continued to live single; "for this virtue was much commended in their laws and ordinances."[3] Nor is it in China considered proper for a widow to contract a second marriage, and in genteel families such an event rarely, if ever, occurs; indeed, a lady of rank who married a second time would thereby expose herself to a penalty of eighty blows.[4] "As a faithful minister does not serve two lords, neither may a faithful woman marry a second husband"—this is to the Chinese a principle of life, a maxim generally received as gospel.[5] Among the Hindus the widows of the highest castes are forbidden to marry again, and this custom shows signs of extending itself beyond its present limits. So far, however, it has only a comparatively limited currency. Inquiries made at the end of the last century showed that out of a population of forty millions of Hindus no more than twenty-four per cent. prohibited widow marriage, while seventy-six per cent. permitted or even encouraged the practice.[6] But for a woman of the Brahman caste the bare mention of a second marriage would be considered the greatest of insults, and if she married again, "she would be hunted out of society, and no decent person would venture at any time to have the slightest intercourse with her."[7] In Greece[8] and Rome[9]

[1] Hinde, *The Last of the Masai*, p. 72. Merker, *Die Masai*, p. 47. [2] Roscoe, *Baganda*, p. 96.

[3] Garcilasso de la Vega, *First Part of the Royal Commentaries of the Yncas*, i. 305. [4] Gray, *China*, i. 215.

[5] de Groot, *op. cit.* (vol. ii. book) i. 745.

[6] Risley, *op. cit.* pp. 183, 187. Crooke, *North-Western Provinces of India*, p. 228 *sq.* *Idem*, *Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh*, i. p. cxcii. Gait, *Census of India*, 1911, vol. i. (India) Report, p. 246.

[7] Dubois, *Description of the Character, &c. of the People of India*, p. 99.

[8] Pausanias, ii. 21. 7. [9] Rossbach, *Römische Ehe*, p. 262.

a widow's remarriage was regarded as an insult to her former husband; and so it is still looked upon among the Southern Slavs.[1] The early Christians, especially the Montanists and Novatians, strongly disapproved of second marriages by persons of either sex;[2] such a marriage was described by them as a "kind of fornication,"[3] or as "specious adultery."[4]

Much more commonly, however, the prohibition of remarrying refers only to a certain period after the husband's death. When Mr. Batchelor first came to the Ainu, widows and widowers were supposed to remain single for five years.[5] Among the Omaha a widow was obliged to wait from four to seven years after the death of her husband before marrying again.[6] The Angoni, a Zulu tribe, do not allow a widow to remarry until four years have elapsed.[7] The Creeks looked upon a widow as an adulteress if she spoke or made free with any man within four summers after the death of her husband.[8] Among the Chickasaw in Northern Mississippi widows were obliged to live a chaste life for three years at the risk of the law of adultery being executed against the recusants.[9] Among some of the Kukis a widow may marry again after three years have elapsed from the death of her husband, but only with the consent of his relatives.[10] The same period of widowhood is required by

[1] Krauss, *op. cit.* p. 578. *Cf.* Ralston, *op. cit.* p. 115 (Bulgarians).

[2] Mayer, *Die Rechte der Israeliten, Athener und Römer*, ii. 290. Bingham, *Works*, vi. 427 *sq.*; viii. 13 *sq.*

[3] Tertullian, *De exhortatione castitatis*, 9 (Migne, *Patrologiæ cursus*, ii. 924).

[4] Athenagoras, *Legatio pro Christianis*, 33 (Migne, *op. cit.* Ser. Graeca, vi. 967).

[5] Batchelor, *op. cit.* p. 565 *sq.*

[6] Dorsey, 'Omaha Sociology,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethn.* iii. 267.

[7] Wiese, 'Beiträge zur Geschichte der Zulu im Norden der Zambesi,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xxxii. 192.

[8] Schoolcraft, *op. cit.* v. 269. [9] Adair, *op. cit.* p. 186.

[10] Butler, *Travels and Adventures in the Province of Assam*, p. 85. See also Stewart, 'Notes on Northern Cachar,' in *Jour. Asiatic Soc. Bengal*, xxiv. 621 (Old Kukis). According to Soppitt (*Short Account of the Kuki-Lushai Tribes*, p. 16), however, a Kuki widow is at liberty to remarry at once.

the Gold, one of the Amoor tribes,[1] and the Kunáma in North-East Africa.[2] The natives of Saraë,[3] those of Bukoba in East Africa,[4] and the Algonkin of Canada[5] have fixed that period at two years; and among the last-mentioned people the new husband had to be approved of by the mother-in-law. In Madagascar the new marriage was to be authorised by the parents-in-law, and usually they did not give their consent until at least a year had passed.[6] Among many uncivilised peoples the widow must lead a single life for a year at least after her husband's death,[7] and among others for six[8] or five[9] or three[10] or

[1] Laufer, 'Notes and Explorations among the Amoor Tribes,' in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. ii. 322.

[2] Munzinger, *Ostafrikanische Studien*, p. 488. [3] *Ibid.* p. 387.

[4] Richter, 'Der Bezirk Bukoba,' in *Mittheil. Deutsch. Schutzgeb.* xii. 86.

[5] Perrot, 'Memoir on the Manners, &c. of the Savages of North America,' in Blair, *op. cit.* i. 70.

[6] Grandidier, *op. cit.* ii. 239. *Cf.* Sibree, *The Great African Island*, p. 255.

[7] Hill Tout, 'Report on the Ethnology of the Stlatlumh of British Columbia,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxv. 133. Loskiel, *History of the Mission of the United Brethren among the Indians in North America*, i. 64 (Iroquois, &c.). Schoolcraft, *op. cit.* iii. 238 (Dakota). Powers, *op. cit.* p. 383 (Yokut of California). Falkner, *op. cit.* p. 119 (Patagonians). Poupon, in *L'Anthropologie*, xxvi. 128 (Baya). Clozel and Villamur, *op. cit.* p. 104 (Baoulé of the Ivory Coast). Meyer, quoted by Kohler, in *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Rechtswiss.* xiv. 305 (Herero). Minnie Martin, *Basutoland*, p. 88. Munzinger, *op. cit.* pp. 208 (Takue), 241 (Marea). Best, in *Trans. and Proceed. New Zealand Institute*, xxxvi. 63 (Maori, probably, if the husband was a person of importance). Finsch, *Neu-Guinea*, p. 82. Jenks, *Bontoc Igorot*, p. 70. Shakespear, *Lushei Kuki Clans*, p. 53 (Lushais, formerly). v. Siebold, *Ethnologische Studien über die Aino auf der Insel Yesso*, p. 34; *cf.* Bird, *Unbeaten Tracks in Japan*, ii. 100, and Batchelor, *op. cit.* p. 565 *sq.*

[8] Lyon, *Private Journal during the Voyage of Discovery under Captain Parry*, p. 369 (Eskimo of Iglulik and Winter Island). Lahontan, *op. cit.* p. 459 (Canadian Indians). Ashe, *Travels in America*, p. 250 (Shawnee). Heriot, *Travels through the Canadas*, p. 325 (Californian Indians). Trenk, in *Mittheil. Deutsch. Schutzgeb.* xxiii. 168 (Namib Bushmen); *cf.* Kaufmann, *ibid.* xxiii. 157 (Auin). Maass, 'Durch Zentral-Sumatra,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xli. 160.

[9] Dunbar, 'Pawnee Indians,' in *Magazine of American History*, viii. 735. [10] Shakespear, *op. cit.* p. 53 (Lushais, nowadays).

two[1] months. Various American tribes required that the head of the widow should be shaved or her hair cut off, and that she should remain unmarried until her locks regained their wonted length.[2]

We know that among some peoples, as the Chinese and Hindus, the prohibition of remarriage has succeeded an earlier custom which demanded that the widow should die with her husband; but such a prohibition is by itself no evidence of former widow sacrifice. Nor must we assume that the interdict against remarriage for a certain period is generally a survival of compulsory widowhood for life, although we know that it sometimes is so[3] and that in other cases the period in question has been shortened.[4] The same cause may in some instances lead to an absolute prohibition of remarrying and in other instances to a prohibition for a limited period only.

We are told that among the Omaha a widow was obliged to wait for several years before she could remarry, partly in order to show the proper respect to the memory of her deceased husband, but partly also "to enable her to wean her infant, if she had one by him, before she became *enceinte* by her next husband";[5] and another explanation, referring to compulsory widowhood for a shorter time, may be that the prohibition serves the object of removing all apprehensions as to pregnancy. But this explanation is, at any rate, insufficient, even though the widowhood last only for a few months. In Ruanda, where a widow is strictly prohibited from sexual intercourse during her two months of mourning, it is believed that if she does not observe this

[1] Schumacher, 'Das Eherecht in Ruanda,' in *Anthropos*, vii. 8. Parkinson, *Dreissig Jahre in der Südsee*, p. 396 (Moánus of the Admiralty Islands).

[2] Lo d, *The Naturalist in Vancouver Island and British Columbia*. ii. 235. Catlin, *Illustrations of the Manners, &c. of the North American Indians*, i. 95 (Mandan). de Bry, *Narrative of Le Moyne*, Description of the Illustrations, p. 8 (Florida Indians). Schomburgk, *Reisen in Britisch-Guiana*, i. 227.

[3] Batchelor, *op. cit.* p. 565 (Ainu).

[4] Dorsey, *loc. cit.* p. 267 *sq.* (Omaha). Shakespear, *op. cit.* p. 53 (Lushais).

[5] Dorsey, *loc. ci*. p. 267 *sq.*

rule her fingers and nose will fall off;[1] and the Namib Bushmen have the idea that a widow who marries soon after her husband's death will also die.[2] There can be no doubt that the rule which among many uncivilised peoples compels a widow to remain single either for the rest of her life or for a certain time is chiefly founded on superstition.[3] She is held to be defiled. The Thonga believe, according to M. Junod, that "when a man dies all his relatives are contaminated by the defilement of death. . . . There are concentric circles around him, some people being more affected than others. The wives form the first circle, especially the first wife."[4] But the widow is not only polluted by the contagion of death:[5] she is haunted by her dead husband, who jealously watches her behaviour, ready to punish her if she swerves from the duty he still thinks she owes him. Among the Thompson River Indians of British Columbia a widow sometimes wore a breech cloth made of dry bunch-grass for several days, that the ghost of the husband should not have connection with her.[6] The Iroquois and other Indians connected with them, who prohibited a widow from remarrying within a year after the death of her husband, said that he did not forsake her before that time, but that then his soul went to the mansions of departed spirits.[7] The Igorot of Bontoc in Northern Luzon believe that if either a widow or a widower marries before a year has elapsed, she or he will be killed "by an *anito* whose business it is to punish such sacrilege";[8] and we may guess that the *anito* referred to originally was the dead person's soul. Among the Maori "widows were not permitted to marry until their dead husband's bones were

[1] Schumacher, in *Anthropos*, vii. 8.

[2] Trenk, in *Mittheil. Deutsch. Schutzgeb.* xxiii. 168.

[3] *Cf.* Révész, *Das Trauerjahr der Witwe, passim.*

[4] Junod, *op. cit.* i. 197.

[5] On the contagion of death see Crawley, *Mystic Rose*, p. 95 *sqq.*; Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. 536 *sqq.*

[6] Teit, 'Thompson Indians of British Columbia,' in *Memoirs of the American Museum of Natural History*, Anthropology, i. 333.

[7] Loskiel, *op. cit.* i. 64. [8] Jenks, *op. cit.* p. 70.

taken to their final resting-place."[1] This rule evidently owes its origin to an idea similar to that which prevents a widow among the Syntengs of Assam from remarrying during the time she keeps her dead husband's bones: they believe that "as long as the bones remain in the widow's keeping, the spirit of her husband is still with her."[2] Among some of the Nagas marriage with the deceased husband's brother is not permitted till the expiry of the general funeral rite following after the death of the husband; and as the purpose of this rite is in part to lay to rest the ghosts of those who have died in the year, the reason for the restriction is obvious.[3] A Dyak widow "is regarded as belonging to her deceased husband until she is formally freed from him by the feast of the *Sungkup*."[4] In Australian tribes a widow has to perform many formalities before she can remarry;[5] and "the spirit of the dead man was supposed to have been watching all these proceedings as he lay at the bottom of the grave."[6]

The remarriage of a widow may, indeed, be dangerous not only to her but to the new husband. Among the Baganda, "when a man wished to marry a widow, he first paid the deceased husband a barkcloth and a fowl, which he put into the little shrine at the grave; in this way he imagined he could pacify the ghost."[7] Of the Stlatlumh in British Columbia we are told that "should a widow marry shortly after the death of her former husband without going through a course of ceremonial cleansing, it was believed that her second or subsequent husband's life would be very short."[8] Among the Kamchadal nobody would marry a widow before an outsider had had sexual inter-

[1] Thomson, *Story of New Zealand*, i. 178.

[2] Gurdon, *Khasis*, p. 76 *sq.*

[3] Hodson, *Nāga Tribes of Manipur*, p. 95 *sq.*

[4] Brooke Low, quoted by Ling Roth, *Natives of Sarawak and British North Borneo*, i. 130.

[5] Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 500 *sqq.* Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 248.

[6] Spencer and Gillen, *op. cit.* p. 507.

[7] Roscoe, *Baganda*, p. 97.

[8] Hill Tout, in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxv. 139.

course with her, which was called "removing the sin from her," since otherwise it was thought that the new husband would also die. As Dr. Jochelson remarks, she was thereby evidently freed from the old union, and her new husband could take her to his own family hearth without incurring vengeance on the part of her first husband's spirit. This explanation is favoured by the fact that a man might take his deceased brother's widow *without* any ceremonies. The person who would undertake to "remove the sin" from the woman was paid for this service; and prior to the coming of the Cossacks it was difficult to find among the Kamchadal men who would volunteer for this undertaking, which, according to their belief, was fraught with danger, and was looked upon as "very dishonourable for the man."[1] So also among the Akamba, east of the Victoria Nyanza, "in the event of a widow not going to her brother-in-law, but to a stranger, she must first go through a ritual coitus with another elderly man (*mutumia*), otherwise her prospective husband's earlier wives will become barren, or her children will die."[2] Similar customs have been found among the tribes near Fort Johnston in British Central Africa[3] and the Baronga, farther south.[4] Among the Maori the brother of the dead husband had to "free from *tapu*" the latter's bed, for both bed and widow would be *tapu*; and the new husband often assumed the name of the dead brother, discarding his former one. After the widow had thus married her brother-in-law, she might be divorced from him by the priest if she took a dislike to him, and could then marry any one she pleased,

[1] Steller, *Beschreibung von dem Lande Kamtschatka*, p. 346 *sq.* Krasheninnikoff, *History of Kamschatka*, p. 214 *sq.* Jochelson, *Koryak*, p. 752.

[2] Lindblom, *Akamba*, p. 82. See also Hildebrandt, 'Ethnographische Notizen über Wakámba und ihre Nachbaren,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* x. 402.

[3] Stannus, 'Notes on some Tribes of British Central Africa,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xl. 316.

[4] Junod, 'Les conceptions physiologiques des bantou sud-africains et leurs tabous,' in *Revue d'ethnographie et de sociologie*, i. 163.

because she had become free from *tapu* by first marrying the brother of her former husband.[1]

That the prohibition of the remarriage of a widow even for a limited period has little, if anything, to do with the question of pregnancy is indicated by the fact that a widower is likewise very frequently compelled to live single for a certain length of time.[2] Among some peoples he is supposed to do so for the rest of his life.[3] The period of compulsory celibacy is in many cases the same for widowers and widows, but in other cases it is shorter for the former. Thus in Bukoba, in East Africa, it lasts one year for a widower, but two for a widow.[4] Butler states that among the Kukis the widower can marry again in the second year after the wife's death, but the widow only when three years have elapsed after the death of her husband.[5] According to Mr. Soppitt, however, another rule prevails among the Kukis, or some of them, namely, that a widower is not

[1] Best, in *Trans. and Proceed. New Zealand Institute*, xxxvi. 63.

[2] Cranz, *op. cit.* i. 148 (Greenlanders). Lyon, *op. cit.* p. 369 (Eskimo of Iglulik and Winter Island). Bancroft, *op. cit.* i. 93 n. 133 (Aleut). Schoolcraft, *op. cit.* iii. 238 (Dakota); v. 655 (Indians of Oregon). Teit, *loc. cit.* p. 334 (Thompson River Indians). Lahontan, *op. cit.* p. 459; Perrot, *loc. cit.* i. 73 (Canadian Indians). Powers, *op. cit.* p. 383 (Yokut). Dorsey, *loc. cit.* p. 268 (Omaha). Ashe, *op. cit.* p. 250 (Shawnee). Waitz, *op. cit.* iv. 367 (Chibchas). v. Martius, *op. cit.* i. 649; Appun, 'Die Indianer von Britisch-Guayana,' in *Das Ausland*, xliv. 447 (Macusis). Meyer, quoted by Kohler, in *Zeitschr. vergl. Rechtswiss.* xiv. 305 (Herero). Trenk, in *Mittheil. Deutsch. Schutzgeb.* xxiii. 168 (Namib Bushmen). Neuhauss, *op. cit.* i. 168 (Papuans of Kaiser Wilhelm Land). Blumentritt, *Versuch einer Ethnographie der Philippinen*, p. 28; Meyer, 'Die Igorroten von Luzon,' in *Verhandl. Berliner Gesellsch. Anthrop.* 1883, p. 385; Jenks, *op. cit.* p. 70 (Igorot of Luzon). Stewart, in *Jour. Asiatic Soc. Bengal*, xxiv. 620 (Old Kukis). Shakespear, *op. cit.* p. 53 (Lushais). Laufer, in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. ii. 322 (Gold, an Amoor tribe). v. Siebold, *op. cit.* p. 34; Bickmore, 'Notes on the Ainos,' in *Trans. Ethn. Soc.* N.S. vii. 20; Batchelor, *op. cit.* p. 566; Bird, *op. cit.* ii. 100 (Ainu).

[3] Logan, in *Jour. Indian Archipelago*, i. 300 (Biduanda Kallang in Johor). Müller, in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xlii. 230 (savages of Formosa). Batchelor, *op. cit.* p. 565 (Ainu, formerly).

[4] Richter, in *Mittheil. Deutsch. Schutzgeb.* xii. 86.

[5] Butler, *op. cit.* p. 85.

permitted to remarry within the period of three years, whereas a widow is at liberty to remarry at once.[1]

The prohibitions relating to a widower have obviously a similar origin to those relating to a widow. He is haunted by his dead wife, and he is contaminated with the defilement of death. Among the Lillooet Indians in the south-western interior of British Columbia both widowers and widows had to perform many purificatory ceremonies, and a number of restrictions were placed on them; and if they did not keep all the observances, they were supposed to become lame or crippled in some part of the body.[2] Among the Thompson River Indians the widower, on the fourth day after the death of his wife, tied buckskin thongs round the right ankle, knee, and wrist, and round the neck—evidently in order to keep away the ghost of his wife—and he should not marry until the thongs had fallen off.[3] Among the Stlatlumh a young widower must be careful to refrain from sexual intercourse for a year, the more particularly if he possessed esoteric or mystery powers; and it was not unusual for such a person to go apart into the forest by himself for that period and purify himself from the death defilement and seek mystery powers.[4] Moreover, as the remarriage of a widow may be dangerous to her new husband, so the remarriage of a widower may also be dangerous to his new wife. Among the tribes near Fort Johnston, "after the death of a wife the husband mourns five or six months and is then given medicine, after which he may marry again, and without which, should he marry, his new wife would die."[5] Among the Hindus of the Punjab there is a belief that the jealousy of the spirit of the first wife is instrumental in causing the death of the subsequent wives. Hence when a widower has to marry a second time, a miniature picture of the first wife, either cased in silver

[1] Soppitt, *op. cit.* p. 16.

[2] Teit, 'Lillooet Indians,' in *Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, ii. 271.

[3] *Idem*, 'Thompson Indians,' in *Mem. American Mus. Nat. History*, Anthropology, i. 333 *sq.*

[4] Hill Tout, in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxv. 139.

[5] Stannus, *ibid.* xl. 315 *sq.*

or gold or engraved on a silver or gold plate, is hung round the neck of the bride at the wedding ceremonies. When a picture cannot be obtained or engraved, the name of the deceased wife is substituted for the picture. "The idea seems to be to humour the spirit of the first wife, by proving the fidelity of the husband, who in marrying the second wife pretends to really marry the picture or name of the deceased wife, thus identifying the second wife with the first."[1] It is worth noticing that the prohibition of the remarriage of a widower, either for the rest of his life or for some definite period, is chiefly found among peoples who are strictly monogamous or practise polygyny only as a rare exception.

There are certainly savage peoples who have been said to be almost devoid of jealousy. This has often been inferred from the practice of lending, exchanging, or prostituting wives. But such an inference cannot be accepted if sexual jealousy simply means, as I take it to mean, the angry feeling which is aroused by the loss, or the fear of the loss, of the exclusive possession of an individual who is the object of one's sexual desire. First, who can exactly tell what a savage feels when he, for reasons stated above or simply in compliance with the customs of his people, lends his wife to a visitor? And secondly, a person may have a tendency, and even a strong tendency, to experience a certain feeling although it on some special occasions fails to make its voice heard. I have nowhere received more profuse, and apparently more ungrudging, hospitality than in Jewish homes in Morocco, but I should be greatly mistaken if I took this for evidence of any lack of frugality, or even parsimony, on the part of my hosts. A desire may be silenced by another desire, which for the moment at least is the stronger of the two. A man may, generally

[1] Pandit Harikishan Kaul, *Census of India*, 1911, vol. xiv. (Punjab) Report, p. 283 *sq.* Instances of haunted widows and widowers are also given by Hartland, in his essay 'The Haunted Widow' (in *Ritual and Belief*, p. 194 *sqq.*), and by Frazer, *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament*, i. 523 *sqq.* See also *infra* on Marriage Rites.

speaking, be quite jealous of his wife and yet, under the influence of love of money, prostitute her to a stranger or, as negro husbands sometimes do,[1] use her for entrapping other men and making them pay a heavy fine. Moreover, sexual jealousy presupposes some degree of sexual love, and neither a savage nor a civilised man always loves his wife. As we have seen, one reason why a man exchanges his wife for that of another man is that he has got thoroughly tired of her.

By all this I certainly do not mean to deny that there are peoples who are remarkably little addicted to jealousy. This is said of many who practise polyandry.[2] But these peoples cannot on that account be quoted in support of the theory of promiscuity, since polyandry, as will be seen, owes its origin to specific causes which never would have produced general communism in women. It is also in the present connection important to note that polyandry has been mainly found, not among savages of the lowest type, but among peoples who have flocks and herds or who practise agriculture and some of whom cannot be called savages at all. These facts do not speak in favour of McLennan's statement that "polyandry must be regarded as a modification of and advance from promiscuity."[3] Nor could the practice of prostituting wives in any case be taken as evidence of primitive lack of jealousy. It has certainly not the flavour of primitiveness, and among many peoples it is known to have arisen through their contact with a "higher culture." In a book on the Tasmanians Mr. Bonwick observes that "husbands, after the degradation of a pseudo-civilisation, are sometimes found ready to barter the virtue of a wife for a piece of tobacco, a morsel of bread, or a silver sixpence."[4] Curr observes that among the Australian natives "husbands display much less jealousy of white men than of those of their own colour," and that

[1] Reade, *Savage Africa*, p. 44. 'Negersitten,' in *Das Ausland*, liv. 1028. Torday and Joyce, *Les Bushongo*, p. 111 *sq.*

[2] *Infra*, on Polyandry.

[3] McLennan, *Studies in Ancient History*, p. 93 *sq.*

[4] Bonwick, *The Last of the Tasmanians*, p. 308.

they will more commonly prostitute their wives to strangers visiting the tribe than to their own people.[1] "Under no circumstances," says Sir George Grey, "is a strange native allowed to approach the fire of a married man."[2] According to Bosman, the Negroes of Benin were very jealous of their wives with their own countrymen, though not in the least with European foreigners;[3] and Lisiansky states exactly the same as regards the Sandwich Islanders.[4] In California, says Powers, "since the advent of the Americans the husband often traffics in his wife's honour for gain, and even forces her to infamy when unwilling; though in early days he would have slain her without pity and without remorse for the same offence."[5] The like is true of the Columbians about Puget Sound.[6] Georgi remarks that the nomadic Koryak torment their wives by their jealousy, sometimes even killing them from this passion; whereas those Koryak who lead a stationary life, being far more advanced in civilisation, are so little addicted to it, that they even have a relish for seeing foreigners make love to their wives, whom they dress accordingly.[7] Indeed, if the hypothesis of an animal pairing time in the infancy of mankind holds good, we may assume that jealousy at that stage was no less intense than among other mammals.

Dr. Hartland maintains that the view taken by a large number of savages in different parts of the world of what we should call serious offences against virtue must lead the student seriously to ask whether the masculine passion of jealousy can be as fundamental and primitive as it is sometimes asserted to be. He believes that the answer must be in the negative, and that certain hypothetical reconstructions of the history of marriage will in consequence

[1] Curr, *Australian Race*, i. 110. *Cf.* Lumholtz, *Among Cannibals*, p. 345 *sq.*

[2] Grey, *op. cit.* ii. 252 *sq.*

[3] Bosman, *loc. cit.* p. 525.

[4] Lisiansky, *op. cit.* p. 128.

[5] Powers, *op. cit.* p. 413.

[6] Bancroft, *op. cit.* i. 218.

[7] Georgi, *op. cit.* p. 349. See also Sarytschew, 'Account of a Voyage of Discovery to the North-East of Siberia,' in *Collection of Modern and Contemporary Voyages and Travels*, vi. 76 *sq.* (Aleut); Bogoras, *Chukchee*, p. 607.

need reconsideration.[1] In his long chapter on marital jealousy, however, I find nothing to support this view, whereas we have an overwhelming array of facts which seem to me to be entirely at variance with it. Nor can I in the least agree with the suggestion sometimes made that, however jealous man originally may have been, his gregarious way of living made promiscuity a necessity. The men of a group, it is argued, must either have quarrelled about their women and separated, splitting the horde into hostile sections, or indulged in promiscuous intercourse. But why should tribal organisation in olden times have prevented a man from having his special wife as it does not do so among savages still existing? There must always have been in the group stronger or more influential men and weaker or less influential men, and the former—whether their superiority depended upon their physical strength or their skill in the magic art or any other quality—would naturally have appropriated the most comely women and kept them for themselves. So it is nowadays, and I can see no reason to suppose that it ever was otherwise.

I even venture to go a step further and suggest that masculine jealousy has not only been a powerful obstacle to promiscuity, but that its peculiar violence may possibly serve the very purpose of preventing it. The murderous rage of the male which tolerates no rivals may be the result of natural selection if promiscuous intercourse is, as it is often supposed to be, unfavourable to fecundity. It is a well-known fact that prostitutes very seldom have children, except in the beginning of their career.[2] This has been attributed to various causes—such as ablutions, injections, abortions, and venereal disease; but an explanation which, however hypothetical, is of interest in the present connection is that excessive sexual intercourse leads to a pathological state of the vagina which is injurious to

[1] Hartland, *op. cit.* ii. 242 *sq.*

[2] See, *e.g.*, Parent-Duchâtelet, *La prostitution dans la ville de Paris*, i. 218; Mireur, *La prostitution à Marseille*, p. 177 *sqq.*; Reuss, *La prostitution au point du vue de l'hygiène et de l'administration*, p. 221 *sq.*

fecundation.[1] Moreover, it is conceivable that the spermatozoa of different individuals have a counteracting effect upon each other; this, as I am told by my friend Dr. Harry Federley, has been found to be the case with the spermatozoa of males belonging to different animal species, whereas I am not aware of any experiments made with males of the same species. It has been noticed that prostitutes who give up their profession and marry very often become mothers.[2] And Dr. Carpenter refers to the efforts of the American planters to form the negroes into families, as the promiscuity into which they were liable to fall produced infertility, and fertility had become important to the slave-owners through the prohibition of the slave-trade.[3] The saying, "Il ne pousse pas d'herbe dans les chemins où tout le monde passe,"[4] may thus perhaps express a general physiological truth which helps us to understand the peculiar violence of masculine jealousy.

It may possibly be argued that if there is any truth in these suppositions the same evil effects as are ascribed to promiscuity ought also to result from polyandry. Now the two cases are not quite similar. Among many polyandrous peoples, at least, the various husbands live or cohabit with their common wife in turn, or more than one of them are seldom at home at the same time. Nevertheless various statements relating to polyandrous peoples rather support the view that intercourse between one woman and several men is unfavourable to reproduction. In Tibet, where polyandry is common, the families are, according to Rockhill, generally small, containing three or four children, but more generally two.[5] Mr. Sherring makes a very similar statement, and adds that "it has been noticed in our own hills that where polyandry has existed

[1] For an original suggestion of this kind, see Mireur, *op. cit.* p. 182 *sqq.*

[2] Reuss, *op. cit.* p. 222.

[3] Carpenter, quoted by Maine, *Dissertations on Early Law and Custom*, p. 204 *sq.* note.

[4] Bertillon, quoted by Witkowski, *La génération humaine*, p. 218.

[5] Rockhill, *Land of the Lamas*, pp. 213, 212.

the result has been small families."[1] Drew[2] and Knight[3] observe that in Ladakh polyandry has a striking tendency to keep down the population in more than one way: "not only are fewer families founded than would be otherwise, but the families are smaller," and the children are far between. Baierlein noticed the great scarcity of children among the Todas.[4] Concerning the Herero, among whom two men enter into a peculiar relation which gives each of them the right of access to the other one's wives, Dr. Brincker states that this custom has led to the result that the pagan Herero women bear comparatively few children.[5] Dr. Tautain expresses the opinion that a cause of the low birth-rate among the Marquesas Islanders is "la liberté extrême des mœurs poussée au point qu'elle ressemble à l'état de communauté des femmes."[6] Among the Ahîrs in the North-Western Provinces of India, on the other hand, Mr. Crooke was struck by the fact that the women who practised fraternal polyandry gave birth to as many children as those who had but a single husband; but he was informed that "the visits of the brothers were not so frequent as to produce any effect of this kind."[7]

It is not, of course, impossible that among some peoples the intercourse between the sexes may have been almost promiscuous. But the hypothesis according to which promiscuity has formed a general stage in the social history of mankind, instead of belonging—as Giraud-Teulon puts it—to the class of hypotheses which are scientifically permissible,[8] is in my opinion one of the most unscientific ever set forth within the whole domain of sociological speculation.

[1] Sherring, *Western Tibet and the British Borderland*, p. 88.

[2] Drew, *The Jummoo and Kashmir Territories*, p. 251.

[3] Knight, *Where Three Empires meet*, p. 140.

[4] Baierlein, *Nach und aus Indien*, p. 250.

[5] Brincker, 'Character, Sitten und Gebräuche speciell der Bantu Deutsch-Südwestafrikas,' in *Mittheil. d. Seminars f. orientalische Sprachen*, iii. 3. 86.

[6] Tautain, 'Étude sur la dépopulation de l'archipel des Marquises,' in *L'Anthropologie*, ix. 420, 421, 423.

[7] Crooke, *Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces*, ii. 445.

[8] Giraud-Teulon, *Les origines du mariage et de la famille*, p. 70.

CHAPTER X

THE FREQUENCY OF MARRIAGE AND THE MARRIAGE AGE

AMONG the uncivilised races of men marriage not only exists but is much more frequent than among ourselves. As a general rule, nearly every man endeavours to marry when he has reached the age of puberty, and practically every woman gets married. Among some savages priests or magicians have to remain single; and there are inverts, male and female, who avoid sexual intercourse with the opposite sex. With the former I shall deal in the next chapter, of the latter I have spoken in another work.[1] I shall now give some instances of what, with variations in details, undoubtedly may be said to be the rule among the vast majority of savage tribes.

Mr. Bridges wrote to me that among the Yahgans of Tierra del Fuego none but mutes and imbeciles remained single, except some lads of vigour who did so from choice, influenced by licentiousness. But "no woman remained unmarried; almost immediately on her husband's death the widow found another husband." So also among the Lengua Indians of the Paraguayan Chaco there is no such thing as a spinster, and even a widow rarely remains single, unless she be old; "their mode of life and state of society are such that every girl must have a recognised protector."[2] Dr. Nordenskiöld never heard of the existence of any elderly unmarried women among the Choroti or in any other Chaco tribe.[3] The Charruas of Paraguay, according to

[1] *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, vol. ii. ch. xliii., 'Homosexual Love.'

[2] Grubb, *An Unknown People in an Unknown Land*, p. 214 *sq.*

[3] Nordenskiöld, *Indianliv i El Gran Chaco* (*Syd-Amerika*), p. 88.

Azara, "ne restent jamais dans le célibat, et ils se marient aussitôt qu'ils sentent le besoin de cette union." [1] Among the Mosquito Indians on the western shores of the Caribbean Sea "there are very rarely unmarried girls. If there are any spare girls, the principal men take two more wives, so that the supply is never in excess of the requirements, and all are happy. . . . To be without a wife is not only an ignominious, but a most distressing plight for an Indian." [2] Mr. Russell writes of the Pima Indians of Arizona:—"Occasionally a man possessed such a character that no woman would marry him, and more rarely a woman would remain unmarried. There is one such at Casa Blanca and one at Blackwater at the present time, the latter being regarded as possessed of supernatural powers because of her spinsterhood." [3] Harmon found that among the Blackfeet, Cree, Chipewyan, and other tribes on the eastern side of the Rocky Mountains celibacy was a rare exception; [4] and Ashe noticed the same among the Shawnee of the Mississippi. [5] Prescott says of the Dakota:—"I do not know of a bachelor among them. They have a little more respect for the women and themselves, than to live a single life." [6] According to Adair, many Indian women thought virginity and widowhood the same as death. [7] Among the Eskimo round Repulse Bay "every woman is married as soon as she arrives at a marriageable age, and whenever a man dies his wife is taken by some one else." [8] Lieutenant Holm found only one unmarried woman among the Eastern Greenlanders visited by him, and she was the mother of two children. [9]

[1] Azara, *Voyages dans l'Amérique méridionale*, ii. 21.

[2] Bell, *Tangweera*, p. 261 *sq.*

[3] Russell, 'Pima Indians,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethnol.* xxvi. 184.

[4] Harmon, *Journal of Voyages and Travels in the Interior of North America*, p. 339.

[5] Ashe, *Travels in America*, p. 250.

[6] Prescott, in Schoolcraft, *Information respecting the History, &c. of the Indian Tribes of the United States*, iii. 238.

[7] Adair, *History of the American Indians*, p. 187.

[8] Gilder, *Schwatka's Search*, p. 246.

[9] Holm, 'Konebaads-Expeditionen til Grønlands Østkyst 1883–85,' in *Geografisk Tidskrift*, viii. 91.

Among the Reindeer Chukchee in the north-western extremity of Asia, according to Dr. Bogoras, no man can live a tolerable life without a separate house of his own and a woman to take care of it; and another motive for marriage is the idea of the necessity of continuing the family line. On the other hand, among the Maritime portion of the tribe marriage is not so indispensable, and the unmarried state is consequently somewhat more common.[1]

Among the Káfirs of the Hindu-Kush "a young woman who remains unmarried must be a hopelessly bad character."[2] Mr. Sherring observes that among the Bhotias of British Garhwal, in the Himalayas, everybody, man and woman, is married, whereas among those of Darma Pargana many unmarried persons are to be found in every village, "the reason being that there marriage depends upon the will of the parties, who are always of mature age at the time of the marriage contract; and instances are not uncommon of men and women who have remained unmarried all their lives, because nobody would marry them."[3] Among the Santals of Bengal "nobody but an idiot remains a celibate."[4] Among the Toungtha of the Chittagong Hills it is unheard of for a man or woman to be unmarried after the age of thirty, and among the Chukmas living in the same region a bachelor twenty-five years old is rarely seen.[5] Concerning the Todas of the Nilgiri Hills Mr. Marshall writes:—"Every man and every woman, every lad and every girl is somebody's husband or wife; tied at the earliest possible age. . . . With the exception of a cripple girl, and of those women who, past the child-bearing age, were widows, I did not meet with a single instance of unmarried adult females."[6] The Kachins of Burma, according to Father Gilhodes, seem to have no idea of voluntary celibacy. It is an honour for

[1] Bogoras, *Chukchee*, p. 569 *sq.*

[2] Scott Robertson, *Káfirs of the Hindu-Kush*, p. 534.

[3] Sherring, 'Notes on the Bhotias of Almora and British Garhwal,' in *Memoirs Asiatic Soc. Bengal*, i. 98, 106.

[4] Macphail, 'Cycle of the Seasons in a Santal Village,' in *Calcutta Review*, N.S. i. 159.

[5] Lewin, *Wild Races of South-Eastern India*, pp. 193, 175.

[6] Marshall, *A Phrenologist amongst the Todas*, p. 220.

every one of them to marry and have children, and a shame to die without offspring. Yet there are among them a few bachelors and old maids, mostly semi-idiots or persons of an impossible character.[1]

Among the Hill and Sea Dyaks of Borneo old maids and bachelors are said to be unknown or almost so.[2] Marsden writes of the inhabitants of the districts in Sumatra which were under his charge that he does not conceive it would be possible to find among a population amounting to about eight thousand persons even ten instances of men of the age of thirty who were unmarried.[3] Hagen observes that among the Orang Kubu, an aboriginal tribe of the same island, old maids are as absent as among the Malays; even the ugliest woman finds a husband because there are more men than women among them.[4] In Java Crawfurd "never saw a woman of two-and-twenty that was not, or had not been, married."[5] Mr. Jenks states that among the Igorot of Bontoc, in Northern Luzon, there were only two men who had never married, and both were deaf and dumb.[6]

Of various Papuans of New Guinea it is said that nobody remains unmarried, that a girl is married as soon as she has reached the proper age, and that a young widow gets another husband immediately after the period of mourning has come to an end.[7] In New Ireland (New Mecklenburg) it is the rule that every man and every girl marries.[8] In Buin, in the island of Bougainville of the Solomon Group, prac-

[1] Gilhodes, 'Mariage et Condition de la Femme chez les Katchins,' in *Anthropos*, viii. 374.

[2] Wallace, *Malay Archipelago*, i. 141. Gomes, *Seventeen Years among the Sea Dyaks of Borneo*, p. 127.

[3] Marsden, *History of Sumatra*, p. 256 *sq.*

[4] Hagen, *Die Orang Kubu auf Sumatra*, p. 130.

[5] Crawfurd, *History of the Indian Archipelago*, i. 86.

[6] Jenks, *Bontoc Igorot*, p. 69.

[7] Vetter, 'Bericht über papuanische Rechtsverhältnisse, namentlich bei den Jabim,' in *Nachrichten über Kaiser Wilhelms-Land*, 1897, pp. 89, 93. Schellong, 'Familienleben und Gebräuche der Papuas der Umgebung von Finschhafen,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xxi. 17. Landtman, *Nya Guinea färden*, p. 81 (Kiwai Papuans).

[8] Stephan and Graebner, *Neu-Mecklenburg (Bismarck-Archipel)*, p. 109.

tically every woman from fifteen years of age upwards is married.[1] In East Mallicolo, of the New Hebrides, "a woman without a husband is rare."[2] In New Caledonia there are in every tribe a certain number of women who have to live single, namely such as in their childhood were betrothed to a great chief while still an infant, and afterwards when he became a man were refused by him. Rochas assures us that among the men, on the other hand, celibacy is unknown;[3] but according to Brainne it sometimes happens that a man can find no woman who is willing to marry him and consequently has to remain a bachelor all his life.[4] Mariner states that in Tonga there were but a few women who, from whim or some accidental cause, remained single till their death.[5] Among the Australian aborigines girls are as a rule, it seems, betrothed in infancy,[6] and marriage takes place very early. The betrothed girls are said to be removed from their parents when they are between eight and fourteen years of age and most generally at the age of about ten or eleven.[7] Curr never heard of a woman over sixteen who, prior to the breakdown of aboriginal customs after the coming of the whites, had not a husband.[8]

Passing to African peoples, we notice that among the Namib Bushmen most men and girls marry as soon as they have arrived at puberty.[9] In Ondonga all men and women are said to do so.[10] At Latuka, in Bechuanaland, Campbell was assured that there was not an unmarried man, young

[1] Thurnwald, *Forschungen auf den Salomo-Inseln und dem Bismarck-Archipel*, iii. 81.

[2] Paton, quoted by Serbelov, 'Social Position of Men and Women among the Natives of East Malekula, New Hebrides,' in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. xv. 279.

[3] de Rochas, *La Nouvelle Calédonie*, p. 229 *sq.*

[4] Brainne, *La Nouvelle Calédonie*, p. 251.

[5] Mariner, *Account of the Natives of the Tonga Islands*, ii. 168.

[6] Malinowski, *The Family among the Australian Aborigines*, p. 35 *sqq.*, particularly p. 48.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 257 *sq.*

[8] Curr, *The Australian Race*, i. 110.

[9] Trenk, 'Die Buschleute der Namib,' in *Mittheil. Deutsch Schutzgeb.* xxiii. 169.

[10] Schinz, *Deutsch-Süd-West-Afrika*, p. 311.

or old, in the whole town.[1] "Such a thing as an 'old maid' is almost unknown amongst the heathen Basuto, nor are widows allowed to remain as such for any length of time."[2] Among the natives of South Africa generally, according to Burchell, neither men nor women ever pass their lives in a state of celibacy.[3] In his description of the Thonga tribe of Mozambique M. Junod observes:—"The kind of individual called bachelor does not abound amongst the Bantu. The wretched, the invalids, the weak-minded only, are deprived of the legal marriage which for the black man is and remains the one object in life. It is through his wife and children that he becomes somebody in the society." And so also every girl in the primitive Bantu tribe gets married, some girls, however, sooner than others.[4] Among the natives of Northern Rhodesia widows, unless old women, very seldom remain bereft of a husband for more than a year, when they are inherited by the nearest male relative; and although the divorced state is very common, young women rarely continue in it for long.[5] Speaking of the Bagesu, a Bantu tribe living on the slopes of Mount Elgon, on the eastern boundary of the Uganda Protectorate, Mr. Roscoe remarks that "an unmarried and childless woman finds no place in social life among primitive people, for woman's principal function is child-bearing and in the second place that of making a home for some man."[6] Among the Bantu Kavirondo "it is highly improbable that any woman goes to her death unmarried; for if no suitor asks for her in the ordinary way, she will single out a man and offer herself to him at a 'reduced price.'"[7] Among the Mandingo of Senegambia, Caillié met with no instance of a young woman, pretty or plain, who had not a husband.[8]

[1] Campbell, *Second Journey in the Interior of South Africa*, p. 214.

[2] Minnie Martin, *Basutoland*, p. 88.

[3] Burchell, *Travels in the Interior of Southern Africa*, ii. 58. *Cf. ibid.* ii. 565.

[4] Junod, *Life of a South African Tribe*, i. 125, 183. See also *ibid.* i. 101, 184.

[5] Gouldsbury and Sheane, *Northern Rhodesia*, p. 171.

[6] Roscoe, *Northern Bantu*, p. 172.

[7] Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, p. 746.

[8] Caillié, *Travels through Central Africa*, i. 348.

In various other tribes in the western parts of Africa celibacy is said to be rare or almost unknown.[1] Barth tells us that the Western Touareg found no other fault with him than that he was unmarried; they could not understand how this was possible.[2]

Very frequently we are told that a person who does not marry is looked upon as an unnatural being or is an object of contempt or ridicule. Among the Araucanians of Chili "old bachelors are called, by way of contempt, *vuchiapra*, and old maids *cudepra*, that is, old, idle, good for nothing."[3] In the Tupi tribes of Brazil no man was allowed to partake in the drinking-feast while he remained single.[4] Among the Chukchee "a man fullgrown and unmarried is despised by the people, and in reality is looked upon as a good-for-nothing, a lounger, a tramp, idly wandering from camp to camp."[5] The Tipperahs of the Chittagong Hills do not consider a man a person of any importance until he is married.[6] Among the Santals a man who remains single "is at once despised by both sexes, and is classed next to a thief, or a witch: they term the unhappy wretch 'No man.'"[7] Among the Kafirs a bachelor has no voice in the kraal,[8] among the Baganda he was not allowed to possess land.[9] The Batamba in the Uganda Protectorate have a saying which means that an unmarried woman is death itself; she is a dead quantity, of no use whatever to anyone and therefore might as well be dead.[10] So also the Todas consider

[1] Delafosse, 'Le peuple Siéna ou Sénoufo,' in *Revue des études ethnographiques et sociologiques*, i. 483. Schuster, 'Die sozialen Verhältnisse des Banjange-Stammes (Kamerun),' in *Anthropos*, ix. 951. Bosman, 'New Description of the Coast of Guinea,' in Pinkerton, *Collection of Voyages and Travels*, xvi. 424. Torday and Joyce, 'Notes on the Ethnography of the Ba-Mbala,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxv. 410 *sq.*

[2] Barth, *Reisen in Nord- und Central-Afrika*, i. 489.

[3] Molina, *History of Chili*, ii. 115.

[4] Southey, *History of Brazil*, i. 240. [5] Bogoras, *op. cit.* p. 569.

[6] Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal*, p. 110.

[7] Man, *Sonthalia and the Sonthals*, p. 101.

[8] v. Weber, *Vier Jahre in Afrika*, ii. 215.

[9] Decle, *Three Years in Savage Africa*, p. 446.

[10] Condon, 'Contribution to the Ethnography of the Basoga-Batamba,' in *Anthropos*, vi. 372.

it a disgrace for a woman not to get married, and if a girl among them does not succeed in securing a husband by the natural process of sexual selection, her father bribes a man to marry her by the present of a buffalo.[1] On the coast of Malabar, if anyone died a maid, some poor man of the family was asked to deflower her; he was well paid for his service, but as soon as he had done it stones were thrown at him till he ran out of reach.[2] The Kachins of Burma perform derisory funeral rites on the death of bachelors and old maids.[3] The natives of Futuna, in the Western Pacific, maintained that it was necessary to be married in order to hold a part in the happy future life, and that all celibates, both men and women, had to submit to a chastisement of their own before entering the *fale-mate*, or "home of the dead."[4] According to Fijian beliefs, he who died wifeless was stopped by the god Nangganangga on the road to Paradise, and smashed to atoms.[5]

The frequency of marriage depends of course largely on the age when people generally marry. Although in the latter respect as well as in the former statistical data are entirely lacking so far as savages are concerned, I think we may safely say that among all of them the girls marry at an earlier age than among the peoples of Western civilisation, and the same is probably in most cases true of the men. The following statements seem to justify these conclusions,

[1] Thurston, 'Todas of the Nilgiris,' in the Madras Government Museum's *Bulletin*, i. 158.

[2] Faria y Sousa, *Asia Portoguesa*, ii. 4.6.3, vol. ii. 708.

[3] Gilhodes, in *Anthropos*, viii. 374.

[4] Percy Smith, 'Futuna,' in *Jour. Polynesian Soc.* i. 39 *sq.*

[5] Pritchard, *Polynesian Reminiscences*, pp. 368, 372. Seemann, *Viti*, p. 399 *sq.* Fison, 'Fijian Burial Customs,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* x. 139. Williams and Calvert, *Fiji*, p. 206. For other instances see Armstrong, *Discovery of the North-West Passage*, p. 192 (Eskimo); Lansdell, *Through Siberia*, ii. 226 (Gilyak); Wilken, 'Over de primitieve vormen van het huwelijk en den oorsprong van het gezin,' in *De Indische Gids*, 1880, vol. ii. 633 n. 2 (natives of the Malay Archipelago); Klose, *Togo unter deutscher Flagge*, p. 508 (Bassari); Hutter, *Wanderungen und Forschungen im Nord-Hinterland von Kamerun*, p. 376 (Bali); Torday and Joyce, *Les Bushongo*, p. 114 (Bangongo).

even though many or most of them can only be regarded as approximately accurate.[1]

Starting with the American aborigines, we notice that the betrothal of girls, or of both boys and girls, in their early childhood occurs more or less frequently among a large number of them.[2] Even though the betrothal be not strictly binding, we may assume that as a rule the marriage is consummated when the persons thus betrothed reach the age of puberty, if not before. In South America the custom of parents contracting marriages for their children when infants is particularly prevalent among the Arawaks and Macusis of British Guiana,[3] and in North America among

[1] See also Ploss-Bartels, *Das Weib*, i. 668 *sqq.*

[2] Falkner, *Description of Patagonia*, p. 124; King and Fitzroy, *Narrative of the Voyages of the Adventure and Beagle*, ii. 152 *sq.* (Patagonians). Stade, *Captivity in A.D.* 1547–1555 *among the Wild Tribes of Eastern Brazil*, p. 143 (Tupinambase). Tocantins, 'Estudos sobre o tribu "Mundurucu,"' in *Revista trimensal do Instituto Historico Geographico e Ethnographico do Brazil*, vol. xl. pt. ii. 113. v. Martius, *Beiträge zur Ethnographie Amerika's*, i. 322 (Botocudos). Whiffen, *North-West Amazons*, p. 162 (Witoto and Boro). Coudreau, *Chez nos Indiens*, p. 127 (Roucouyennes of French Guiana). Bell, *op. cit.* p. 262 (Mosquito Indians). Stephen, 'Navajo,' in *American Anthropologist*, vi. 356. Lewis and Clarke, *Travels to the Source of the Missouri River*, p. 307 (Shoshoni). James, *Account of an Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains*, i. 231 (Omaha). Loskiel, *History of the Mission of the United Brethren among the Indians in North America*, i. 56 (Iroquois). Richardson, *Arctic Searching Expedition*, ii. 23; Mackenzie, *Voyages from Montreal to the Frozen and Pacific Oceans*, p. cxxiii. (Chipewyan). Dixon, 'Notes on the Achomawi and Atsugewi Indians of Northern California,' in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. x. 217. Sapir, 'Notes on the Takelma Indians of Southwestern Oregon,' *ibid.* N.S. ix. 274. Bancroft, *Native Races of the Pacific States of North America*, i. 276 *sq.* (Inland Columbians). Mayne, *Four Years in British Columbia*, p. 276 (Nootka). Swanton, *Haida*, p. 50. Kohler, 'Die Rechte der Urvölker Nordamerikas,' in *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Rechtswiss.* xii. 378.

[3] Appun, 'Die Indianer von Britisch-Guayana,' in *Das Ausland*, xliv. 124, 446. Bernau, *Missionary Labours in British Guiana*, p. 59. Schomburgk, *Reisen in Britisch Guiana*, ii. 460. Brett, *Indian Tribes of Guiana*, p. 99 *sq.* v. Martius, *op. cit.* i. 645. Im Thurn, *Among the Indians of Guiana*, p. 221.

the Eskimo,[1] except in Greenland, where the practice seems always to have been rare, though not unknown.[2] Dalager, who wrote in the eighteenth century, says that the young Greenlanders marry as soon as they feel the desire and are able to support a wife, and that they choose a woman of their own age; but he also states that there are many men who remain bachelors till the age of twenty-seven or twenty-eight.[3] According to Holm, a Greenlander on the east coast often marries before he is grown-up, chiefly in order to get a woman to attend to his fishing implements and to prepare what he catches; hence it may be that a young lad has a wife who is old enough to be his mother.[4] Among the Thompson River Indians of British Columbia girls were often betrothed while mere infants to men sometimes twenty years their seniors. "They were considered marriageable only after they had finished the ceremonies attendant upon reaching the age of puberty. This was approximately in the seventeenth or eighteenth year, but sometimes the ceremonies were continued until the twenty-third year. Most of the men married from three to seven years after finishing the puberty ceremonials, and it may be said that most of them married between the ages of twenty-two and twenty-five."[5] Among the coast Indians in Washington Territory Mr. Swan noticed as a general thing that the young men married women much older than themselves, while the young girls were married to men much their seniors; the reason they gave for this was that if the

[1] Franklin, *Narrative of a Journey to the Shores of the Polar Sea*, p. 263. Hall, *Arctic Researches*, p. 567. Klutschak, *Als Eskimo unter den Eskimos*, p. 233. Ross, *Narrative of a Second Voyage in Search of a North-West Passage*, p. 269. Kumlien, *Contributions to the Natural History of Arctic America*, p. 16. Gilder, *op. cit.* p. 249 *sq.* Boas, 'Central Eskimo,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethnol.* vi. 578. Murdoch, 'Ethnological Results of the Point Barrow Expedition,' *ibid.* ix. 410. Turner, 'Ethnology of the Ungava District, Hudson Bay,' *ibid.* xi. 188.

[2] Cranz, *History of Greenland*, i. 146.

[3] Dalager, *Grønlandske Relationer*, pp. 7, 67.

[4] Holm, in *Geografisk Tidskrift*, viii. 91.

[5] Teit, 'Thompson River Indians of British Columbia,' in *Memoirs American Museum Natural History*, Anthropology, i. 321.

young men marry young girls, both are so foolish that they do not know how to take care of each other.[1] Among the Omaha, a tribe of the Missouri valley in the State of Nebraska, men formerly did not marry till they were twenty-five or thirty years old and women not till they were twenty; but nowadays it is customary for girls to be married at the age of fifteen, sixteen, or seventeen.[2] So also among the Natchez it was rare for young men to marry before they were twenty-five, as till then they were looked upon as too weak and devoid of understanding and experience.[3] But of a large number of other North and also Central American tribes we are told that marriages take place at an early age.[4] Among the Sauk and Foxes, for instance, most men married from sixteen to twenty and the girls from fourteen to eighteen, but generally before sixteen.[5] The Havasupai girls of Arizona marry as soon as possible after attaining puberty, mostly between the ages of thirteen and fourteen;[6] and almost the same is said of the girls of the Pawnee.[7] Concerning the Tarasco of Mexico, Dr. Lumholtz states that "if a man is bearded, though he may be only twenty and not yet married, he generally has to content himself with a widow, for the girls are suspicious lest something prevented him from marrying when it was time for him to

[1] Swan, *Northwest Coast*, p. 170.

[2] Dorsey, 'Omaha Sociology,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethnol.* iii. 259.

[3] Le Page du Pratz, *History of Louisiana*, p. 344.

[4] Ross, 'Eastern Tinneh,' in *Smithsonian Report*, 1866, p. 305. Powers, *Tribes of California*, p. 413. Catlin, *Illustrations of the Manners, &c. of the North American Indians*, i. 121 (Mandan). Schoolcraft, *Information Respecting the History, &c. of the Indian Tribes of the United States*, ii. 132; ten Kate, *Reizen en onderzoekingen in Noord-Amerika*, p. 390 (Comanche). Hrdlička, 'Notes on the Indians of Sonora, Mexico,' in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. vi. 69 (Yaqui). Bancroft, *op. cit.* i. 632 (Central Mexican tribes). Bovallius, *Resa i Central-Amerika*, i. 248 (Talamanca).

[5] Marston, 'Letter,' in Blair, *Indian Tribes of the Upper Mississippi Valley*, ii. 165. Forsyth, 'Account of the Manners and Customs of the Sauk and Fox Nations of Indians,' *ibid.* ii. 216.

[6] James, *Indians of the Painted Desert Region*, p. 227.

[7] Dunbar, 'Pawnee Indians,' in *Magazine of American History*, iv. 264.

do so."[1] In some Central American tribes the parents try to get a wife for their son when he is nine or ten years old.[2]

Among the Guaraunos on the Orinoco, according to M. Chaffanjon, the men marry at the age of fourteen or fifteen and the women at the age of ten or twelve.[3] Among the natives of British Guiana marriages are concluded by boys of fifteen or sixteen and by girls of twelve or thirteen.[4] Among Kayuás of the Gran Chaco the men seldom marry before they are seventeen or eighteen years old, but the girls marry when they are eleven or twelve.[5] Among the Coroados on the Rio Xipotó, according to v. Spix and v. Martius, a man generally marries at the age of from fifteen to eighteen and a woman from ten to twelve.[6] Dr. Krause states that the Kayapó, on the Araguaya, marry early, between the ages of about fifteen and twenty, and that among the Karayá, living on the same river, the men marry apparently when they are from seventeen to twenty and the women between fourteen and sixteen.[7] But he adds that among the latter there are men who put off their marriage as long as possible so as not to be burdened with marital duties, and that they are enticed to do so by a number of elderly bachelors, who extol the advantages of a single life ; and widowers also prefer remaining unmarried if they have no children who are in need of maternal care.[8] Among the Guaycurûs of the Gran Chaco even the majority of the men were said by an old writer to refrain from marrying until they were between twenty-five and thirty years old in order to be able to lead a free and easy life.[9] Father Baucke, who lived in Paraguay in the middle of the eighteenth century, states that among the Mocobis in the southern part of the Gran Chaco the man is generally past twenty

[1] Lumholtz, *Unknown Mexico*, ii. 416.
[2] Morelet, *Reisen in Central-Amerika*, p. 257.
[3] Chaffanjon, *L'Orénoque et le Caura*, p. 11.
[4] Bernau, *op. cit.* p. 59.
[5] v. Koenigswald, ' Die Cayuás,' in *Globus*, xciii. 381.
[6] v. Spix and v. Martius, *Travels in Brazil*, ii. 248.
[7] Krause, *In den Wildnissen Brasiliens*, pp. 401, 324.
[8] *Ibid.* pp. 160, 190, 325 *sq.*
[9] Sánchez Labrador, *El Paraguay Católico*, ii. 26.

when he enters into the married state.[1] But the Guarani of the Plata, according to Azara, marry at an earlier age, and among the Guanas of the Gran Chaco the girl "qui se marie le plus tard, se marie à neuf ans."[2] In Tierra del Fuego, as we are told by Lieutenant Bove, a girl looks about for a husband when twelve or thirteen years old, and a youth marries at the age of from fourteen to sixteen.[3] It is a widespread custom in South America that older men marry young girls and young men elderly women; when in the latter case the wife becomes too old, the husband can take another one, either keeping or sending away the first.[4] Thus among the Jíbaros of Ecuador men of thirty or forty often marry girls of from six to twelve.[5] Among the Witoto and Boro of the North-West Amazons the general disparity of age is between five and fifteen years. A man will choose an undeveloped girl, perhaps nine or ten years old, and hand her over to the women of his own family. Mr. Whiffen says that he thereby "seeks to gain affection by association. The girl lives with him and his people, they become to all intents and purposes her people; she is trained by custom to their habits of life."[6]

As among the American Eskimo so also among the Chukchee on the other side of Bering Strait there are betrothals of infants.[7] Dr. Bogoras states that families who are friendly to each other, though not connected by ties of blood, sometimes even agree to a marriage between their children before these are born; but more frequently such agreements are concluded between friendly families on the basis of the exchange of one woman for another.[8] He also

[1] Kohler, *Pater Florian Baucke, ein Jesuit in Paraguay*, p. 311.

[2] Azara, *op. cit.* ii. 60, 61, 94.

[3] Bove, *Patagonia. Terra del Fuoco. Mari Australi*, p. 132.

[4] Ehrenreich, *Beiträge zur Völkerkunde Brasiliens*, p. 27. Krause, *op. cit.* p. 325 (Karayá). Gumilla, *El Orinoco ilustrado*, i. 197 *sq.* (Otomacos). Im Thurn, *op. cit.* p. 223 (Macusis).

[5] Rivet, 'Les Indiens Jíbaros,' in *L'Anthropologie*, xviii. 607 *sq.*

[6] Whiffen, *op. cit.* p. 162.

[7] Hooper, *Ten Months among the Tents of the Tuski*, p. 209. Bogoras, *op. cit.* p. 571.

[8] Bogoras, *op. cit.* p. 577 *sq.*

says that the young men marry early, and that not infrequently very young girls bear children.[1] Among the Gilyak betrothals are made in childhood;[2] among those of Sakhalin the marriage is said to take place at the age of thirteen or fourteen in the case of men and at the age of twelve or thirteen in the case of women.[3] Among the Ainu it seems to have been an ancient custom, though not general, to betroth children, but the young man and his *fiancée* were not absolutely bound to marry. They consider their daughters to be marriageable at about sixteen or seventeen years of age, whilst the men marry when about nineteen or twenty.[4] Among the Koryak girls generally marry when twenty years old or even older; but in former times marriages with minors were more common.[5] The Buryat usually betroth their children in infancy,[6] but the custom by which the parents of two families where there are sons and daughters exchange brides for their sons may lead to a great difference of age between husband and wife—a young boy may be married to an elderly woman and an old man to a young girl.[7] Infant-betrothals are practised by the Samoyed[8] and Yakut,[9] and according to Vámbéry by all peoples of the Turkish stock.[10] Among the Lake Dwellers of Lob-Nor girls enter into matrimony at the age of fourteen or fifteen, and men at the same age or a little later.[11]

Among the Káfirs of the Hindu-Kush it is comparatively rare to find a girl of twelve who is unmarried; infants in arms are sometimes married, or at least affianced, to grown men, and full-grown or even middle-aged women are on the other hand sometimes married to boys, because a wife is a

[1] *Ibid.* pp. 37, 573. [2] Miss Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, p. 100.
[3] Labbé, 'L'île de Sakhaline,' in *Bull. Soc. de géographie commerciale de Paris*, xxiii. 124.
[4] Batchelor, *Ainu and their Folk-Lore*, p. 225 *sqq.*
[5] Jochelson, *Koryak*, p. 753. [6] Miss Czaplicka, *op. cit.* p. 118.
[7] Melnikow, 'Die Burjäten des Irkutskischen Gouvernements,' in *Verhandl. Berliner Gesellsch. Anthrop.* 1899, p. 441 *sq.*
[8] Arnesen, 'Från Gyda-viken till Obdorsk,' in *Ymer*, iii. 144.
[9] Miss Czaplicka, *op. cit.* p. 108.
[10] Vámbéry, *Das Türkenvolk*, p. 109.
[11] Prejevalsky, *From Kulja to Lob-nor*, p. 111 *sq.*

field-slave and an orphan lad who is the owner of fields requires one to get his land cultivated.[1] So also there is often a very great disproportion of age in the marriages of the Todas of Southern India. The woman may be older, owing to the custom of marrying a cousin, but more commonly the man is much the older, which is partly due to the practice of infant marriage, a child being often married when only two or three years of age.[2] Among the Kotas, another tribe of the Nilgiri Hills, when a boy is from fifteen to twenty years old, his parents ask in marriage for him some girl of six or eight.[3] Among the Kasubas of the Nilgiris "marriage is either infant or adult; the former is more common. Adult marriage is, strange to say amongst this forest tribe, looked down upon with something akin to contempt."[4] In Tamil land, when the daughters are from six to eight years old it is time to marry them;[5] whilst among the Tamils in ancient days girls were considered marriageable at twelve and boys at sixteen.[6] A Kandh boy marries when he reaches his tenth or twelfth year, his wife being usually about four years older.[7] Among the Oráons, a Dravidian tribe in Chota Nagpur, the average age of the bridegroom is sixteen and that of the bride fourteen or fifteen.[8] Of the Mundas, another Chota Nagpur tribe, we are told that early marriages are not infrequent nowadays among the well-to-do people, but the days are still remembered when no young Munda could marry before he was able to construct a plough with his own hands, and no girl was given away in marriage before she could weave mats with palm-leaves and spin cotton.[9] Among the Bódo and

[1] Scott Robertson, *op. cit.* p. 534. [2] Rivers, *Todas*, pp. 504, 523.
[3] Breeks, *Account of the Primitive Tribes of the Nīlagiris*, p. 46.
[4] Hayavadana Rao, 'Kasubas,' in *Anthropos*, iv. 179.
[5] Baierlein, *Land of the Tamulians*, p. 35.
[6] Kanakasabhai, *Tamils Eighteen Hundred Years ago*, p. 124.
[7] Hunter, *Rural Bengal*, iii. 82.
[8] Dehon, 'Religion and Customs of the Uraons,' in *Memoirs Asiatic Soc. Bengal*, i. 161.
[9] Sarat Chandra Roy, *Mundas*, p. 436. See also Jellinghaus, 'Sagen, Sitten und Gebräuche der Munda-Kohls in Chota Nagpore,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* iii. 366 *sq.*

Dhimáls "marriage takes place at maturity, the male being usually from twenty to twenty-five years of age, and the female from fifteen to twenty."[1] A Santal lad marries, as a rule, about the age of sixteen or seventeen, and a girl at that of fifteen.[2] Among the Mikirs, a Tibeto-Burman people inhabiting the Province of Assam, child-marriage is unknown, the age for marriage being from fourteen to twenty-five, but most usually eighteen or nineteen, for men, and ten to fifteen, but most usually fifteen, for girls.[3] Generally speaking, among the aboriginal tribes of India marriage is almost as universal as among the Hindus, but the age at which it is contracted is higher and infant-marriage rare.[4] The aborigines of the Malay Peninsula, as a rule, marry early in life; among the Besisi, for instance, boys of fourteen marry girls of thirteen,[5] but sometimes a girl is married when a little child, in which case the husband carries her to his house and brings her up.[6] The Veddas of Ceylon marry young;[7] whereas in the Andaman Islands a marriage rarely takes place before the man is twenty-six.[8]

Child-marriage is practised in various tribes of the Philippine Islands.[9] Among the Subanu, a mountain folk of Mindanao, the women usually marry upon arriving at the age of puberty, but the men often after they have passed that age.[10] Among the Bagobo in Southern Mindanao marriage is said to take place much later than is common among most Philippine tribes, the couple being eighteen or twenty years of age.[11] Betrothals of children are also frequent in various

[1] Hodgson, 'Kócch, Bodo and Dhimál People,' in *Jour. Asiatic Soc. Bengal*, vol. xviii. pt. ii. 734.

[2] Hunter, *Rural Bengal*, i. 205. *Cf.* Man, *Sonthalia*, p. 20.

[3] Stack, *Mikirs*, p. 17.

[4] Gait, *Census of India*, 1911, vol. i. (India) Report, pp. 263, 266, 270.

[5] Martin, *Die Inlandstämme der Malayischen Halbinsel*, p. 865 *sq.*

[6] Logan, 'Five Days in Naning,' in *Jour. Indian Archipelago*, iii. 490. [7] Nevill, 'Vaeddas of Ceylon,' in *Taprobanian*, i. 178.

[8] Portman, *History of Our Relations with the Andamanese*, i. 29.

[9] Reed, *Negritos of Zambales*, p. 57; Blumentritt, *Versuch einer Ethnographie der Philippinen*, p. 7 (Negritos). Worcester, *Philippine Islands*, p. 108 (Tagbanuas of Palauwan). Jenks, *Bontoc Igorot*, p. 68. [10] Finley and Churchill, *Subanu*, p. 39.

[11] Cole, 'Wild Tribes of Davao District,' in *Field Museum of Natural History, Anthropological Series*, xii. 101. See also *ibid.* p. 143 (Bila-an).

other parts of the Malay Archipelago.[1] Among the Sea Dyaks of Borneo the young men marry when about twenty years of age and the girls at sixteen or seventeen; sometimes, however, marriage is postponed till later, though it is very unusual to meet a bachelor above the age of twenty-five.[2] Among the Kayans of the same island a young man "is usually not much over twenty years of age when he becomes accepted as the future husband of a girl some years his junior."[3] The Kubus of Sumatra marry at a very early age.[4] Among the Battas the men generally marry when they are eighteen years old and the girls when they are fifteen or still younger, sometimes already in their ninth year.[5] In the kingdom of Acheh, on the east coast of Sumatra, a young man usually marries for the first time at the age of from sixteen to twenty years, whilst girls marry earlier in life than perhaps in any other Muhammadan country of the Eastern Archipelago; girls of eight or ten, nay, even of seven years of age are actually handed over to their husbands, though the latter may be grown-up or elderly men.[6] Mr. Bickmore says that among the Malays the boys usually marry for the first time when about sixteen and the girls at the age of thirteen or fourteen, and occasionally still earlier.[7]

Among the Pacific Islanders betrothals very frequently

[1] Wilken, 'Plechtigheden en gebruiken bij verlovingen en huwelijken bij de volken van den Indischen Archipel,' in *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, ser. v. vol. i. 161 *sqq.*; Schmidt, *Liebe und Ehe im alten und modernen Indien*, p. 307 *sq.*; Hickson, *A Naturalist in North Celebes*, p. 270 (various peoples in the Malay Archipelago). 'Aus dem Wanderbuche eines Weltreisenden,' in *Das Ausland*, liv. 569 (Javanese). Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua*, p. 21; Martin, *Reisen in den Molukken, &c.*, p. 289 (natives of Buru; children are even betrothed before their birth).

[2] Gomes, *op. cit.* p. 127. See also Ling Roth, *Natives of Sarawak*, i. 115.

[3] Hose and McDougall, *Pagan Tribes of Borneo*, ii. 170.

[4] Hagen, *Die Orang Kubu auf Sumatra*, p. 130.

[5] Junghuhn, *Die Battaländer auf Sumatra*, ii. 133. See also v. Brenner, *Besuch bei den Kannibalen Sumatras*, p. 248.

[6] Snouck Hurgronje, *Achehnese*, i. 295 *sqq.*

[7] Bickmore, *Travels in the East Indian Archipelago*, p. 278.

take place in childhood or infancy or even before birth.[1] Mariner supposed that in Tonga about one-third of the married women had been thus betrothed.[2] As a rule, it seems, the tender girl is promised to a boy more or less of her own age, but in some places she is not infrequently affianced to a grown-up man[3] or even to a man who is old enough to be her grandfather.[4] She may remain with her

[1] Finsch, *Neu-Guinea*, pp. 102, 116. Guillemard, *Cruise of the Marchesa*, p. 389. Neuhauss, *Deutsch Neu-Guinea*, i. 160 *sq.* Vetter, in *Nachrichten über Kaiser Wilhelms-Land*, 1897, p. 89. Seligman, *Melanesians of British New Guinea*, p. 745 (natives of Mukaua and Bogaboga). Williamson, *Mafulu Mountain People of British New Guinea*, p. 170. Moszkowski, 'Die Völkerstämme am Mamberamo in Holländisch-Neuguinea,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xliii. 323 (natives of Dorey). Hahl, 'Ueber die Rechtsanschauungen der Eigeborenen eines Theiles der Blanchebucht und des Innern der Gazelle Halbinsel,' in *Nachrichten über Kaiser Wilhelms-Land*, 1897, p. 78; Burger, *Die Küsten- und Bergvölker der Gazellehalbinsel*, p. 23; Parkinson, *Dreissig Jahre in der Südsee*, p. 63 (natives of Gazelle Peninsula of New Britain). Powell, *Wanderings in a Wild Country*, p. 85 (natives of New Britain). Stephan und Graebner *Neu-Mecklenburg*, p. 107. Brown, 'Notes on the Duke of York Group,' in *Jour. Roy. Geograph. Soc.* xlvii. 148. Thurnwald, *Forschungen auf den Salomo-Inseln*, iii. 12 (natives of Buin). Codrington, *Melanesians*, pp. 237, 241. Robertson, *Erromanga*, p. 395. de Rochas, *op. cit.* p. 231; Lambert, *Mœurs et Superstitions des Néo-Caledoniens*, p. 91 (New Caledonians). Thomson, *Fijians*, p. 201. Wilkes, *op. cit.* iii. 92 (Fijians); v. 102 (Gilbert Islanders). Senfft, 'Die Insel Nauru,' in *Mittheil. Deutsch. Schutzgeb.* ix. 106; Kohler, 'Das Recht der Marschallinsulaner,' in *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Rechtswiss.* xiv. 417 *sq.* Tautain, 'Étude sur le mariage chez les Polynésiens des îles Marquises,' in *L'Anthropologie*, vi. 644 *sq.* Waitz-Gerland, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, vi. 127 (Nukahivans). Jarves, *History of the Hawaiian Islands*, p. 43. Stair, *Old Samoa*, p. 171. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, i. 267, 270 (Tahitians). Geiseler, *Die Oster-Insel*, p. 27. Gisborne, *Colony of New Zealand*, p. 27; Polack, *Manners and Customs of the New Zealanders*, i. 135 *sq.*; Tregear, *Maori Race*, p. 285; Best, 'Maori Marriage Customs,' in *Trans. and Proceed. New Zealand Institute*, xxxvi. 32, 42 *sq.*

[2] Mariner, *op. cit.* ii. 167.

[3] See, *e.g.*, Neuhauss, *op. cit.* i. 161 (natives of the part of New Guinea which formerly belonged to Germany); Stephan and Graebner, *op. cit.* p. 107 (natives of New Ireland); Thomson, *Story of New Zealand*, i. 176.

[4] Thomson, *Fijians*, p. 201. Stair, *Old Samoa*, p. 171.

parents until she is marriageable, or she may be at once transferred to the family of the *fiancé*. In the latter case the betrothed persons may nevertheless be kept away from each other and even strictly prohibited from speaking to one another; nay, it sometimes happens that whilst the girl is taken to the boy's family the boy is taken to the girl's people to be educated by them.[1] As regards the age when marriages are concluded or consummated we are told that the Papuans of the Maclay Coast of New Guinea marry soon after they are circumcised, at the age of between thirteen and fifteen;[2] whereas among the inland tribes of Dutch New Guinea the men are said to marry comparatively late, living together as bachelors in the men's house and indulging there in homosexual orgies.[3] In the Mekeo district of British New Guinea a boy may marry at the age of about thirteen and a girl at ten, but as a rule the youngest ages at which marriages are concluded would be more like eighteen for a boy and sixteen for a girl.[4] Among the Mafulu mountain people of British New Guinea a boy is regarded as having reached a marriageable age at about sixteen, seventeen, or eighteen, and a girl a few years earlier; but they do not as a rule marry before they have received their perineal bands, although there does not appear to be any definite custom against their doing so.[5] At Port Moresby "few men over twenty years of age remain single."[6] Among the natives of Bogadjim, in the part of New Guinea which formerly belonged to Germany, marriages are seldom contracted before the age of twenty.[7]

In the groups of islands to which the Germans gave the collective name Bismarck Archipelago the earliest age for marrying is in the case of boys fourteen or fifteen and in the

[1] Moszkowski, in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xliii. 323 (Papuans of Dorey).

[2] Miklucho-Maclay, 'Anthropologische Bemerkungen über die Papuas der Maclay-Küste in Neu-Guinea,' in *Natuurkundig Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch Indie*, xxxiii. 245.

[3] Moszkowski, in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xliii. 339.

[4] Williamson, *Ways of the South Sea Savage*, p. 129.

[5] *Idem*, *Mafulu Mountain People of British New Guinea*, p. 168.

[6] Stone, 'Port Moresby and Neighbourhood,' in *Jour. Roy. Geograph. Soc.* xlvi. 55.

[7] Hagen, *Unter den Papua's*, p. 241.

case of girls nine or ten, but it seldom happens that people marry as early as that; few girls, however, seem to remain unmarried after the age of fifteen.[1] In the Buin district of Bougainville, one of the Solomon Islands, where practically all women in the child-bearing age, from about fifteen years upwards, are married, the men do not marry till they are between twenty and twenty-five, and formerly they had to wait till they were about from twenty-five to thirty.[2] In East Mallicolo, of the New Hebrides, the girls are usually married at the age of twelve.[3] In New Caledonia it is very common for men and women to marry when they have attained the age of from eighteen to twenty.[4] In Fiji "young men of the lower orders married rather late in life for a primitive race, rarely, it appears, before the age of twenty-five."[5] In Easter Island the ancient custom, which still prevails there to a considerable extent, is that when a boy arrives at the age of, say, twelve years, his father tries to find a suitable wife for him, the girl being perhaps of the same age or more likely younger than the boy;[6] according to some authorities, the girls were generally ten years old when they married.[7] In Niue Island, as in fact among all Polynesians, the women married at an early age.[8] "Early marriages," says Mr. Best, "seem to have been common among the Maori, although the elders appear to have believed them to be harmful."[9] According to Mr. Tregear, however, such marriages were not the rule among them; the men, especially, often reached mature age before they took wives.[10]

The custom of betrothing females in infancy or sometimes

[1] Pfeil, *Studien und Beobachtungen aus der Südsee*, p. 26 *sq.*
[2] Thurnwald, *op. cit.* iii. 81.
[3] Serbelov, in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. xv. 278.
[4] Brainne, *op. cit.* p. 251. [5] Thomson, *Fijians*, p. 172 *sq.*
[6] Cooke, 'Te Pito Te Henua,' in *Smithsonian Report*, 1897, vol. i. 716.
[7] Gana, quoted in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* v. 112. Tregear, 'Easter Island,' in *Jour. Polynesian Soc.* i. 99.
[8] Percy Smith, 'Niuē Island,' in *Jour. Polynesian Soc.* xi. 206.
[9] Best, in *Trans. and Proceed. New Zealand Institute*, xxxvi. 32.
[10] Tregear, *The Maori Race*, p. 284.

before they are born is extremely widespread in Australia.[1] The girl may be promised to a boy of a friendly family, or to a grown-up man, who even may be married before and old enough to be her father. She generally remains with her parents till she attains puberty, when she is claimed by her husband; but sometimes he claims her or has intercourse with her while she is still a mere child. Among the Arunta and Southern Loritja, according to Strehlow, when a girl is betrothed to a boy of her own age, the marriage does not take place until the latter gets a beard or even till the first grey hairs make their appearance in it.[2] A man may have to wait a long time before he gets a wife. Mr. Curr

[1] Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, pp. 60, 61, 194, 196, 197, 216, 217, 219, 222, 232, 236, 237, 241, 245, 251, 260, 262 *sq.* Ridley, *Kamilaroi, Dippil, and Turrubul*, p. 157. Holden, in Taplin, *Folklore, &c. of the South Australian Aborigines*, p. 17 (Maroura tribe, Lower Darling). Bonney, 'Customs of the Aborigines of the River Darling,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xiii. 129, 301. Cameron, 'Notes on some Tribes of New South Wales,' *ibid.* xiv. 352. Newland, 'Parkengees, or Aboriginal Tribes on the Darling River,' in *Proceed. Roy. Geograph. Soc. Australasia: South Australian Branch*, ii. 21. Curr, *Recollections of Squatting in Victoria*, pp. 129, 249 *sq.* Mathews, *Ethnological Notes on the Aboriginal Tribes of N. S. Wales and Victoria*, pp. 96, 97, 100 *sq.* Fraser, *Aborigines of New South Wales*, p. 26. Wilhelmi, 'Manners and Customs of the Australian Natives, in particular of the Port Lincoln District,' in *Trans. Roy. Soc. Victoria*, v. 179. Westgarth, *Australia Felix*, p. 69 (aborigines of Port Phillip, N. S. Wales). Schulze, 'Aborigines of the Upper and Middle Finke River,' in *Trans. and Proceed. Roy. Soc. South Australia*, xiv. 236. Gillen, 'Notes on some Manners and Customs of the Aborigines of the McDonnell Ranges belonging to the Arunta Tribe,' in *Report on the Work of the Horn Expedition to Central Australia*, iv. 165. Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 558 *sqq.* Sturt, *Narrative of an Expedition into Central Australia*, ii. 284 *sq.* Mrs. Langloh Parker, *Euahlayi Tribe*, p. 55 *sq.* Purcell, 'Aborigines of Australia,' in *Trans. Roy. Geograph. Soc. Australasia* (*Victoria Branch*), xi. 19 (natives of Queensland and the Northern Territory). Brown, 'Three Tribes of Western Australia,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xliii. 156. Waitz-Gerland, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, vi. 772. Malinowski, *The Family among the Australian Aborigines*, p. 118.

[2] Strehlow, *Die Aranda- und Loritja-Stämme in Zentral-Australien*, vol. iv. pt. i. 89, 100 *sq.*

even goes so far as to say that as a rule wives are not obtained by the men until they are at least thirty years of age;[1] and when young men are allowed to marry they generally get old lubras as wives.[2] Mr. Taplin states that among the Narrinyeri the men rarely marry before they are eighteen or twenty.[3]

Infant- or child-betrothals are also practised, more or less frequently and sometimes almost as exclusive custom, among a large number of African tribes.[4] The *fiancé* may be a small boy, a youth, a man already married, or even a greybeard. In many cases two families agree that their

[1] Curr, *The Australian Race*, i. 110.

[2] See *infra*, on Group-marriage and other Group-relations.

[3] Taplin, *op. cit.* p. 35.

[4] Ruelle, 'Notes sur quelques populations noires du 2e territoire militaire de l'Afrique Occidentale française,' in *L'Anthropologie*, xv. 684 (Mossi of the French Sudan). Henry, *Les Bambara*, p. 199. Sarbah, *Fanti Customary Laws*, p. 45. Härtter, 'Sitten und Gebräuche der Angloer (Ober-Guinea),' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xxxviii. 44. Cruickshank, *Eighteen Years on the Gold Coast of Africa*, ii. 192; Bosman, *loc. cit.* p. 424 (natives of the Gold Coast). Bowdich, *Mission to Ashantee*, p. 302; Beecham, *Ashantee and the Gold Coast*, p. 126; Wilson, *Western Africa*, pp. 181 (Ashanti), 113 (Kru people of the Grain Coast). Ellis, *Ewe-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast of West Africa*, p. 201; Spieth, *Die Ewe-Stämme*, p. 182 (Ewhe of Ho); Klose, *Togo unter deutscher Flagge*, p. 252 (Ewhe of the interior). Eliis, *Yoruba-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast of West Africa*, p. 183; Dennett, *Nigerian Studies*, p. 165 (Yoruba). Mockler-Ferryman, *British Nigeria*, p. 232. Thomas, *Anthropological Report on the Edo-speaking Peoples of Nigeria*, i. 47. *Idem*, *Anthropological Report on Ibo-speaking Peoples of Nigeria*, iv. 61 (Asabe). Landolphe, *Mémoires*, ii. 50 (people of Benin). Dennett, *At the Back of the Black Man's Mind*, p. 198 *sq.* (Bini). Partridge, *Cross River Natives*, p. 254. Zöller, *Forschungsreisen in der deutschen Colonie Kamerun*, ii. 58 (Dualla). Poupon, 'Étude des Baya,' in *L'Anthropologie*, xxvi. 126. Torday and Joyce, *Les Bushongo*, p. 115 (Bangongo). Torday, *Camp and Tramp in African Wilds*, p. 94 (Bambala). Johnston, *George Grenfell and the Congo*, ii. 677 (Mongwandi of the Upper Mongala region). Weeks, *Among Congo Cannibals*, p. 122 (Boloki of the Upper Congo). Hahn, 'Die Ovahererő,' in *Zeitschr. d. Gesellsch. f. Erdkunde zu Berlin*, iv. 490; v. François, *Nama und Damara Deutsch-Süd-West-Afrika*, p. 195; Schinz, *Deutsch-Süd-West-Afrika*, p. 172 (Herero). Gottschling, 'Bawenda,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxv. 373. Kidd, *The Essential Kafir*, p. 211. Theal,

children shall intermarry. Among the Yao of the former German East Africa, for instance, it is said to be very common for a woman who has just had a child to say to a neighbour who is expecting one, "I have a son—if you will have a daughter, let him marry her"; and this, in due course, is done.[1] In British Nyasaland the matrimonial future of a girl is nearly always settled within a few months of her birth, the *fiancé* being generally a boy of tender years.[2] Among some African peoples the betrothal is considered binding on the family of the girl,[3] among others it is not.[4] But before the man can take the girl to his home and consummate the marriage the bride price must be paid and the girl, as a rule, must have attained the age of from ten to twelve years at least.

The age of about twelve or thirteen seems to be a very common average age for the marriage of girls in Africa.[5]

Yellow and Dark-skinned People of Africa south of the Zambesi, pp. 159 (Barotse), 219 *sq.* (Makaranga). Holub, *Seven Years in South Africa*, ii. 314; Decle, *Three Years in Savage Africa*, p. 78 (Barotse). Gouldsbury and Sheane, *Northern Rhodesia*, p. 156 (Awemba). Miss Werner, *Natives of British Central Africa*, p. 129. Junod, *Life of a South African Tribe*, i. 99 (Pedi). Dahlgrün, 'Heiratsgebräuche der Schambaa,' in *Mittheil. Deutsch. Schutzgeb.* xvi. 224. Fülleborn, *Das Deutsche Njassa- und Ruwuma-Gebiet*, p. 345 *sqq.* (Konde people). Duff, *Nyasaland under the Foreign Office*, p. 311. Roscoe, *Northern Bantu*, pp. 38, 39 (Banyoro), 118 (Bahima), 262 *sq.* (Bateso). Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, p. 747 (Bantu Kavirondo). Hobley, *Eastern Uganda*, pp. 17 (Bantu Kavirondo), 28 (Nilotic tribes of Kavirondo). Gregory, *Great Rift Valley*, p. 343 (Wapokomo). Merker, *Die Masai*, p. 44. Munzinger, *Ueber die Sitten und das Recht der Bogos*, p. 61 *sq.* Grandidier, *Ethnographie de Madagascar*, ii. 163 *sqq.*

[1] Weule, *Native Life in East Africa*, p. 306. [2] Duff, *op. cit.* p. 311.

[3] Sarbah, *op. cit.* p. 45 *sq.* (Fanti). Cruickshank, *op. cit.* ii. 192 (Gold Coast natives). Ellis, *Ewe-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast*, p. 201.

[4] Torday, *op. cit.* p. 94 (Bambala). Decle, *op. cit.* p. 490 (Akamba).

[5] Cruickshank, *op. cit.* ii. 193 (Gold Coast natives). Landolphe, *op. cit.* ii. 50 (people of Benin). Johnston, *George Grenfell*, ii. 678 (Bakongo). Le Vaillant, *Travels from the Cape of Good-Hope, into the Interior Parts of Africa*, ii. 68 (Hottentots). Magyar, *Reisen in Süd-Afrika*, p. 283 (Kimbunda). Decle, *op. cit.* p. 490 (Akamba). Roscoe, *Baganda*, p. 87. Grandidier, *op. cit.* ii. 164 (Malagasy).

Among the Herero the girls are married when they are from twelve to fifteen years old,[1] in the tribes near Fort Johnston in British Central Africa when they are about fifteen.[2] In some Kafir tribes a girl is married as early as thirteen, but in others not until seventeen; "if an average has to be struck," says Mr. Kidd, "it would be best to place sixteen as the average age for marriage."[3] Among the Auin Bushmen the girls marry between about thirteen and sixteen.[4] Among the Bassari of Togoland they do not marry, or are not allowed to marry, before fifteen or sixteen years of age,[5] among the Akikúyu of British East Africa not before sixteen or seventeen,[6] among the Wadshagga of Mount Kilimanjaro not before seventeen,[7] among the Baganda according to a recent enactment of the native council of Uganda not before seventeen or eighteen.[8] The age at which an African male enters into the married state depends upon his ability to pay the bride price, provided that he has attained the age of puberty. Among the Bassari in Togoland a man is not allowed to marry until he is seventeen years old,[9] but elsewhere in West Africa he can do so as early as fifteen or sixteen.[10] According to the recent enactment of the native council of Uganda, just referred to, a youth must not get married "under the age of twenty English years";[11] but formerly young Baganda of about sixteen married, as there was no prohibition of marrying at any age after attaining puberty if the husband had enough property to pay the dowry.[12]

[1] Hahn, in *Zeitschr. d. Gesellsch. f. Erdkunde zu Berlin*, iv. 490. v. François, *op. cit.* p. 195.

[2] Stannus, 'Notes on some Tribes of British Central Africa,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xl. 310. [3] Kidd, *op. cit.* p. 211.

[4] Kaufmann, 'Die Auin,' in *Mittheil. Deutsch. Schutzgeb.* xxiii. 156.

[5] Klose, *op. cit.* p. 508.

[6] Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People*, p. 124.

[7] Volkens, *Der Kilimandscharo*, p. 251.

[8] Cunningham, *Uganda and its Peoples*, p. 164.

[9] Klose, *op. cit.* p. 508.

[10] Nassau, *Fetichism in West Africa*, p. 12.

[11] Cunningham, *op. cit.* p. 164.

[12] Felkin, 'Notes on the Waganda Tribe of Central Africa,' in *Proceed. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh*, xiii. 744.

According to Fanti customary law "it is the duty of the father to engage a wife for his son as soon after he reaches the age of puberty as possible."[1] Among the Herero the men marry from sixteen years of age upwards,[2] among the Auin Bushmen between about sixteen and eighteen,[3] in the tribes near Fort Johnston in British Central Africa[4] and among the Central African Fors at about seventeen,[5] among the Wanyamwezi to the south of the Victoria Nyanza from seventeen to twenty,[6] among the Wafipa in the former German East Africa from eighteen to twenty,[7] among the Wadshagga generally at twenty-four.[8] Nowhere in Africa, so far as I know, have the men been reported to marry at an earlier age than in Madagascar, where the majority of them, according to M. Grandidier, did so when about fourteen years old.[9]

To most savages marriage seems absolutely indispensable. Among very many uncivilised peoples, as we have seen, a man cannot easily, or cannot at all, gratify his sexual desire but in the married state or in relations which normally lead to marriage. On the other hand, where no such restrictions exist we sometimes hear of young men preferring to lead a bachelor's life. We have noticed instances of this among certain South American Indians; and with reference to the

[1] Sarbah, *op. cit.* p. 45. [2] Hahn, *loc. cit.* p. 490.

[3] Kaufmann, *loc. cit.* p. 156.

[4] Stannus, in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xl. 310.

[5] Felkin, 'Notes on the For Tribe of Central Africa,' in *Proceed. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh*, xiii. 207.

[6] Decle, *op. cit.* p. 348.

[7] Fromm,' Ufipa-Land und Leute,' in *Mitiheil. Deutsch. Schutzgeb* xxv. 96.

[8] Volkens, *op. cit.* p. 251.

[9] Grandidier, *op. cit.* ii. 164.—For additional instances of early marriages among African peoples see Ward, *A Voice from the Congo*, p. 251; Torday and Joyce, *Les Bushongo*, p. 113 ("On peut voir des femmes mariées dont la poitrine est à peine formée, et des pères famille qui sont encore des jeunes garçons"); Wilson and Felkin, *Uganda and the Egyptian Soudan*, ii. 145 *sq.*; Felkin, 'Notes on the Madi or Moru Tribe of Central Africa,' in *Proceed. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh*, xii. 323; Petherick, *Egypt, the Soudan and Central Africa*, p. 396 (Djour tribes on the White Nile); Munzinger, *Ostafrikanische Studien*, p. 324 (Beni-Amer); Parkyns, *Life in Abyssinia*, ii. 41.

Dravidian tribes of India Mr. Crooke remarks that the prenubial laxity of their girls "enables the men to avoid marriage till they are well advanced in life, and desire to found homes for their old age."[1] Yet even where the man can freely indulge in extra-matrimonial intercourse, marriage will sooner or later become a necessity for him. He must have a female companion who takes care of his house: she procures wood and water, lights and attends to the fire, prepares the food, dresses skins, makes clothes, gathers roots and berries, and among agricultural peoples very frequently cultivates the soil. He must have a woman who bears to him children, and nurses and looks after them; for a man without offspring is an unfortunate being under savage conditions of life where individual safety and welfare depend upon family ties, and the old have to be supported by the young. The childless man may even have to suffer after his death for lack of offspring. The Eskimo about Bering Strait "appear to have great dread of dying without being assured that their shades will be remembered during the festivals, fearing if neglected that they would thereby suffer destitution in the future life"; hence a pair of childless Eskimo frequently adopt a child, so that when they die there will be some one left whose duty it will be to make the customary feast and offerings to their shades at the festival of the dead.[2] The Rev. J. Roscoe says that among the Bagesu of British East Africa marriage is "a matter of expediency rather than love, because children are the means of assisting the ghost after death."[3] Among the Ainu of Japan, according to Mr. Batchelor, there are various reasons why the men wish for at least one boy:—that he may act as family priest when the father dies; that he may inherit, preserve, and hand down to posterity the principal heirlooms and family treasures; that he may act as the head of the family, and take the place of the father to the younger

[1] Crooke, *Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh*, i. p. cxcvii.

[2] Nelson, 'Eskimo about Bering Strait,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethnol.* xviii. 290.

[3] Roscoe, *Northern Bantu*, p. 172.

members thereof, should there be any; and that he may keep the father in his old age.[1]

Moreover, the young savage will generally find little difficulty in supporting a family. Speaking of some aboriginal tribes in Farther India, Lieutenant-Colonel Low observes:—"In the infancy of society and where a youth of activity has equal means with the older persons of the tribe of subsisting himself by the chase or by fishing, he finds nothing to prevent his marrying early. In fact it becomes a matter requiring little thought. He soon perceives it to be his real interest to enter into that state."[2] The same is true of pastoral and agricultural tribes; Bickmore's statement with reference to the Malays, that the difficulty in supporting a family is unknown to them,[3] has a much wider application. Indeed, far from being a burden to a man, wife and children are frequently a source of prosperity. In his description of some Indians of Canada Heriot remarks that children form the wealth of savage tribes.[4]

There are, however, even in savage life circumstances which may compel persons to live unmarried for a longer or shorter time. When the wife has to be bought, it may be difficult for a young man to provide the necessary price to be paid for her. Thus, with regard to the Zulus Mr. Eyles wrote to me that "young men who are without cattle have often to wait many years before getting married." When Campbell asked some Kandhs why they remained single, they replied that they did so because wives were too expensive.[5] In the island of Pentecost, one of the Northern New Hebrides, according to Dr. Speiser, "young men, as a rule, either cannot marry, being too poor to buy a wife, or, at best, can only afford to pay for an old widow, a low-priced article. The young, pretty girls are generally bought by

[1] Batchelor, *Ainu and their Folk-Lore*, p. 231 *sq.*

[2] Low, 'Karean Tribes or Aborigines of Martaban and Tavai,' in *Jour. Indian Archipelago*, iv. 418. See also Hunter, *Rural Bengal*, i. 205.

[3] Bickmore, *op. cit.* p. 278.

[4] Heriot, *Travels through the Canadas*, p. 337.

[5] Campbell, *Wild Tribes of Khondistan*, p. 143.

old men."[1] In fact, of many simple peoples we are told that the necessity of paying a bride price is a more or less frequent obstacle to early marriages or even a cause of lasting celibacy.[2] It affects of course in the first place the men, but may also increase the number of unmarried women. It is said that among the Munda Kols and Hos, in consequence of the high prices of brides, are to be found "what are probably not known to exist in other parts of India, respectable elderly maidens";[3] and in the Solomon Islands a chief's daughter seldom marries young on account of the exorbitant price demanded for her hand.[4] Yet, however frequent it be, we must not exaggerate the importance of this obstacle to marriage. When a young man is not able to buy a wife for himself, he may in many cases acquire her by working for some time with her parents, or by eloping with her. Moreover, as Lord Avebury remarks, the price of a wife is generally regulated by the circumstances of the tribe, so that nearly every industrious young man is enabled

[1] Speiser, *op. cit.* p. 234.

[2] Richardson, *Arctic Searching Expedition*, i. 383 (Kutchin). Bogoras, *op. cit.* p. 570 (Tungus). Melnikow, 'Die Burjäten des Irkutskischen Gouvernements,' in *Verhandl. Berliner Gesellsch. f. Anthrop.* 1899, p. 441. Ahlqvist, 'Unter Wogulen und Ostjaken,' in *Acta Societatis Scient. Fennicae*, xiv. 291 (Ostyak). *Idem*, *Die Kulturwörter der westfinnischen Sprachen*, p. 203 *sq.* (Tartars). Finley and Churchill, *op. cit.* p. 39 (Subanu of Mindanao). v. Brenner, *op. cit.* p. 248 (Battas). Zollinger, 'Lampong Districts,' in *Jour. Indian Archipelago*, v. 697. Romilly, 'Islands of the New Britain Group,' in *Proceed. Roy. Geograph. Soc.* N.S. ix. 8. Pfeil, *op. cit.* p. 26 *sq.* (natives of the Bismarck Archipelago). Thurnwald, *op. cit.* iii. 81 (natives of Buin in the Solomon Islands, especially in former times). Penny, *Ten Years in Melanesia*, p. 93 (Solomon Islanders). Waitz-Gerland, *op. cit.* vi. 126 (Tahitians). Tessmann, *Die Pangwe*, ii. 262. Zöller, *op. cit.* ii. 58 (Dualla). Chavanne, *Reisen im Kongostaate*, p. 399 (Bafióte tribes). Torday and Joyce, 'Notes on the Ethnography of the Ba-Mbala,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxv. 410. *Iidem*, *Les Bushongo*, p. 114 (Bangongo). v. Weber, *Vier Jahre in Afrika*, ii. 216 (Kafirs). Petherick, *op. cit.* p. 393 (certain Dinka).

[3] Watson and Kaye, *People of India*, i. no. 18. Dalton, *op. cit.* p. 192.

[4] Penny, *op. cit.* p. 93.

to get one.[1] Speaking of the Sumatrans, Marsden observes that the necessity of purchasing does not prove such an obstacle to matrimony as is supposed, for there are few families who are not in possession of some small substance, and the purchase-money of the daughters serves also to provide wives for the sons.[2]

A poor man may find it particularly difficult, if not impossible, to procure a wife where the males outnumber the females, as is the case in many savage communities.[3] When such a disproportion between the sexes is combined with the practice of polyandry it need not of course lead to celibacy among the men, but when it occurs among a non-polyandrous people there must inevitably be a certain number of men who are unable to marry. This must, for instance, be the case in many of the South Sea Islands,[4] where there is often a striking excess of males over females.[5] Concerning the Easter Islanders we have the statement that bachelors were very frequent among them owing to the great preponderance of males.[6] With regard to the late age at which the Solomon Islanders of Buin formerly married, Dr. Thurnwald observes that it was due partly to the high bride price and partly to the smaller number of females compared with that of males. He adds that in spite of this polygyny exists there;[7] and Hagen holds polygyny responsible for the large number of unmarried men in other parts of the Solomon Islands.[8] On the Gazelle Peninsula of New

[1] Avebury, *Origin of Civilisation*, p. 106. *Cf.* Bosman, *loc. cit.* pp. 419, 424 (Negroes of the Gold Coast).

[2] Marsden, *op. cit.* p. 256 *sq.*

[3] See *infra*, on Monogamy and Polygyny.

[4] In Micronesia it is common for the poorer class and the slaves to be doomed to perpetual celibacy (Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition*, v. 74; Romilly, *Western Pacific*, p. 69 *sq.*; Waitz-Gerland, *op. cit.* vol. v. pt. ii. 125). In Tikopia many people never marry (Rivers, *History of Melanesian Society*, i. 346).

[5] See *infra*, on Monogamy and Polygyny.

[6] Geiseler, *op. cit.* p. 29. See also Cooke, in *Smithsonian Report*, 1897, p. 716.

[7] Thurnwald, *op. cit.* iii. 81.

[8] Hagen, 'Les indigènes des îles Salomon,' in *L'Anthropologie*, iv. 4. See also Parkinson, *Dreissig Jahre in der Südsee*, p. 481 *sq.*

Britain (New Pomerania) the males are in the majority, polygyny is extensively practised by those who can afford it, and many a poor young man can get no wife at all.[1] Among the Australian aborigines there are likewise, as a rule, more males than females, the old men appropriate to themselves a plurality of women, especially young ones, and in consequence the younger men have generally to wait a long time until they can marry.[2]

Polygyny, in connection with an unequal distribution of property, is very frequently reported to cause celibacy among the poorer and younger men. I have received statements to this effect from several correspondents living among different savage peoples—from Mr. Hadfield with reference to the natives of Lifu, from Mr. Cousins with reference to the Cis-Natalian Kafirs, from Mr. Ingham with reference to the Bakongo, from Dr. Sims with reference to the Bateke. Mr. Weeks writes of the Boloki on the Upper Congo that the effect of polygyny among them was to tie up the women to a comparatively small number of men who had either inherited them or got the wealth with which to pay their marriage money. "There was a constant complaint amongst the young and vigorous men of the middle and lower orders that it was almost impossible for them to procure wives. Thus we found a small number of men possessing nearly all the women in a town, having from four or five up to twenty-five and thirty each, and a large number of young men who could not secure wives."[3] So also, according to Wilson, among the maritime tribes of Southern Guinea, where polygyny flourishes, "a very large proportion of the younger male members of society have no wives."[4] In Makin, one of the Gilbert Islands, a great number of young men were unmarried owing to the majority of the women being monopolised by the wealthy and

[1] Burger, *op. cit.* p. 28 *sq.*

[2] See *infra*, on Group-marriage and other Group-relations.

[3] Weeks, *Among Congo Cannibals*, p. 135. See also *Idem*, 'Anthropological Notes on the Bangala of the Upper Congo River,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xl. 418 *sq.*

[4] Wilson, *Western Africa*, p. 266.

powerful.[1] Among the Kutchin Indians, according to Hardisty, there are but few young men who have wives—unless they can content themselves with some old cast-off widow—on account of all the chiefs, medicine-men, and those who possess rank acquired by property having two, three, or more wives.[2] Polygyny may be a cause of male celibacy even where there are many more females than males. Dr. Felkin states that among the Baganda, owing to the frequency of polygyny, a large number of the poorer men were unable to marry although the proportion of females to males was as $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 1.[3] So also among the Konde people in the former German East Africa, who have a striking excess of girls, many young men are compelled to lead a single life because the old and well-to-do men indulge in a plurality of wives.[4] On the other hand, it must not be supposed that wherever polygyny occurs, it necessarily or even generally leads to compulsory celibacy for a considerable number of men. Among most peoples practising polygyny it is restricted to a small minority of the population, and very often it is combined with a surplus of females, which makes it possible for practically every man to procure a wife although there are some who have more than one. Among the polygynous Waguha of Lake Tanganyika, for instance, as I am informed by Mr. A. J. Swann, unmarried grown-up men do not exist, the females being more numerous than the males. It should also be noticed that polygyny could hardly have been a potent cause of celibacy at the lowest stages of civilisation, where it was little practised; nor is it likely that men had to remain unmarried on account of poverty in those primitive conditions where there was no accumulated property worth speaking of.

Whilst polygyny may lead to celibacy among the men, its effect upon the women is exactly the opposite. As Junod

[1] Wilkes, *op. cit.* v. 102.

[2] Hardisty, 'Loucheux Indians,' in *Smithsonian Report*, 1866, p. 312.

[3] Felkin, in *Proceed. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh*, xiii. 744. See also Wilson and Felkin, *op. cit.* i. 224.

[4] Zache, quoted by Fülleborn, *op. cit.* p. 345.

observes in his description of the life of a South African tribe, "every girl finds a husband in the land where polygamy flourishes."[1] And it seems that in countries unaffected by European civilisation polygyny is practised whenever the women are in the majority; hence the almost complete absence of old spinsters among savage races. For it must not be supposed that polyandry in some countries leads to that which polygyny prevents in others. Apart from the fact that among peoples practising polyandry the males are, often at least, more numerous than the females, it is among many of them quite an exceptional form of marriage; and in no case is it known to be the exclusive form, monogamy, polygyny, and sometimes group-marriage being practised side by side with it.

Among the obstacles barring the way to matrimony for many a young savage should also be mentioned the rule of exogamy. Dr. Bogoras remarks that unmarried men are more frequently met with among the Tungus than among the Chukchee, not only on account of the considerable price to be paid for a bride, but "because marriages are strictly exogamic, and a bride may be taken only from another clan than that of the bridegroom."[2] Concerning the natives of Pentecost Dr. Speiser observes, "All marriages between near relations being impossible, the chances to marry at all are considerably diminished, so that nowadays, with the decreased population, a man very often cannot find a wife even though surrounded by any number of girls."[3] To the causes already referred to, which partly account for the large number of bachelors among the Australian aborigines, should be added their peculiar marriage rules, which only allow marriages between members of certain small groups of people.[4]

Sometimes a military life is a hindrance to marriage

[1] Junod, *op. cit.* i. 184. See also *ibid.* i. 273.

[2] Bogoras, *op. cit.* p. 570. [3] Speiser, *op. cit.* p. 234.

[4] *Cf.* Schulze, in 'Aborigines of the Upper and Middle Finke River,' in *Trans. and Proceed. Roy. Soc. South Australia*, xiv. p. 224; Strehlow, *Die Aranda- und Loritja-Stämme*, vol. iv. pt. i. 98. See *infra*, on Exogamy.

among savages as well as among civilised nations. Old writers tell us that among the Iroquois and neighbouring peoples young warriors seldom married or had anything to do with women until they became thirty years of age, because, as they said, commerce with women exhausted their knees, and rendered them heavy in the course. Those who married before that age were looked upon as unfit for war or hunting and were despised as effeminate persons.[1] Among the Masai of Eastern Africa the warriors are absolutely prohibited from marrying—but, as we have noticed before, not from having extra-matrimonial connections with the other sex.[2] The younger men, or warriors, do not dwell with the rest of the tribe, but have separate kraals where they live with the immature unmarried girls; and they are not allowed by the elders of the tribe to marry until they have reached the age of about thirty and have accumulated a fair amount of property, or else have so distinguished themselves by their bravery as to merit an early retirement. The warrior then becomes himself an elder (*ol-moruo*). According to their own traditions, the practice of living with the girls was permitted to the warriors because it was found that the girls, if kept apart from their own warriors, allowed themselves to be courted by the enemy and betrayed the interests of the tribe.[3] "In the Zulu-country," says Shooter, "bachelors require the king's permission to take wives—a permission sometimes not given until they are thirty or thirty-five years old. The reason of its being so long withheld is that unmarried men are thought to make better soldiers than those who have wives and families to attach them to life. Tshaka permitted very few of his people to marry, but his successors have found it politic to be more indulgent. This unnatural practice, introduced by Tshaka, seems to have been based on an existing institu-

[1] Hennepin, *New Discovery of a Vast Country in America*, p. 483. Lahontan, *New Voyages to North-America*, p. 451.

[2] *Supra*, p. 134.

[3] Eliot, *East Africa Protectorate*, p. 136 *sq.* Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, p. 822. Hinde, *The Last of the Masai*, p. 105. Merker, *op. cit.* pp. 45, 334. Hollis, *Masai*, p. 292.

tion."[1] In this connection it may be noticed that in ancient Rome the *milites gregales*, who were Roman citizens, were prohibited from marrying. The women with whom they cohabited—commonly, as it appears, called *focariae*—were regarded as concubines, even when they had been the regular wives of the soldiers before the date of enrolment. These restrictions, however, seem to have been removed by Septimius Severus; in any case it is certain that the *milites gregales* in the fourth century possessed the right to marry during service.[2] In a subsequent chapter I shall deal with the Nayars of Malabar and the Zaporog Cossacks, who were also forbidden to contract actual marriages though allowed to have mistresses.[3] In the Sandwich Islands most of the people about court remained unmarried, but homosexual practices and fornication were common among them.[4]

The difficulties experienced by the men in procuring wives, or young wives, may be one cause of the practice of infant- or child-betrothal, which is so widely spread among the uncivilised races. Its apparently universal prevalence among the Australian aborigines is no doubt connected with the great demand for women in their tribes. Of the natives of Eastern Victoria we are told that more than one girl is usually betrothed to the same youth, as the girl may die, and that on the other hand one girl may also be betrothed to several young men; if the man to whom she was first betrothed dies before he is old enough to claim her, then she becomes the wife of one of the others.[5] To acquire a girl in her childhood may also be a matter of economy. Among the Mongwandi of the Upper Mongala region on the Congo the youth selects by preference a girl child of six or seven years because she can be bought cheaper at that age than when she grows older.[6] So also the child-betrothals among the Negritos of Northern Zambales in Luzon are attributed by Mr. Reed to a desire of the boy's parents to get the girl cheaper than they could by waiting until she was of marriage-

[1] Shooter, *Kafirs of Natal and the Zulu Country*, p. 47.

[2] Meyer, *Der römische Konkubinat*, p. 106.

[3] *Infra*, on Polyandry. [4] Malo, *Hawaiian Antiquities*, p. 93.

[5] Mathews, *Ethnological Notes on the Aboriginal Tribes of N. S. Wales and Victoria*, p. 100 *sq.* [6] Johnston, *George Grenfell*, ii. 677.

able age, as well as to a desire on the part of the girl to come into early possession of the things which are paid for her; and in support of this view he mentions the fact that the practice is not met with in Southern Zambales and Bataan, where marriage does not seem to partake so much of the nature of a sale as in the other district.[1] With special reference to child-marriage in the Malay Archipelago it has been observed that where elopement or the abduction of girls is a recognised custom parents are anxious to marry their daughter as early as possible in order to prevent an undesirable match.[2] The child-betrothal may further be a means of preserving the virginity of the girl, which among so many peoples is a highly valued quality in a bride. Among the Yoruba of the Slave Coast, for instance, "non-virginity in a bride is only a valid ground for repudiation when the girl has been betrothed at a tender age; for unbetrothed girls can bestow their favours upon whom they please."[3] Finally, a very frequent motive for infant- or child-betrothals among uncivilised peoples is the wish of two families to be drawn together or to cement and perpetuate their friendship, or a desire to become connected with a family of importance.[4] In many cases such betrothals are said to be particularly prevalent among people of consequence or wealth or among chiefs, and may thus be alliances of political moment.[5]

[1] Reed, *op. cit.* p. 57.

[2] Schmidt, *Liebe und Ehe im alten und modernen Indien*, p. 308.

[3] Ellis, *Yoruba-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast*, p. 184.

[4] Dennett, *Nigerian Studies*, p. 165 (Yoruba). Cruickshank, *op. cit.* ii. 192 (natives of the Gold Coast). Bowdich, *op. cit.* p. 302 (Ashanti). Zöller, *op. cit.* ii. 58 (Dualla). Munzinger, *Ueber die Sitten und das Recht der Bogos*, p. 61 *sq.* Mathews, *op. cit.* p. 96 *sq.* (natives of Eastern Victoria). Williamson, *Mafulu Mountain People of British New Guinea*, p. 170. Gisborne, *op. cit.* p. 27; Polack, *op. cit.* i. 135 *sq.*; Best, in *Trans. and Proceed. New Zealand Institute*, xxxvi. 43 (Maori). Tautain, in *L'Anthropologie*, vi. 644 (Marquesas Islanders). Stair, *Old Samoa*, p. 171. Geiseler, *op. cit.* p. 29 (Easter Islanders).

[5] Ellis, *Yoruba-speaking Peoples*, p. 183. Dennett, *At the Back of the Black Man's Mind*, p. 198 (Bini of Southern Nigeria). Codrington, *Melanesians*, pp. 237, 241. Best, *loc. cit.* p. 42 *sq.* (Maori). Tautain, *loc. cit.* p. 645 (Marquesas Islanders). Jenks, *op. cit.* p. 68 (Bontoc Igorot).

Among many uncivilised peoples younger sons[1] or daughters,[2] or both younger sons and daughters,[3] must not marry before the elder ones as long as there is a chance of the latter getting married; or it is at any rate considered improper for them to do so. Such customs are also found in China, where children are married according to seniority,[4] and among Semitic and Aryan peoples. We read in Genesis: "Laban said, It must not be so done in our country, to give the younger before the firstborn."[5] In modern Egypt a father very often objects to marrying a younger daughter before an elder.[6] Among the Vedic people it was considered proper that the younger brothers and sisters should not

[1] Dugmore, in Maclean, *Compendium of Kafir Laws and Customs*, p. 45; Kidd, *op. cit.* p. 211 (Kafirs). Wilken, in *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, ser. v. vol. i. 143 (Battas of Sumatra). Carey and Tuck, *Chin Hills*, i. 189 (Siyin tribe).

[2] Casalis, *Basutos*, p. 184 (Bechuanas). Junod, *Life of a South African Tribe*, i. 235 (Thonga). Heese, 'Sitte und Brauch der Sango,' in *Archiv f. Anthrop.* N.S. xii. 134 (Sango of East Africa). Riedel, 'Galela und Toberloresen,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xvii. 76 (natives of Halmahera, to the west of New Guinea). Snouck Hurgronje, *op. cit.* i. 301 (Achehnese of Eastern Sumatra and other natives of the Malay Archipelago). v. Rosenberg, *Der malayische Archipel*, p. 155 (natives of Nias). Among certain tribes in the Malay Archipelago a man who marries a younger sister before an elder must pay the latter a fine (Frazer, *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament*, ii. 291). Among the Salish of British Columbia the eldest daughter is always the first to be disposed of in marriage, and it is customary for her husband to marry her younger sisters afterwards (Hill Tout, 'Report on the Ethnology of the Stlatlumh of British Columbia,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxv. 133). Among the Meitheis (Hodson, *Meitheis*, p. 76 n. *) and Garos (Playfair, *Garos*, p. 69) of Assam a man may marry two sisters only on condition that he marries the elder before the younger. Many other races allow or even encourage a man to marry all his wife's sisters "provided that he marries them one after the other in order of seniority, beginning with the eldest and working his way down to the youngest" (Frazer, *op. cit.* ii. 264).

[3] Nassau, *op. cit.* p. 9 (West Africans). Thurnwald, 'Ermittlungen über Eingeborenenrechte der Südsee. A. Buin auf Bougainville (Deutsche Salomo-Inseln),' in *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Rechtswiss.* xxiii. 335. Sorge, 'Nissan-Inseln im Bismarck-Archipel,' in Steinmetz, *Rechtsverhältnisse von eingeborenen Völkern in Afrika und Oceanien*, p. 407.

[4] Gray, *China*, i. 190.

[5] *Genesis*, xxix. 26.

[6] Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, p. 172.

anticipate their elders by marrying before them;[1] and in the ancient law-books of India a transgression of this rule of marrying in order of seniority is punished with damnation, or, at any rate, has to be atoned for by the performance of a penance.[2] In the Punjab Muhammadans and Sikhs, as well as Hindus, consider it a disgrace to marry the younger son or daughter before the elder one.[3] In Serbia and Bulgaria custom requires that the eldest son should marry before his younger brothers; and the daughters always precede their brothers in marriage, except when one of the sisters is married and the other still is a child, in which case the brother is not obliged to wait till his younger sister is marriageable.[4] In modern Greece, too, it is considered wrong for the sons to marry until all the daughters have been disposed of, and the latter must marry in order of seniority.[5] In Ireland it was likewise usual that girls should be married in order of age, beginning with the eldest;[6] and reminiscences of the same rule survive in English and Scotch marriage ceremonies. Brand quotes a statement to the effect that "if the youngest daughter in a family should chance to be married before her elder sisters, they must all dance at her wedding without shoes. This, it is held, will counteract their ill-luck, and procure them husbands."[7] This custom, which is also alluded to by Shakespeare,[8] is still observed or remembered in Shropshire[9] and the north of England.[10] In Worcestershire an elder

[1] Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*, i. 476.

[2] *Laws of Manu*, iii. 172. *Sacred Laws of the Âryas*, ii. 103 (Vasishtha), 217 (Baudhâyana). *Institutes of Vishnu*, liv. 16.

[3] Pandit Harikishan Kaul, *Census of India*, 1911, vol. xiv. (Punjab) Report, p. 268.

[4] Demelić, quoted by Frazer, *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament*, ii. 287 *sq.* Piprek, *Slawische Brautwerbungs- und Hochzeitsgebräuche*, p. 137 (Bulgaria).

[5] Rodd, *Customs and Lore of Modern Greece*, p. 92.

[6] Joyce, *Social History of Ancient Ireland*, ii. 6.

[7] Brand, *Observations on Popular Antiquities*, p. 398.

[8] Shakespeare, *Taming of the Shrew*, ii. 1. 33.

[9] Miss Burne, *Shropshire Folk-Lore*, p. 290.

[10] Henderson, *Notes on the Folk-Lore of the Northern Counties of England and the Borders*, p. 41.

sister has to dance barefooted or to jump over a pig trough at the wedding of a younger sister,[1] and in Gloucestershire she has to carry a broom on the same occasion as a penalty for allowing the younger sister to get engaged and married before her.[2] In Wales, "if the youngest of a family was married before the eldest, the seniors had to dance shoeless for penance to the company"[3]—which seems to imply that elder brothers also had to dance without shoes at the weddings of their younger brothers.[4] In the neighbourhood of Balmoral, when a younger sister marries before the elder, the latter is forcibly made to wear green garters at the wedding, and any young man who takes them off is destined to be her future husband.[5] In the north-east of Scotland the bride had to give her unmarried elder sister green garters;[6] whilst among the mining folk of Fife green garters were surreptitiously pinned on to the clothing of the elder unmarried brother or sister of the bride, and afterwards, when discovered, tied round the left arm and worn for the rest of the evening.[7] It is obvious that all these customs are ultimately based on the idea that men and women should marry as soon as they arrive at the proper age, and that it is unnatural for an elder brother or sister to remain unmarried when a younger one becomes marriageable.

Among peoples of archaic culture, as among most uncivilised races, celibacy is a great exception and marriage is regarded as a duty. In ancient Mexico, when a young man became between twenty and twenty-two years of age, a wife was singled out for him, unless he was going to be a priest; and for girls the customary marriage age was from eleven, or, according to Clavigero, sixteen, to eighteen. In Tlascala, we are told, the unmarried state was so despised that a grown-up man who would not marry had his hair

[1] *Notes and Queries*, ser. vi. vol. ix. 135.
[2] *Ibid.* ser. vi. vol. viii. 147.
[3] Marie Trevelyan, *Folk-Lore and Folk-Stories of Wales*, p. 274.
[4] *Cf.* Frazer, *op. cit.* ii. 288.
[5] Miss Burne, in *Folk-Lore*, xix. 339.
[6] Gregor, *Notes on the Folk-Lore of the North-East of Scotland*, p. 90.
[7] Simpkins, *County Folk-Lore*, vol. vii. Fife, p. 393.

cut off for shame.[1] Among the ancient Peruvians, every year or every two years each governor in his district had to arrange for the marriage of all the young men at the age of twenty-four and upwards, and of all the girls from eighteen to twenty.[2]

"Almost all Chinese," says Dr. Gray, "robust or infirm, well-formed or deformed, are called upon by their parents to marry as soon as they have attained the age of puberty. Were a grown-up son or daughter to die unmarried, the parents would regard it as most deplorable." Hence a young man of marriageable age, whom consumption or any other lingering disease had marked for its own, would be compelled by his parents or guardians to marry at once.[3] So indispensable is marriage considered by the Chinese that even the dead are married, the spirits of all males who die in infancy or in boyhood being in due time married to the spirits of females who have been cut off at a like early age.[4] To die without leaving a son to perpetuate the family cult is considered one of the greatest misfortunes that could befall a man, and at the same time an offence against the whole line of ancestors. For it would doom father, mother, and all the ancestry in the Nether-world to a pitiable existence without descendants enough to serve them properly, to worship at the ancestral tombs, to take care of the ancestral tablets, and duly to perform all rites and ceremonies connected with the departed dead. According to Confucius no crime is greater than filial impiety; and Mencius said that "there are three things which are unfilial, and to have no posterity is the greatest of them." Consequently there can be no greater crime that a man can commit than to remain single. And if his wife has reached her fortieth year without bringing him a son, it is an imperative duty for him to take a concubine.[5]

[1] Clavigero, *History of Mexico*, i. 319. Bancroft, *op. cit.* ii. 251 *sq.*

[2] Garcilasso de la Vega, *First Part of the Royal Commentaries of the Yncas*, i. 306 *sq.* [3] Gray, *op. cit.* i. 186. [4] *Ibid.* i. 216 *sq.*

[5] Hozumi, *Ancestor-Worship and Japanese Law*, p. 129 *sqq.* de Groot, *Religious System of China* (vol. ii.) book i. 617. Giles, *Strange Stories from a Chinese Studio*, i. 64 n. 10. *Indo-Chinese Gleaner*, iii. 58.

The doctrine of the Chinese moralists on marriage was also taught in Japan for more than a thousand years. The consequence of it was that, although celibacy was not positively forbidden by law, it was denounced by public opinion; indeed, according to Professor Hozumi, the obligation to marry was so effectively insisted upon by the latter that there was no need of enforcing it by legislation. But he adds that the customary prohibition of celibacy only extended to the present or future head of a family. As to the other members of the family, on the contrary, celibacy was, as a rule, obligatory. Before the Restoration of 1868 only the house-head, his eldest son, who was the presumptive heir, and his eldest grandson, who would become the presumptive heir after the eldest son, were allowed—or obliged—to marry, but younger sons could not lawfully contract marriage. There was no need for the latter to marry and have children, because they had no apparent hope of ever becoming house-heads and continuators of the cult. This rule was strictly followed among the *samurai*, or military class; for permission was not given by their feudal lords for the marriage of younger sons. Among merchants, artisans, and farmers, again, there were sometimes exceptional cases in certain localities, but in such cases the newly married couple generally established a "new house."[1] At the time of the Taiho-ryo (A.D. 701-1192) a male was allowed to marry at the age of fifteen and a female at thirteen;[2] but the present Civil Code requires the age of seventeen for the male and fifteen for the female.[3]

In Corea the men usually marry at the age of fifteen or sixteen, and it is considered correct for them to marry girls a year or two older than themselves; but it frequently happens that a girl of twelve or thirteen marries a boy of ten or less.[4] Very often the marriage is decided upon when

[1] Hozumi, *op. cit.* pp. 131, 136 *sqq.* *Cf.* Kikuchi, *Japanese Education*, p. 264.

[2] Nakajima, 'Marriage (Japanese and Korean),' in Hastings, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, viii. 459.

[3] *Civil Code of Japan*, § 765, p. 201.

[4] Saunderson, 'Notes on Corea and its People,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxiv. 305. Nakajima, *loc. cit.* p. 460.

the future bride and bridegroom are in their early infancy.[1] It is said that "the male human being who is unmarried is never called a 'man,' whatever his age, but goes by the name of 'yatow,' a name given by the Chinese to unmarriageable young girls; and the 'man' of thirteen or fourteen has a perfect right to strike, abuse, order about the 'yatow' of thirty, who dares not as much as open his lips to complain."[2]

Among the Semites we meet with the idea that a dead man who has no children will miss something in Shĕol through not receiving that kind of worship which ancestors in early times appear to have received.[3] The Hebrews looked upon marriage as a religious duty.[4] According to the Shūlḥān 'Ārūkh, the recognised Jewish code, he who abstains from marrying is guilty of bloodshed, diminishes the image of God, and causes the divine presence to withdraw from Israel; hence a single man past twenty may be compelled by the court to take a wife.[5] The Mishna regards eighteen as the normal age of marriage for a man, whilst girls were treated as marriageable from the beginning of their thirteenth year, when they attained their majority.[6] But at various times very youthful marriages have prevailed among the Jews: by the thirteenth century a large proportion of Jewish girls were married during their minority, and in the second half of the seventeenth century the bridegroom was frequently not more than ten years old and the bride was younger still.[7]

Although Islam considers marriage a civil contract, it

[1] Saunderson, *loc. cit.* p. 305. [2] Ross, *History of Corea*, p. 313.

[3] Cheyne, 'Harlot,' in Cheyne and Black, *Encyclopædia Biblica*, ii. 1964.

[4] Mayer, *Rechte der Israeliten*, pp. 286, 353. Lichtschein, *Ehe nach mosaisch-talmudischer Auffassung*, p. 5 *sqq.* Klugmann, *Die Frau im Talmud*, p. 39 *sq.*

[5] *Shūlḥān 'Ārūkh*, iv. (Ebhen ha-'ezer) i. 1, 3. See also *Yebhāmôth*, fol. 63 b. *sq.*, quoted by Margolis, 'Celibacy,' in *Jewish Encyclopedia*, iii. 636.

[6] Abrahams, *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages*, p. 166 *sq.* *Idem*, 'Marriage (Jewish),' in Hastings, *op. cit.* viii. 461.

[7] *Idem*, *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages*, p. 167 *sq.*

nevertheless enjoins it as a religious duty "incumbent on all who possess the ability."[1] "When a servant of God marries, verily he perfects half his religion."[2] It is related in the Traditions that the Prophet once asked a man if he was married, and being answered in the negative, said, "Art thou sound and healthy?" When the man replied that he was, the Prophet said, "Then thou art one of the brothers of the devil."[3] In Morocco I was told that a married man is blessed in this life and goes to Paradise after death, whereas a grown-up man who dies a bachelor does not find the road to Paradise, but will rise again with the devil.[4] In Muhammadan countries it is certainly considered improper and even disreputable for a man to abstain from marrying when he has attained a sufficient age and when there is no just impediment;[5] and, as Niebuhr remarked, "nothing is more rarely to be met with in the East, than a woman unmarried after a certain time of life." She will rather marry a poor man, or become second wife to a man already married, than remain in a state of celibacy.[6] Among the Persians, according to Dr. Polak, almost every girl of good repute is married before her twenty-first year, and old bachelors are unknown.[7] Elphinstone states that in Afghanistan the common age for marriage is twenty for the men and fifteen or sixteen for the women. Men unable to pay the price of a wife are often unmarried till forty, and women are sometimes single till twenty-five; but on the other hand the rich sometimes marry before the age of puberty.[8]

[1] *Sayings of Muhammad*, edited by Abdullah al-Māmūn al-Suhrawardy, p. 55.

[2] Quoted by Lane, *Arabian Society in the Middle Ages*, p. 221.

[3] *Mishkāt*, book xiii. ch. i., quoted by Hughes, *Dictionary of Islam*, p. 313.

[4] See Westermarck, *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco*, p. 359.

[5] See, *e.g.*, Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, i. 213.

[6] Niebuhr, 'Travels in Arabia,' in Pinkerton, *op. cit.* x. 151. *Cf.* Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins and Wahábys*, p. 64.

[7] Polak, *Persien*, i. 205. *Cf.* Wilson, *Persian Life and Customs*, p. 261.

[8] Elphinstone, *Account of the Kingdom of Kaubul*, i. 236 *sq.*

The so-called Aryan nations in ancient times, as M. Fustel de Coulanges and others have pointed out, regarded celibacy as an impiety and a misfortune: "an impiety, because one who did not marry put the happiness of the manes of the family in peril; a misfortune, because he himself would receive no worship after his death." A man's happiness in the next world depended upon his having a continuous line of male descendants, whose duty it would be to make the periodical offerings for the repose of his soul.[1] It was no doubt possible to adopt a son; but in the Rig-Veda at least that custom is plainly viewed as unsatisfactory.[2] The old idea still survives in India: "a Hindu man must marry and beget children to perform his funeral rites, lest his spirit wander uneasily in the waste places of the earth."[3] Marriage is a duty which every parent must perform for his children; otherwise they owe him no reverence. But although a man who is unmarried is looked upon as an almost useless member of the community and, indeed, as beyond the pale of nature, he does not disgrace his family. On the other hand, there is no greater reproach for a high-class Hindu than to have a daughter unmarried at the age of puberty. A family with such a daughter is supposed to labour under the displeasure of the gods; on a strict rendering of certain texts her unmarried state entails retrospective damnation on three generations of ancestors.[4] Of the unmarried girls in India in general only one in every fourteen has turned her fifteenth year, and of the bachelors only one in twenty-four is over thirty; and among the Hindus marriage is contracted at an earlier age than in the population as a whole.

[1] Fustel de Coulanges, *La cité antique*, p. 54 *sq.* Hearn, *The Aryan Household*, pp. 69, 71. Mayne, *Treatise on Hindu Law and Usage*, p. 83.

[2] *Rig-Veda*, vii. 4.7.8. Macdonell and Keith, *op. cit.* i. 486.

[3] Risley, *People of India*, p. 154. See also Monier-Williams, *Brāhmanism and Hindūism*, p. 243 *sq.*; Gait, *op. cit.* p. 263.

[4] Sleeman, *Rambles and Recollections of an Indian Official*, i. 50. Dubois, *Description of the Character, &c. of the People of India*, p. 96 *sq.* Risley, *op. cit.* pp. 154, 191. Forster, *Sketches of the Mythology, &c. of the Hindoos*, p. 58.

At the higher ages practically no one is left unmarried, except persons suffering from some infirmity or disfigurement, beggars, prostitutes, concubines, religious devotees and mendicants, and a few members of certain hypergamous groups who have been unable to effect alliances of the kind which alone are permitted to them by the rules of their community.[1]

A considerable number of Hindus of both sexes are married already as infants, namely, 10 males and 18 females in every thousand children in the age-period 0–5, 48 males and 132 females in the age-period 5–10, and 159 males and 488 females in the age-period 10–15. Infant-marriage prevails chiefly in Bihar and Orissa, Bombay, Baroda, the Central India Agency, and Hyderabad, that is, in certain central tracts, whereas it is rare in the east, west, and south of India.[2] The Hindus as a body are more addicted to it than any other religious community; it is much rarer among the Muhammadans and much rarer still among Christians and Animists, whilst among the Buddhists marriage below the age of ten is practically unknown and marriage below the age of fifteen extremely rare.[3] It should be noticed that the Hindu child-marriage does not as a rule imply immediate cohabitation. Yet in some parts of the country cohabitation often takes place before the child-wife has reached the age of puberty, and it does so, at the latest, immediately after her first menstruation.[4]

These early betrothals have been attributed to various causes. First of all it should be noted that they cannot be regarded as survivals of a primitive custom, either Dravidian or Aryan; for most of the Dravidian tribes have adult marriage,[5] whilst in the early Vedic texts marriage appears essentially as a union of two persons of full development and child-wives first occur regularly in the Sūtra period.[6] Many of the law-books fix a definite age for the marriage of girls; and the later the treatise, the

[1] Gait, *op. cit.* pp. 262, 263, 266. [2] *Ibid.* p. 267.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 267 *sq.* [4] *Ibid.* p. 267. Risley, *op. cit.* p. 193 *sq.*
[5] Gait, *op. cit.* p. 270. Risley, *op. cit.* p. 187.
[6] Macdonell and Keith, *op. cit.* i. 474 *sq.*

earlier is the age which it prescribes. According to the 'Laws of Manu' a man of thirty should marry a girl of twelve, and a man of twenty-four a girl of eight;[1] whilst later books fix the higher limit of age in such cases at ten or eight years and reduce the lower limit to seven, six, or even four years.[2] It has been surmised that one cause of the child-marriage was the growth of the patriarchal power of the head of the family, who must have been adverse to any assertion of independence on the part of its female members, and more especially to their exercising the right of choosing their husbands for themselves, which might prove detrimental to the interests of the family. Moreover, the gradual lowering of the position of women from the high standard of Vedic times and the distrust of their virtue induced by the example of pre-matrimonial licence set by the Dravidian races may have operated in the same direction; it is hinted in the literature of the subject that a girl would be married as a child in order to avert the possibility of her causing scandal later on.[3] It has further been said that child-marriage was introduced on account of the frequent invasions of foreigners and the insecurity of the times.[4] As the most potent motive, however, has been represented the desire of parents to secure appropriate bridegrooms for their daughters.[5] The custom of hypergamy, which prohibits a woman from marrying a man belonging to a caste lower than her own, limits the number of possible husbands for the girls of the higher classes and makes fathers anxious to get their daughters married as soon as an acceptable match offers. And, says Sir Herbert Risley, "when the custom of infant marriage had once been started, under pressure of social necessity, by the families of the highest group, who had the largest surplus of marriageable daughters, a sort of fashion would have been set and would be blindly followed through all the grades."[6]

[1] *Laws of Manu*, ix. 94. [2] Risley, *op. cit.* p. 189.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 189 *sq.*
[4] Kanjilal, 'Hindu Early Marriage,' in *Calcutta Review*, cxxviii. 168.
[5] Forbes, *Oriental Memoirs*, iii. 302. [6] Risley, *op. cit.* p. 190.

This opinion has been contradicted by Mr. Gait, who observes that the practice of hypergamy, although it in some cases leads to early marriages, often, on the contrary, leads to the postponement of marriage. "A poor man with many daughters," he writes, "finds it extremely difficult to pay the bridegroom price; and it often happens in consequence that his girls remain unmarried until long after the age of puberty. So frequently is this the case that, in various castes, the hypergamous sections no longer penalise a man for failing to give his daughters in marriage before they attain puberty. The Rājputs, who are much addicted to hypergamy, are by no means in the front rank as regards infant marriage. On the whole, therefore, it cannot be said that hypergamy leads to early marriage. It seems rather to be the case that infant marriage is most common where the difficulty of obtaining a husband is small and the marriage ceremony inexpensive."[1] His own view is that the practice had its origin neither in the pure Aryan nor in the pure Dravidian culture, but was the result of their impact. He remarks that though the non-Hinduised Dravidian tribes do not ordinarily give their girls in marriage before puberty, they allow them great sexual freedom so long as they are spinsters. When such tribes come under the influence of Hinduism, this premarital communism falls into disrepute, and the simplest method of putting an end to it would obviously be by providing the girls with husbands before the promptings of nature could lead them astray. And in the same way the new-born desire to get virgin wives for their sons would lead parents to select girls who are so young that there can be little fear of their having already lost their virginity. Mr. Gait thinks that this hypothesis is the one which, on the whole, seems to fit most closely into the facts. It explains how it is that while the non-Hinduised tribes have adult marriage, those that have become Hinduised are ordinarily more addicted to infant-marriage than any other section of the community. The statistics show that the practice is least common in the north-west of India, where the Aryan element is strongest, and that

[1] Gait, *op. cit.* p. 271.

elsewhere it is often most prevalent among the lower rather than the higher castes, that is, among the communities of Dravidian origin.[1] In this fact he finds an argument against the theory that infant-marriage originated with high caste Hindus and spread gradually from them to the lower castes.[2] But his argument does not seem convincing as it is quite possible that a certain custom, which has originated in one class of society, is not only adopted but carried to an extreme by a lower class. Mr. Gait thinks that a further cause tending to encourage the marriage of very young girls, where that of widows is forbidden, is the fact that girls are wanted as wives by widowers as well as bachelors;[3] but this suggestion seems of little importance considering that the very castes who practise infant-marriage as a general rule allow their widows to marry again.[4] Infant-marriage in India may no doubt be due to various causes, but it appears that the most potent of them, at all events, are the dread of future celibacy and the preference given to virgin brides—causes which, as we have seen, have led to the same result in many other parts of the world.

In Burma—as well as in Assam, the North-West Frontier Province, Cochin, Travancore, and Mysore—marriage before the age of ten is practically non-existent.[5] Most Burmese lads are said to get married when they are eighteen or nineteen, and very few, not in the sacred order, are unmarried when they are twenty; whilst thirteen or fourteen is a common age for the girls.[6] So also in Siam marriage takes place early—about fourteen in the case of girls and about twenty in the case of men;[7] and "every girl gets married sooner or later, so that old maids do not exist."[8]

In the Zoroastrian books, as in the sacred books of India, we meet with the idea that a man should marry and get progeny. Ahura Mazda said to Zoroaster:—"The man who has a wife is far above him who lives in continence;

[1] *Ibid.* p. 269 *sq.* [2] *Ibid.* pp. 264, 269. [3] *Ibid.* p. 271. [4] *Ibid.* p. 269.
[5] *Ibid.* p. 267. [6] Shway Yoe, *The Burman*, pp. 55, 64.
[7] Young, *Kingdom of the Yellow Robe*, p. 85. Bowring, *Kingdom and People of Siam*, i. 118. [8] Young, *op. cit.* p. 85.

he who keeps a house is far above him who has none; he who has children is far above the childless man."[1] The greatest misfortune which could befall an ancient Persian was to be childless.[2] To him who has no child the bridge of Paradise shall be barred; the first question the angels there will ask him is, whether he has left in this world a substitute for himself, and if the answer be "No" they will pass by and he will stay at the head of the bridge, full of grief. The primitive meaning of this is plain: the man without a son cannot enter Paradise because there is nobody to pay him the family worship.[3] Ashi Vanguhi, a feminine impersonification of piety, and the source of all the good and riches that are connected with piety, rejects the offerings of barren people—old men, courtesans, and children.[4] It is said in the Yasts, "This is the worst deed that men and tyrants do, namely, when they deprive maids that have been barren for a long time of marrying and bringing forth children."[5] And in the eyes of all good Parsis of the present day, as in the time of King Darius and the contemporaries of Herodotus, the two greatest merits of a citizen are the begetting and rearing of a numerous family, and the fruitful tilling of the soil.[6] It is by no means unusual, therefore, for Parsis to enjoin by will or by a trust that a certain amount of their wealth be expended in aiding poor brides to marry, and certain institutions provide special funds for this purpose.[7]

The ancient Greeks regarded marriage as a matter both of public and private importance.[8] In various places

[1] *Vendîdâd*, iv. 47.

[2] Rawlinson, in his translation of Herodotus, i. 262 n. 1. *Cf.* Herodotus, i. 133, 136; *Dînâ-î Maînôg-î Khirad*, xxxv. 19.

[3] Darmesteter, in *Sacred Books of the East*, iv. 47. *Cf. Idem, Ormazd et Ahriman*, p. 294.

[4] *Yasts*, xvii. 54. [5] *Ibid.* xvii. 59.

[6] Darmesteter, in *Sacred Books of the East*, iv. p. lxii.

[7] Jivanji Jamshedji Modi, 'Marriage (Iranian).—1. Zoroastrian,' in Hastings, *op. cit.* viii. 455.

[8] Müller, *History and Antiquities of the Doric Race*, ii. 300 *sq.* Fustel de Coulanges, *op. cit.* p. 55. Hearn, *op. cit.* p. 72. Döllinger, *The Gentile and the Jew*, ii. 234 *sq.* Kessler, *Plutarchs Leben des Lykurgos*, p. 64.

criminal proceedings might be taken against celibates.[1] Plato remarks that every individual is bound to provide for a continuance of representatives to succeed himself as ministers of the Divinity;[2] and Isaeus says, "All those who think their end approaching look forward with a prudent care that their houses may not become desolate, but that there may be some person to attend to their funeral rites and to perform the legal ceremonies at their tombs."[3] So also the conviction that the founding of a house and the begetting of children constituted a moral necessity and a public duty had a deep hold of the Roman mind in early times.[4] Cicero's treatise 'De Legibus'—which generally reproduces in a philosophical form the ancient laws of Rome—contains a law according to which the Censors had to impose a tax upon unmarried men.[5] But in later periods, when sexual morality reached a very low ebb in Rome, celibacy—as to which grave complaints were made as early as 520 B.C.—naturally increased in proportion, especially among the upper classes. Among these marriage came to be regarded as a burden which people took upon themselves at the best in the public interest. Indeed, how it fared with marriage and the rearing of children is shown by the Gracchan agrarian laws, which first placed a premium thereon;[6] and later the Lex Julia et Papia Poppaea imposed various penalties on those who lived in a state of celibacy after a certain age,[7] though with little or no result.[8] According to the later

[1] Pollux, *Onomasticum*, iii. 48.

[2] Plato, *Leges*, vi. 773.

[3] Isaeus, *Oratio de Apollodori hereditate*, 30, p. 66. Rohde observes (*Psyche*, p. 228), however, that such a belief did not exist in the Homeric age, when the departed souls in Hades were supposed to be in no way dependent upon the survivors.

[4] Mommsen, *History of Rome*, i. 74.

[5] Cicero, *De legibus*, iii. 3. Fustel de Coulanges, *op. cit.* p. 55.

[6] Mommsen, *op. cit.* iii. 121; iv. 186 *sq.* For the growing unpopularity of marriage in Rome see also Fowler, *Social Life at Rome in the Age of Cicero*, p. 149 *sq.*; Meyer, *Der römische Konkubinat*, p. 17.

[7] Rossbach, *Römische Ehe*, p. 418.

[8] Mackenzie, *Studies in Roman Law*, p. 104.

Roman law a man could marry from the age of fourteen and a woman from the age of twelve.[1]

The ancient Teutons as described by Cæsar, on the other hand, accounted it in the highest degree scandalous to have intercourse with the opposite sex before the twentieth year.[2] Tacitus also asserts that the young men married late, and that the maidens did not hurry into marriage;[3] and the accuracy of this statement is confirmed by what we know about Teutonic custom in the Middle Ages.[4] It seems probable, however, that at a mature age celibacy was almost unknown among the Teutons, except in the case of women with a bad reputation, for whom neither beauty nor riches could procure a husband.[5]

Among the Russian peasantry celibacy is unheard of: when a youth reaches the age of eighteen he is informed by his parents that he ought to marry at once.[6] Formerly the father was even anxious to marry his son at an earlier age in order to secure an additional female labourer, and he cohabited himself with the wife during the son's minority.[7] Professor Giorgevitch of Belgrade informs me that such marriages are occasionally found to this day in Serbia; in former times they were more common there, but the younger generation were unwilling to submit to the old custom, and this contributed to the breaking up of the *zadruga*, or joint-family institution. Infant-betrothal occurred both in Serbia and Montenegro,[8] and in High Albania it is still in vogue. According to Miss Durham, most of the children there are betrothed in infancy or in early childhood, and some even before birth. A man, as soon as

[1] Dernburg, *Pandekten*, iii. 16. [2] Cæsar, *De bello Gallico*, vi. 21.
[3] Tacitus, *Germania*, ch. 20.
[4] Hoops, *Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde*, ii. 486.
[5] Tacitus, *op. cit.* ch. 19. [6] Mackenzie Wallace, *Russia*, i. 138.
[7] v. Haxthausen, *Transcaucasia*, p. 403 note. Le Bon, *L'homme et les sociétés*, ii. 295. Bogoras, *Chukchee*, p. 578 n. 4. A Serbian writer, Sava Tekelija, found this custom in the government of Kursk, when travelling there in 1786 (Sava Tekelija, 'Autobiografija,' in *Letopis Matice Srpske*, cxix. 39 *sq.*; I am indebted to Professor Giorgevitch for this reference).
[8] Piprek, *op. cit.* p. 119.

a son is born to him, seeks a suitable family with which to be allied, and should there be no daughter available, bespeaks the next one born. The girl may afterwards refuse to marry the man, but only on condition that she swears before witnesses to remain virgin all her life, and should she break this vow there would be endless bloodshed in consequence. Girls are married as young as thirteen and boys at fifteen or even fourteen, but the age is rising.[1]

The laws of all Christian countries fix the lowest ages at which marriage is allowed for males and females. The stipulation of the Roman law, according to which a man may marry at the age of fourteen and a woman at the age of twelve, was adopted by the Church, and is, under the influence of Canon Law, still preserved in Great Britain, in some of the United States, and in Spain, Portugal, Greece, Mexico, Chili, and several other Roman Catholic States in America. In Austria both men and women become capable of marrying at the age of fourteen; in Serbia and Caucasia, men at fifteen and women at thirteen; in Brazil, North Carolina, and Texas, men at sixteen and women at fourteen; in Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, and Illinois, men at seventeen and women at fourteen; in Peru, men at eighteen and women at fourteen; in France, Belgium, Italy, Rumania, California, Minnesota, New Mexico, Oregon, and Wisconsin, men at eighteen and women at fifteen; in Russia, Holland, Indiana, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, Ohio, and Wyoming, men at eighteen and women at sixteen; in Switzerland, men at twenty and women at eighteen; in Germany, men at twenty-one and women at sixteen; in Sweden, men at twenty-one and women at eighteen. In many countries, however, where the canonic age-limit has not been preserved, the obstacle to marrying at an earlier age than that which the law admits may be removed by dispensation. The German Civil Code allows such dispensation only with regard to women, but a man is nevertheless in special cases

[1] Miss Durham, 'High Albania and its Customs,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xl. 459 *sq.* *Idem, High Albania*, p. 35 *sq.*

able to marry before twenty-one, namely, if the Court of Wardship declares him to be of full age, which the Court has power to do at any time after he has reached the age of eighteen. The general tendency of modern legislation has been to raise the age-limit; and it is therefore quite possible that some of the figures given above have become antiquated in the course of the last few years.[1]

Besides the age-limit below which marriage is prohibited there is frequently another, higher limit below which a marriage can only be contracted with the consent of parents, guardians, or other persons having control of the parties. This subject will be dealt with in a subsequent chapter.[2] We shall now proceed to consider the frequency of marriage and the age at which people actually marry in Europe.

Generally speaking, modern civilisation has proved unfavourable to the frequency of marriage, and has raised the average age at which marriages are concluded. In Europe more than a third of the male and female population beyond the age of fifteen live in a state of voluntary or involuntary celibacy;[3] and among them there are many who never marry. In the middle of the nineteenth century Wappäus found that in Saxony 14·6 per cent. of the unmarried adult population died single, in Sweden 14·9 per cent., in the Netherlands 17·2 per cent., and in France 20·6 per cent.[4] The marriage-rate varies greatly in different European countries, as appears from the following figures,

[1] Roguin, *Traité de droit civil comparé. Le mariage*, p. 48 *sqq.* Winroth, *Äktenskapshindren*, p. 100 *sq.* (some statements found in these works are already antiquated). Wright, *Report on Marriage and Divorce in the United States*, p. 29. *Code civil*, art. 144. *Das allgemeine bürgerliche Gesetzbuch für das Kaisertum Oesterreich*, §§ 21, 49. *Schweizerisches Zivilgesetzbuch vom* 10 *Dezember* 1907, art. 96. *Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch* (German Civil Code), § 1303. *Lag om äktenskaps ingående och upplösning av den* 12 *november* 1915, ii. 1 (Sweden). As a curious exception to the general tendency to raise the age-limit may be mentioned the law of the grand-duchy of Hesse before the year 1875, which prohibited a man from marrying before the age of twenty-five (Roguin, *op. cit.* p. 49 *sq.*).

[2] *Infra*, on Consent.

[3] v. Oettingen, *Die Moralstatistik*, p. 140 n. 1.

[4] Wappäus *Allgemeine Bevölkerungsstatistik*, ii. 267.

which give the annual number of marriages per 10,000 marriageable persons, that is, males 18 years of age or over and females 15 years or over who are either single, widowed, or divorced. It was in Serbia (1896–1905) 1386, in Bulgaria (1910–1911) 1223, in Russia—not including Finland and Poland—(1896–1897) 921, in Rumania (1896–1903) 873, in Hungary (1906–1915) 778, in Germany (1907–1914) 569, in France (1910–1911) 539, in Austria (1908–1913) 536, in England and Wales (1907–1914) 507, in Norway (the same period) 418, in Scotland (the same period) 411, in Finland (1906–1915) 398, in Sweden (1908–1913) 367, in Iceland (1906–1915) 335, and in Ireland (1909–1912) 254.[1] The average age of the bachelors and the spinsters who enter into matrimony was in Serbia (1896–1900) 21·8 and 19·7 respectively, in Italy (1911–1914) 27·2 and 23·6, in Germany (the same period) 27·4 and 24·7, in England (1906–1914) 27·4 and 25·7, in Scotland (the same period) 27·8 and 25·8, in France (1906–1910) 28·0 and 23·7, and in Sweden (1906–1913) 28·8 and 26·4.[2]

In recent times the proportion of unmarried people is known to have increased in various European countries[3] and the marriage age to have risen. In England and Wales the annual number of marriages per 10,000 marriageable persons was, in 1876–1885, 568; in 1886–1895, 529; in 1896–1905, 531; in 1907–1914, as already said, 507;[4] but in 1911–1914, a little higher than in 1906–1910.[5] In Hungary it was, in 1876–1885, 1038; in 1886–1895, 999; in 1896–1905, 813. In Finland it was, in 1876–1885, 536; in Sweden, during the same period, 417; in Norway, in 1881–1885, 458; in Germany, in 1901, 603.[6] In England and Wales the average age of bachelor-bridegrooms and of spinster-brides was, in 1876–1885, 25·9 and 24·4 respectively;

[1] *Annuaire international de statistique*, p. 11 *sqq.* [2] *Ibid.* p. 28 *sq.*

[3] Wappäus, *op. cit.* ii. 229. v. Oettingen, *op. cit.* p. 120. Haushofer, *Lehr- und Handbuch der Statistik*, p. 396. Mayo-Smith, *Science of Statistics*, i. 96.

[4] *Annuaire international de statistique*, p. 12.

Baines, 'Recent Trend of Population in England and Wales,' in *Jour. Roy. Statistical Soc.* lxxix. p. 401.

[6] *Annuaire international de statistique*, p. 11 *sqq.*

in 1886–1895, 26·4 and 24·9; in 1896–1905, 26·8 and 25·3; in 1906-1910, 27·2 and 25·6.[1] The tendency towards increasing age at marriage in England may also be demonstrated by taking the percentages of marriages contracted at ages under 25. These were, in 1896–1900, 48·2 for bachelors and 64·4 for spinsters; in 1901–1905, 45·4 and 61·6 respectively; in 1906–1910, 42·5 and 59·1; and in 1911–1915, 40·4 and 56·9.[2]

A very important cause of the decline of the marriage-rate and the rise of the age for marriage in Europe is the difficulty of supporting a family in modern society. The importance of the economic factor has been much emphasised by statisticians. From the days of Süssmilch till the middle of the last century it was regarded almost as a statistical axiom that the number of marriages varies inversely with the price of corn. In Germany this tendency of the number of marriages to decrease when the price of rye was high and to increase when the price was low was observed until about 1860; but since then Germany has become so industrial and commercial that the price of food is only one element in the economic well-being of the masses.[3] In the English records, at any rate so far back as 1820, no such relation is noticeable between the number of marriages and the price of corn; on the contrary, the marriage-rate has often been found to vary not inversely but directly with the price of wheat.[4] In explanation of this fact Dr. Ogle points out that increased exports and imports put up freights and thus increase the price of corn, while at the same time men marry in greater numbers when trade is brisk and the value of exports increases; the amount of exports gauges the opportunity for employment, and is therefore an index of economic prosperity.[5] But the correspondence between the marriage-rate and the general

[1] *Ibid.* p. 28.

[2] *Seventy-eighth Annual Report of the Registrar-General*, p. xii.

[3] Mayr, *Bevölkerungsstatistik*, p. 385. Mayo-Smith, *op. cit.* i. 190.

[4] Ogle, 'On Marriage-Rates and Marriage-Ages,' in *Jour. Roy. Statistical Soc.* liii. 258.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 260 *sqq.*

prosperity of the country, as indicated by the course of trade, is certainly not absolute: the curves show in fact that it is only the oscillations which are correlated. At the beginning of the present century Hooker observed that over the preceding forty years as a whole the trade curve had risen in England, whereas the marriage-rate had fallen.[1] So also Hermann's formula that "the number of marriages in any period expresses the expectation of economic prosperity prevailing at that time"[2] has only a relative value.[3]

That in spite of the general economic progress people have become more and more unwilling to venture upon marriage is no doubt to some extent due to the ever-increasing standard of comfort among all classes, which has led either to a retardation or to an abandonment of marriages.[4] In this respect there is a difference between different social classes. Professor Fahlbeck has found that among the Swedish nobility 43·17 per cent. of the marriage-

[1] Hooker, 'Correlation of the Marriage-Rate with Trade,' in *Jour. Roy. Statistical Soc.* lxiv. (1901) 485 *sq.* See also Ogle, *loc. cit.* p. 265.

[2] Hermann, quoted by Mayo-Smith, *op. cit.* i. 190.

[3] As for the earlier observation that the effect of war is to bring down the marriage-rate (Haushofer, *op. cit.* p. 401; Ogle, *loc. cit.* p. 255 *sq.*; Mayo-Smith, *op. cit.* i. 99 *sq.*) it is interesting to note that during the second, third, and fourth quarters of 1915 and the first quarter of 1916 there was, on the contrary, a sudden and phenomenal rise in the marriages in England which was directly due to the war. Sir Bernard Mallet ('Vital Statistics as Affected by the War,' in *Jour. Roy. Statistical Soc.* lxxxi. 7) observes that whilst war marriages are of perfectly natural occurrence at the outbreak of war, they were in the present case enormously stimulated by the very generous provision of separation allowance and pensions, as also by the policy which prevailed in the first period of the war of taking single men first. Crudely stated the war resulted in 200,000 persons in England being married between August 1914 and June 1917 who in the ordinary course of events would not have been married (*ibid.* p. 3). On the other hand, taking an average of marriages in Hungary, the effect of the war, up till May 1917, was that over 600,000 who in ordinary circumstances would have married did not do so (*ibid.* p. 6).

[4] *Cf.* Ogle, *loc. cit.* p. 265.

able men and 46·15 of the marriageable women are unmarried, while the figures for the whole population of Sweden are only 31·42 and 31·54 respectively; and the number of unmarried persons has greatly increased in recent times.[1] Generally speaking, the average age for marriage is more advanced among the upper classes than among the lower ones.[2] A "gentleman" before marrying thinks it necessary to have an income of which a mere fraction would suffice for a married workman. He has to offer his wife a home in accordance with her social position and his own; and unless she brings him some fortune, she contributes but little to the support of the family. Moreover, from the economic point of view there is hardly any reason to put off marrying for men who earn in youth almost as much as in later life, as is the case with miners, tailors, shoemakers, artisans, and others, who have been found to marry earlier than men of the professional class.[3] It may also be said that a man requires more time to gain his living by intellectual than by material work.

When we consider the differences in the marriage-rate and the age for marriage in the different countries of Europe, we notice that the tendency to marry is greatest in the East of Europe with its more primitive civilisation. In Russia there is an extraordinarily large number of bridegrooms under the age of twenty, and more than one-half of the brides are under that age;[4] and the reason for this is that an enormous proportion of the population consists of small agriculturists, who are in the habit of arranging for the marriage of their sons at as early an age as possible in order to secure an additional female labourer.[5] The exceptionally low marriage-rate in Northern Europe is, partly at least, due to emigration. And the emigration of young men and women is undoubtedly the cause of Ireland

Fahlbeck, *Sveriges adel*, ii. 118.

Mayo-Smith, *op. cit.* i. 103 *sq.* Dumont, 'L'âge au mariage,' in *Bull. et mém. Soc. d'Anthr. Paris*, ser. v. vol. iii. 260.

Forty-ninth Annual Report of the Registrar-General, p. viii.

Mayo-Smith, *op. cit.* i. 105.

Semenow, quoted in *Forty-sixth Ann. Rep. Reg.-Gen.* p. ix. *Cf. supra*, p. 386; Leroy-Beaulieu, *Empire of the Tsars*, i. 495.

having a lower marriage-rate than any other country in Europe.[1]

An economic cause of the declining tendency to marry which still remains to be mentioned is the increasing economic independence of women. At the lower stages of civilisation a woman is a helpless being who depends on the support of a man, whereas modern civilisation provides her with means of earning her living by her own efforts alone. But besides factors of an economic character there are others, equally important, which have made men and women less inclined to enter into matrimony.

A modern writer justly points out that "by the general diffusion of education and culture, by the new inventions and discoveries of the age, by the increase of commerce and intercourse and wealth, the tastes of men and women have become widened, their desires multiplied, new gratifications and pleasures have been supplied to them. By this increase of the gratifications of existence the relative share of them which married life affords has become just so much less. The domestic circle does not fill so large a place in life as formerly. It is really less important to either man or woman. Married life has lost in some measure its advantage over a single life. There are so many pleasures, now, that can be enjoyed as well or even better in celibacy." Moreover, "by the diffusion of a finer culture throughout the community, men and women can less easily find any one whom they are willing to take as a partner for life; their requirements are more exacting; their standards of excellence higher; they are less able to find any who can satisfy their own ideal, and less able to satisfy anybody else's ideal. Men and women have, too, a livelier sense of the serious and sacred character of the marriage union, and of the high motives from which alone it should be formed. They are less willing to contract it from any lower motives."[2]

The marriage and divorce laws of Christian countries are also responsible for a certain number of persons remaining

[1] Mayo-Smith, *op. cit.* i. 96 *sq.*

[2] 'Why is Single Life becoming more General?' in *Nation* (New York), vi. 190 *sq.*

celibates. We may assume that if the union could be more easily dissolved it would be more readily entered into. And the law of monogamy is necessarily a cause of celibacy where the adult women outnumber the adult men. If we reckon the age for marriage from twenty to fifty years, a hundred men may in Europe choose amongst a hundred and three or four women, so that about three or four women per cent. are in normal circumstances doomed to a single life on account of our obligatory monogamy.[1]

[1] v. Oettingen, *op. cit.* p. 60.

CHAPTER XI

CELIBACY

SIDE by side with the idea that marriage is highly desirable or obligatory for all ordinary men and women we find the opposite notion, according to which celibacy in extraordinary cases commands more respect than marriage or is even looked upon as a stringent duty.

The Tuhoe, a Maori tribe, had the custom of making the first-born daughter of a chief, but nobody else, a *puhi*. This implied that she was rendered *tapu*—that "she was not allowed to have sexual connection with any man, nor to perform any work except such as the weaving of the better-class garments. . . . The idea was to make her an important person in the tribe, a lady of rank, to be treated with respect and looked up to. If a *puhi* were detected in illicit intercourse with any man she was degraded and the *tapu* taken off her."[1]

We are told that the Shawnee Indian had a great respect for certain persons who observed celibacy.[2] Among other North American tribes certain effeminate men who assumed the dress and habits of women were looked upon as wizards or supernatural beings and held in repute.[3] Among many peoples persons whose function it is to perform religious or magical rites must be celibates.[4] The Tlingit believe that if a shaman does not observe continuous chastity his

[1] Best, 'Maori Marriage Customs,' in *Trans. and Proceed. New Zealand Institute*, xxxvi. 34.

[2] Ashe, *Travels in America*, p. 250.

[3] See Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. 472 *sq.*

[4] Some instances of this are stated by Landtman, *Origin of Priesthood*, p. 156 *sq.*

own guardian spirits will kill him.[1] In Patagonia the male wizards were not allowed to marry.[2] In some tribes of the Guarani of Paraguay "the female Payes were bound to chastity, or they no longer obtained credit."[3] Celibacy was compulsory on the priests of the Chibchas in Bogota.[4] The Tohil priests in Guatemala were vowed to perpetual continence.[5] In Ichcatlan the high-priest was obliged to live constantly within the temple, and to abstain from commerce with any woman whatsoever; and if he failed in this duty he was cut in pieces, and the bloody limbs were given as a warning to his successor.[6] Of the women who held positions in the temples of ancient Mexico we are told that their chastity was most zealously guarded; during the performance of their duties they were required to keep at a proper distance from the male assistants, at whom they did not even dare to glance. The punishment to be inflicted upon those who violated their vow of chastity was death; whilst, if their trespass remained entirely secret, they endeavoured to appease the anger of the gods by fasting and austerity of life, dreading that in punishment of their crime their flesh would rot.[7] In Yucatan there was, connected with the worship of the sun, an order of vestals the members of which generally enrolled themselves for a certain time, but were afterwards allowed to leave and enter the married state. Some of them, however, remained for ever in the service of the temple and were apotheosised. Their duty was to attend to the sacred fire, and to keep strictly chaste, those who broke their vows being shot to death with arrows.[8] In

[1] Veniaminof, quoted by Landtman, *op. cit.* p. 156.

[2] Falkner, *Description of Patagonia*, p. 117.

[3] Southey, *History of Brazil*, ii. 371.

[4] Simon, quoted by Dorman, *Origin of Primitive Superstitions*, p. 384.

[5] Bancroft, *Native Races of the Pacific States of North America*, iii. 489.

[6] Clavigero, *History of Mexico*, i. 274.

[7] *Ibid.* i. 275 *sq.* Torquemada, *Monarchia Indiana*, ii. 188 *sqq.* Bancroft, *op. cit.* iii. 435 *sq.* *Cf.* Acosta, *History of the Indies*, ii. 333 *sq.*

[8] Bancroft, *op. cit.* iii. 473. Lopez Cogolludo, *Historia de Yucathan*, p. 198.

Peru there were likewise virgins dedicated to the sun, who lived in perpetual seclusion to the end of their lives, who preserved their virginity and were forbidden to converse or have sexual intercourse with or to see any man, or even any woman who was not one of themselves.[1] And besides the virgins who thus professed perpetual virginity in the monasteries, there were other women, of the blood royal, who led the same life in their own houses, having taken a vow of continence. These women "were held in great veneration for their chastity and purity, and, as a mark of worship and respect, they were called *Ocllo*, which was a name held sacred in their idolatry"; but if they lost their virtue, they were burnt alive or cast into "the lake of lions."[2]

Among the Guanches of the Canary Islands there were virgins, called Magades or Harimagades, who presided over the cult under the direction of the high-priest, and there were other virgins, highly respected, whose function was to pour water over the heads of newborn children, and who could abandon their office and marry whenever they pleased.[3] The priestesses of the Tshi- and Ewhé-speaking peoples on the West Coast of Africa are forbidden to marry.[4] In a wood near Cape Padron, in Lower Guinea, lives a priestly king who is allowed neither to leave his house nor to touch a woman.[5]

Among the Todas of the Nilgiris, in Southern India, the "dairyman" or priest is bound to a celibate existence.[6] Among the Hindus, in spite of the great honour in which marriage is held, celibacy has always commanded respect in

[1] Garcilasso de la Vega, *First Part of the Royal Commentaries of the Yncas*, i. 291 *sqq.*

[2] *Ibid.* i. 305.

[3] Bory de St. Vincent, *Essais sur les Isles Fortunées*, p. 96 *sq.* Nuñez de la Peña, *Conquista y antigvedades de las islas de la Gran Canaria*, p. 27.

[4] Ellis, *Tshi-speaking Peoples*, p. 121. *Idem*, *Ewe-speaking Peoples*, p. 142. *Supra*, p. 219 *sq.*

[5] Bastian, *Die deutsche Expedition an der Loango-Küste*, i. 287 *sq.*

[6] King, *Aboriginal Tribes of the Nilgiri Hills*, p. 19. Thurston, 'Anthropology of the Todas and Kotas,' in the Madras Government Museum's *Bulletin*, i. 169, 170, 193. Rivers, *Todas*, pp. 80, 99, 236.

instances of extraordinary sanctity.[1] Those of the Sannyāsis who are known to lead their lives in perfect celibacy receive on that account marks of distinguished honour and respect.[2] Already the time-honoured Indian institution of the four Āśramas contained the germ of monastic celibacy, the Brahmacārin, or student, being obliged to observe absolute chastity during the whole course of his study.[3] The idea was further developed in Jainism and Buddhism. The Jain monk was to renounce all sexual pleasures, "either with gods, or men, or animals"; not to give way to sensuality; not to discuss topics relating to women; not to contemplate the forms of women.[4] Buddhism regards sensuality as altogether incompatible with wisdom and holiness; it is said that "a wise man should avoid married life as if it were a burning pit of live coal."[5] According to the legend, Buddha's mother, who was the best and purest of the daughters of men, had no other sons, and her conception was due to supernatural causes.[6] One of the fundamental duties of monastic life, by an infringement of which the guilty person brings about his inevitable expulsion from Buddha's order, is that "an ordained monk may not have sexual intercourse, not even with an animal."[7] In Tibet some sects of the Lamas are allowed to marry, but those who do not are considered more holy; and in every sect the nuns must take a vow of absolute continence.[8] At Taklakot in Western Tibet one boy in every family must invariably be set apart for the priesthood, and similarly of the daughters one or more are assigned to perpetual virginity.[9] The Buddhist

[1] Monier-Williams, *Buddhism*, p. 88.

[2] Dubois, *Description of the Character, Manners, and Customs of the People of India*, p. 133. *Cf.* Monier-Williams, *Brāhmanism and Hindūism*, p. 261.

[3] Kern, *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, p. 73.

[4] Hopkins, *Religions of India*, p. 294.

[5] *Dhammika-Sutta*, 21, quoted by Monier-Williams, *Buddhism*, p. 88. [6] Rhys Davids, *Hibbert Lectures on Buddhism*, p. 148.

[7] Oldenberg, *Buddha*, p. 350 *sq.*

[8] Wilson, *Abode of Snow*, p. 213. Waddell, 'Celibacy (Tibetan),' in Hastings, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, iii. 277.

[9] Sherring, *Western Tibet*, p. 188.

priests of Ceylon are totally debarred from women.[1] Chinese law enjoins celibacy on all priests, Buddhist or Taouist.[2] And among the immortals of Taouism there are some women also, who have led an extraordinarily ascetic life.[3]

In ancient Persia there were sun priestesses who were obliged to refrain from intercourse with men.[4] The nine priestesses of the oracle of a Gallic deity in Sena were devoted to perpetual virginity.[5] The Romans had their Vestal virgins, whose office, according to tradition, was instituted by Numa. They were compelled to continue unmarried during thirty years, which time they employed in offering sacrifices and performing other rites ordained by the law; and if they suffered themselves to be debauched they were delivered up to the most miserable death, being placed in a subterraneous cell, in their funeral attire, without any sepulchral column, funeral rites, or other customary solemnities.[6] After the expiration of the term of thirty years they might marry on quitting the ensigns of their priesthood; but we are told that very few did this, as those who did suffered calamities which were regarded as ominous by the rest, and induced them to remain virgins in the temple of the goddess till their death.[7] In Greece priestesses were not infrequently required to be virgins, if not for their whole life, at any rate for the duration of their priesthood.[8] Tertullian writes:—"To the Achaean Juno, at the town Aegium, a virgin is allotted; and the priestesses who rave at Delphi know not marriage. We know that widows minister to the

[1] Percival, *Account of the Island of Ceylon*, p. 202.

[2] *Ta Tsing Leu Lee*, sec. cxiv. p. 118. Medhurst, 'Marriage in China,' in *Trans. Roy. Asiatic Soc. China Branch*, iv. 18. Davis, *China*, ii. 53.

[3] Réville, *La religion Chinoise*, p. 451 *sq.*

[4] Justin, quoted by Justi, 'Die Weltgeschichte des Tabari,' in *Das Ausland*, xlviii. 307.

[5] Pomponius Mela, *Chorographia*, iii. 6.

[6] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Antiquitates Romanæ*, ii. 64 *sqq.* Plutarch, *Numa*, x. 7 *sqq.*

[7] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, ii. 67.

[8] Strabo, xiv. 1. 23. Müller, *Das sexuelle Leben der alten Kulturvölker*, p. 44 *sqq.* Blümner, *Home Life of the Ancient Greeks*, p. 325. Götte, *Das Delphische Orakel*, p. 78 *sq.*

African Ceres; they not only withdraw from their still living husbands, but they even introduce other wives to them in their own room, all contact with males, even as far as the kiss of their sons, being forbidden them. . . . We have heard, too, of continent men, and among others the priests of the famous Egyptian bull."[1] There were eunuch priests connected with the cults of the Ephesian Artemis,[2] the Phrygian Cybele,[3] and the Syrian Astarte.[4]

A small class of Hebrews held the idea that marriage is impure. The Essenes, says Josephus, "reject pleasure as an evil, but esteem continence and the conquest over our passions to be virtue. They neglect wedlock."[5] This doctrine exercised no influence on Judaism, but perhaps much upon Christianity. St. Paul considered celibacy to be preferable to marriage. "He that giveth her (his virgin) in marriage doeth well; but he that giveth her not in marriage doeth better."[6] "It is good for a man not to touch a woman. Nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let each man have his own wife, and let each woman have her own husband."[7] If the unmarried and widows cannot contain let them marry, "for it is better to marry than to burn."[8] These and other passages[9] in the New Testament inspired a general enthusiasm for virginity. Commenting on the words of the Apostle, Tertullian points out that what is better is not necessarily good. It is better to lose one eye than two, but neither is good; so also, though it is better to marry than to burn, it is far better neither to marry nor to burn.[10] Marriage

[1] Tertullian, *Ad uxorem*, i. 6 (Migne, *Patrologiæ cursus*, i. 1284). *Idem, De exhortatione castitatis*, 13 (Migne, ii. 928 *sq.*). *Cf. Idem, De monogamia*, 17 (Migne, ii. 953).

[2] Strabo, xiv. 1. 23.

[3] Arnobius, *Adversus gentes*, v. 7 (Migne, *op. cit.* v. 1095 *sqq.*). Farnell, 'Sociological Hypotheses concerning the Position of Women in Ancient Religion,' in *Archiv f. Religionswiss.* vii. 78.

[4] Lucian, *De dea Syria*, 15, 27, 50 *sqq.*

[5] Josephus, *De bello Judaico*, ii. 8. 2. See also Solinus, *Collectanea rerum memorabilium*, xxxv. 9 *sq.*

[6] 1 *Corinthians*, vii. 38. [7] *Ibid.* vii. 1 *sq.* [8] *Ibid.* vii. 9.

[9] *St. Matthew*, xix. 12; *Revelation*, xiv. 4; &c.

[10] Tertullian, *Ad uxorem*, i. 3 (Migne, *op. cit.* i. 1278 *sq.*). *Idem, De monogamia*, 3 (Migne, ii. 932 *sq.*).

" consists of that which is the essence of fornication " ;[1] whereas continence " is a means whereby a man will traffic in a mighty substance of sanctity."[2] The body which our Lord wore and in which He carried on the conflict of life in this world He put on from a holy virgin ; and John the Baptist, Paul, and all the others " whose names are in the book of life " [3] cherished and loved virginity.[4] Virginity works miracles : Mary, the sister of Moses, leading the female band, passed on foot over the straits of the sea, and by the same grace Thecla was reverenced even by lions, so that the unfed beasts, lying at the feet of their prey, underwent a holy fast, neither with wanton look nor sharp claw venturing to harm the virgin.[5] Virginity is like a spring flower, always softly exhaling immortality from its white petals.[6] The Lord himself opens the kingdoms of the heavens to eunuchs.[7] If Adam had preserved his obedience to the Creator he would have lived for ever in a state of virgin purity, and some harmless mode of vegetation would have peopled paradise with a race of innocent and immortal beings.[8] It is true that, though virginity is the shortest way to the camp of the faithful, the way of matrimony also arrives there, by a longer circuit.[9] Tertullian himself opposed the Marcionites, who prohibited marriage among themselves and compelled those who were married to separate before they were received by

[1] *Idem, De exhortatione castitatis*, 9 (Migne, *op. cit.* ii. 925).

[2] *Ibid.* 10 (Migne, *op. cit.* ii. 925).

[3] *Philippians*, iv. 3.

[4] St. Clement of Rome, *Epistola I. ad virgines*, 6 (Migne, *op. cit.* Ser. Græca, i. 392).

[5] St. Ambrose, *Epistola LXIII.* 34 (Migne, *op. cit.* xvi. 1198 *sq.*).

[6] Methodius, *Convivium decem virginum*, vii. 1 (Migne, *op. cit.* Ser. Græca, xviii. 125).

[7] Tertullian, *De monogamia*, 3 (Migne, *op. cit.* ii. 932).

[8] This opinion was held by Gregory of Nyssa and, in a later time, by John of Damascus. It was opposed by Thomas Aquinas, who maintained that the human race was from the beginning propagated by means of sexual intercourse, but that such intercourse was originally free from all carnal desire (von Eicken, *Geschichte der mittelalterlichen Weltanschauung*, p. 437 *sq.* ; see also Gibbon, *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ii. 186).

[9] St. Ambrose, *Epistola LXIII.* 40 (Migne, *op. cit.* xvi. 1200).

baptism into the community.[1] And in the earlier part of the fourth century the Council of Gangra expressly condemned anyone who maintained that marriage prevented a Christian from entering the kingdom of God.[2] But, at the end of the same century, a council also excommunicated the monk Jovinian because he denied that virginity was more meritorious than marriage.[3] The use of marriage was permitted to man only as a necessary expedient for the continuance of the human species, and as a restraint, however imperfect, on the natural licentiousness of desire.[4] The procreation of children is the measure of a Christian's indulgence in appetite, just as the husbandman sowing the seed into the ground awaits the harvest, not sowing more upon it.[5]

These opinions led by degrees to the obligatory celibacy of the secular and regular clergy. The conviction that a second marriage of a priest, or the marriage of a priest with a widow, is unlawful, seems to have existed from the earliest period of the Church;[6] and as early as the beginning of the fourth century a synod held in Elvira in Spain insisted on the absolute continence of the higher ecclesiastics.[7] The

[1] Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, i. 1, 29; iv. 11; &c. (Migne, *op. cit.* ii. 247, 280 *sqq.*, 382). *Idem*, *De monogamia*, 1. 15 (Migne, ii. 931, 950). *Cf.* Irenaeus, *Contra Hæreses*, i. 28. 1 (Migne, *op. cit.* Ser. Græca, vii. 690 *sq.*); Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, iii. 3 (Migne, *op. cit.* Ser. Græca, viii. 1113 *sqq.*).

[2] *Concilium Gangrense*, can. 1 (Labbe-Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum collectio*, ii. 1106).

[3] *Concilium Mediolanense*, A.D. 390 (Labbe-Mansi, *op. cit.* iii. 689 *sq.*).

[4] St. Justin, *Apologia I. pro Christianis*, 29 (Migne, *op. cit.* Ser. Græca, vi. 373). Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, ii. 23 (Migne, *op. cit.* Ser. Græca, viii. 1089). Gibbon, *op. cit.* ii. 186.

[5] Athenagoras, *Legatio pro Christianis*, 33 (Migne, *op. cit.* Ser. Græca, vi. 966).

[6] Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church*, p. 37. Lecky, *History of European Morals*, ii. 328 *sq.*

[7] *Concilium Eliberitanum*, A.D. 305, ch. 33 (Labbe-Mansi, *op. cit.* ii. 11):—"Placuit in totum prohiberi episcopis, presbyteris, et diaconibus, vel omnibus clericis positis in ministerio, abstinere se a conjugibus suis, et non generare filios: quicumque vero fecerit, ab honore clericatus exterminetur."

celibacy of the clergy in general was prescribed by Gregory VII., who "looked with abhorrence on the contamination of the holy sacerdotal character, even in its lowest degree, by any sexual connection." But in many countries this prescription was so strenuously resisted, that it could not be carried through till late in the thirteenth century.[1]

These rules and ideas relating to celibacy may be traced to various sources. In the first place, in a community where almost everybody is anxious to marry, a person who willingly refrains from doing so must appear queer, and such queerness may, under otherwise favourable circumstances, help to establish a reputation for sanctity. Yet this could only, at the most, have been a subsidiary cause of religious celibacy.

In many cases the priestess is obviously regarded as married to the god whom she is serving, and is therefore forbidden to marry anybody else. In ancient Peru the Sun was the husband of the virgins dedicated to him.[2] They were obliged to be of the same blood as their consort, that is to say, daughters of the Incas. "For though they imagined that the Sun had children, they considered that they ought not to be bastards, with mixed divine and human blood. So the virgins were of necessity legitimate and of the blood royal, which was the same as being of the family of the Sun."[3] And the crime of violating the virgins dedicated to the Sun was the same and punished in the same severe manner as the crime of violating the women of the Inca.[4] Concerning the priestesses of the Tshi-speaking peoples of the Gold Coast, Major Ellis remarks that the reason for their celibacy appears to be that "a priestess belongs to the god she serves, and therefore cannot become the property of a man, as would be the case if she married one."[5] So also the Ewhe-speaking peoples of the Slave Coast regard the

[1] Gieseler, *Text-Book of Ecclesiastical History*, ii. 275. Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*, ii. 150.

[2] Garcilasso de la Vega, *op. cit.* i. 297.

[3] *Ibid.* i. 292. [4] *Ibid.* i. 300.

[5] Ellis, *Tshi-speaking Peoples*, p. 121.

women dedicated to a god as his wives.[1] In the great temple of Jupiter Belus, we are told, a single woman used to sleep, whom the god had chosen for himself out of all the women of the land; and it was believed that he came down in person to sleep with her. "This," Herodotus says, "is like the story told by the Egyptians of what takes place in their city of Thebes, where a woman always passes the night in the temple of the Theban Jupiter. In each case the woman is said to be debarred all intercourse with men."[2] In the Egyptian texts there are frequent references to "the divine consort," *neter ḥemt*, a position which was generally occupied by the ruling queen, and the king was believed to be the offspring of such a union.[3] As Plutarch states, the Egyptians thought it quite possible for a woman to be impregnated by the approach of some divine spirit, though they denied that a man could have corporeal intercourse with a goddess.[4] Nor was the idea of a nuptial relation between a woman and the deity foreign to the early Christians. St. Cyprian speaks of women who had no husband and lord but Christ, with whom they lived in a spiritual matrimony—who had "dedicated themselves to Christ, and, retiring from carnal lust, vowed themselves to God in flesh and spirit."[5] In the following words he condemns the cohabitation of such virgins with unmarried ecclesiastics, under the pretence of a purely spiritual connection:—"If a husband come and see his wife lying with another man, is he not indignant and maddened, and does he not in the violence of his jealousy perhaps even seize the sword? What? How indignant and angered then must Christ our Lord and Judge be, when He sees a virgin, dedicated to Himself, and consecrated to His holiness, lying with a man! and what punishments does

[1] *Idem, Ewe-speaking Peoples*, pp. 140, 142.

[2] Herodotus, i. 181 *sq.*

[3] Wiedemann, *Herodots zweites Buch*, p. 268. *Cf.* Erman, *Life in Ancient Egypt*, p. 295 *sq.*

[4] Plutarch, *Numa*, iv. 5. *Idem, Symposiaca problemata*, viii. 1. 6 *sq.*

[5] St. Cyprian, *De habitu virginum*, 4, 22 (Migne, *op. cit.* iv. 443, 462). *Cf.* Methodius, *Convivium decem virginum*, vii. 1 (Migne *op. cit.* Ser. Græca, xviii. 125).

He threaten against such impure connections. . . . She who has been guilty of this crime is an adulteress, not against a husband, but Christ."[1] According to the gospel of Pseudo-Matthew, the Virgin Mary had in a similar manner dedicated herself as a virgin to God.[2] The idea that the deity is jealous of the chastity of his or her servants may also perhaps be at the bottom of the Greek custom according to which the hierophant and the other priests of Demeter were restrained from conjugal intercourse and washed their bodies with hemlock-juice in order to kill their passions,[3] as also of the rule which required the priests of certain goddesses to be eunuchs.[4]

Religious celibacy is further enjoined or commended as a means of self-mortification supposed to appease an angry god, or with a view to raising the spiritual nature of man by suppressing one of the strongest of all sensual appetites. Thus we find in various religions celibacy side by side with other ascetic observances practised for similar purposes. Among the early Christians those young women who took a vow of chastity "did not look upon virginity as any thing if it were not attended with great mortification, with silence, retirement, poverty, labour, fastings, watchings, and continual praying. They were not esteemed as virgins who would not deny themselves the common diversions of the world, even the most innocent."[5] Tertullian enumerates virginity, widowhood, and the modest restraint in secret on the marriage-bed among those fragrant offerings acceptable to God which

[1] St. Cyprian, *Epistola LXII., ad Pomponium de virginibus*, 3 *sq.* (Migne, *op. cit.* iv. 368 *sqq.*). See also Neander, *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, i. 378. The Council of Elvira decreed that such fallen virgins, if they refused to return back to their former condition, should be denied communion even at the moment of death (*Concilium Eliberitanum*, A.D. 305, ch. 13 [Labbe-Mansi, *op. cit.* ii. 8]).

[2] *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew*, 8 (*Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, xvi. 25). See also *Gospel of the Nativity of Mary*, 7 (*ibid.* xvi. 57 *sq.*).

[3] Wachsmuth, *Hellenische Alterthumskunde*, ii. 560.

[4] *Cf.* Lactantius, *Divinæ Institutiones*, i. 17 (Migne, *op. cit.* vi. 206) :—"Deum mater et amavit formosum adolescentem, et eumdem cum pellice deprehensum exsectis virilibus semivirum reddidit; et ideo nunc sacra ejus a Gallis sacerdotibus celebrantur."

[5] Fleury, *Manners and Behaviour of the Christians*, p. 128 *sq.*

the flesh performs to its own especial suffering.[1] Moreover, it was argued that marriage prevents a person from serving God perfectly, because it induces him to occupy himself too much with worldly things.[2] Though not contrary to the act of charity or the love of God, says Thomas Aquinas, it is nevertheless an obstacle to it.[3] This was one, but certainly not the only, cause of the obligatory celibacy which the Christian Church imposed upon her clergy.

A very important cause of religious celibacy is the idea that sexual intercourse is defiling and in certain circumstances a mysterious cause of evil.[4] The Syryenians maintain that it develops a peculiar dangerous and contagious quality or substance "which has no definite shape or form" called *pež*; hence a man who has had intercourse with a woman must undergo a rite of purification.[5] So also the Sulka in the central part of New Britain believe that such intercourse pollutes both men and women, married as well as unmarried —a pollution which they call *a sle*. Married persons can themselves cleanse it away, whereas unmarried ones have to ask somebody else to do it for them. The latter, as long as they are polluted, are dangerous both for other people and for themselves. Everybody avoids them and children are warned of them by their parents; and if they are not purified by a particular ceremony, the *sle* with which they are affected will kill them. Even a person who overtakes a couple having sexual intercourse is considered to be defiled and in need of purification, though of a lighter kind.[6] The Tahitians, according to Captain Cook, believed that if a man refrained from all connection with women some months before death,

[1] Tertullian, *De resurrectione carnis*, 8 (Migne, *op. cit.* ii. 806).

[2] Vincentius Bellovacensis, *Speculum naturale*, xxx. 43. See also von Eicken, *op. cit.* p. 445.

[3] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologica*, ii.-ii. 184. 3.

[4] The danger attributed to sexual intercourse has been much emphasised by Mr. Crawley in *The Mystic Rose*. See also Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. 414 *sqq.*; *Idem*, *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco*, *passim*, and especially p. 334 *sqq.*

[5] Nalimov, *Zur Frage nach den ursprünglichen Beziehungen der Geschlechter bei den Syrjänen*, p. 2 *sq.*

[6] Parkinson, *Dreissig Jahre in der Südsee*, p. 179 *sq.*

he passed immediately into his eternal mansion without any purification.[1] When Jellinghaus once asked some Munda Kols in Chota Nagpur if a dog can sin, the answer was, "If the dog did not sin, how could it breed?"[2] Herodotus writes:—"As often as a Babylonian has had intercourse with his wife, he sits down before a censer of burning incense, and the woman sits opposite to him. At dawn of day they wash; for till they are washed they will not touch any of their common vessels. This practice is also observed by the Arabs."[3] Among the Hebrews both the man and woman had to bathe themselves in water, and were "unclean until the even."[4] The Nandi, in Eastern Africa, say that people are dirty (*simwek*) when they have had sexual intercourse, hence they must purify themselves by bathing.[5] The belief in the defiling effect of such intercourse seems to underlie the idea prevalent among various peoples that incontinence, and especially illicit love, injures the harvest.[6] In New Caledonia, "in the case of women engaged in planting, cohabitation is not allowed for some time before and after."[7] Among the Koita of British New Guinea "continence is insisted on when making a new garden. If a man so employed approach his wife his yams will grow but poorly." And among the Motu, another tribe in the same colony, a similar restriction applies to the "master" of a turtle or dugong fishing party, or to any one connected with making

[1] Cook, *Voyage to the Pacific Ocean*, ii. 164.

[2] Jellinghaus, 'Sagen, Sitten und Gebräuche der Munda-Kohls in Chota Nagpore,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* iii. 367.

[3] Herodotus, i. 198. [4] *Leviticus*, xv. 18.

[5] Hollis, *Nandi*, p. 92.

[6] Frazer, *Magic Art*, ii. 105 *sqq.* This is in my opinion a more natural explanation than the one suggested by Sir James G. Frazer (*ibid.* ii. 117) namely, that uncivilised man imagines "that the vigour which he refuses to expend in reproducing his own kind, will form as it were a store of energy whereby other creatures, whether vegetable or animal, will somehow benefit in propagating their species." This theory entirely fails to account for the fact that illicit love, by preference, is supposed to mar the fertility of the earth and to blight the crops—a belief which is in full accordance with my own explanation, in so far as such love is considered particularly polluting.

[7] Atkinson, 'Natives of New Caledonia,' in *Folk-Lore*, xiv. 256.

new turtle or dugong nets.[1] Among the Moánus of the Admiralty Islands a man must observe continence five days before he goes out fishing with large nets, two or three days before he goes to war, and two days before he visits the bachelors' section of the men's house.[2] Among the Nagas of Manipur, according to Mr. Hodson, the periods when a man is in special danger are marked by the prohibition of sexual intercourse; for example, when he is preparing for or returning from a raid.[3] The Wagiriama of British East Africa believe that if men cohabit with their wives during war time "they will be unable to kill any of their enemies, and that if they themselves receive a trifling wound it will prove fatal."[4] Their neighbours, the Wasania, say that if a man has intercourse with his wife during hunting, he will have bad luck and see no animals to kill.[5] Among some other East African tribes—the Akamba, the Akikúyu, and the Atheraka—it was believed that if men and women cohabited during the hours in which the cattle were out grazing this would cause the stock to die, and that it would bring ill-luck upon the village if a man had sexual intercourse with a woman when on a journey.[6] Among the Masai, when poison is being made and when honey wine is being brewed, sexual intercourse is considered dangerous for the man who is making poison and for the man and woman who have been selected for brewing honey wine. Were they to have intercourse during the six days when the honey wine is brewing, the wine would be undrinkable and the bees which made the honey would fly away.[7] Similar taboos are very widespread.[8]

[1] Seligman, *Melanesians of British New Guinea*, p. 140.

[2] Parkinson, *op. cit.* p. 395.

[3] Hodson, *Nāga Tribes of Manipur*, p. 88.

[4] Barrett, 'Notes on the Customs and Beliefs of the Wa-Giriama, etc., British East Africa,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xli. 22.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 31.

[6] Dundas, 'Organization and Laws of some Bantu Tribes in East Africa,' in *Jour. Roy Anthr. Inst.* xlv. 274.

[7] Hollis, 'Note on the Masai System of Relationship and other matters connected therewith,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xl. 480 *sq.*

[8] See, *e.g.*, Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, iv. 226 *sq.*

The fact which chiefly interests us in the present connection is that the idea of sexual defilement is particularly conspicuous in connection with religious observances. It is a common rule that he who performs a sacred act or enters a holy place must be ceremonially clean,[1] and no kind of uncleanness is to be avoided more carefully than sexual pollution. Among the Chipewyan, "if a chief is anxious to know the disposition of his people towards him, or if he wishes to settle any difference between them, he announces his intention of opening his medicine-bag and smoking in his sacred stem. . . . No one can avoid attending on these occasions; but a person may attend and be excused from assisting at the ceremonies, by acknowledging that he has not undergone the necessary purification. The having cohabited with his wife, or any other woman, within twenty-four hours preceding the ceremony, renders him unclean, and, consequently, disqualifies him from performing any part of it."[2] Herodotus tells us that the Egyptians, like the Greeks, "made it a point of religion to have no converse with women in the sacred places, and not to enter them without washing, after such converse."[3] This statement is corroborated by a passage in the 'Book of the Dead.'[4] In Greece[5] and India[6] those who took part in certain religious festivals were obliged to be continent for some time previously. Before entering the sanctuary of Mên Tyrannos, whose worship was extended over the whole of Asia Minor, the worshipper had to abstain from garlic, pork, and women, and had to wash his head.[7] Among the Hebrews it was a duty incumbent upon all to be ritually clean before entering the temple—to be free from sexual defilement,[8] leprosy,[9] and the pollution produced by

[1] See Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. 294, 295, 352 *sq.*

[2] Mackenzie, *Voyages to the Frozen and Pacific Oceans*, p. cii. *sq.*

[3] Herodotus, ii. 64.

[4] Wiedemann, *Herodots zweites Buch*, p. 269 *sq.*

[5] Wachsmuth, *op. cit.* ii. 560.

[6] Oldenberg, *Die Religion des Veda*, p. 411.

[7] Foucart, *Des associations religieuses chez les Grecs*, pp. 119, 123 *sq.*

[8] *Leviticus*, ch. xv. [9] *Ibid.* ch. xiii. *sq.*

the association with corpses of human beings, of all animals not permitted for food, and of those permitted animals which had died a natural death or been killed by wild beasts ;[1] and eating of the consecrated bread was interdicted to persons who had not been continent for some time previously.[2] A Muhammadan would remove any defiled garment before he commences his prayer, or otherwise abstain from praying altogether ; he would not dare to approach the sanctuary of a saint in a state of sexual uncleanness ; and sexual intercourse is forbidden for those who make the pilgrimage to Mecca.[3] The Christians prescribed strict continence as a preparation for baptism[4] and the partaking of the Eucharist.[5] They further enjoined that no married persons should participate in any of the great festivals of the Church if the night before they had lain together ;[6] and in the 'Vision' of Alberic, dating from the twelfth century, a special place of torture, consisting of a lake of mingled lead, pitch, and resin, is represented as existing in hell for the punishment of married people who have had intercourse on Sundays, church festivals, or fast-days.[7] And they abstained from the marriage-bed at other times also, when they were disposed more freely to give themselves to prayer.[8]

Holiness is a delicate quality which is easily destroyed if anything polluting is brought into contact with the holy object or person.[9] In Efate *namim*, or uncleanness, supposed to be contracted in various emergencies, was especially avoided by the sacred men, because it was believed to destroy

[1] *Ibid.* xi. 24 *sqq.* ; xvii. 15. *Numbers*, xix. 14 *sqq.* Montefiore, *Hibbert Lectures on the Religion of the Ancient Hebrews*, p. 476.

[2] 1 *Samuel*, xxi. 4 *sq.* [3] *Koran*, ii. 193.

[4] St. Augustine, *De fide et operibus*, vi. 8 (Migne, *op. cit.* xl. 202).

[5] St. Jerome, *Epistola XLVIII.* 15 (Migne, *op. cit.* xxii. 505 *sq.*).

[6] Lecky, *History of European Morals*, ii. 324. St. Gregory the Great, *Dialogi*, i. 10 (*Migne, op. cit.* lxxvii. 200 *sq.*).

[7] Albericus, *Visio*, ch. 5, p. 17. Delepierre, *L'enfer décrit par ceux qui l'ont vu*, p. 57 *sq.* On this subject see also Müller, *Das sexuelle Leben der christlichen Kulturvölker*, pp. 52, 53, 120 *sq.*

[8] St. Jerome, *Epistola XLVIII.* 15 (Migne, *op. cit.* xxii. 505). Fleury, *op. cit.* p. 75.

[9] On this subject I may refer the reader to my essay on *The Moorish Conception of Holiness* (*Baraka*), ch. iii. p. 121 *sqq.*

their sacredness.[1] The priestly taboos, of which Sir James G. Frazer has given such an exhaustive account in *The Golden Bough*, have undoubtedly in a large measure a similar origin. Nay, sexual uncleanness is not only injurious to holiness with which it comes into contact, but it may also injure holy persons or objects in a more positive manner. When the supreme pontiff in the kingdom of Congo left his residence to visit other places within his jurisdiction, all married people had to observe strict continence the whole time he was out, as it was believed that any act of incontinence would prove fatal to him.[2] In self-defence, therefore, gods and holy persons try to prevent polluted individuals from approaching them, and their worshippers are naturally anxious to do the same. But apart from the resentment which the sacred being naturally feels against the defiler, it appears that holiness is supposed to react quite mechanically against pollution, to the destruction or discomfort of the polluted individual. I shall illustrate these various effects supposed to result from contact between sexual uncleanness and holiness by some ideas I found prevalent in Morocco.[3]

If a person who has been polluted by any discharge of sexual matter enters a holy place, a mosque or a shrine, before he has washed himself, it is believed that he will suffer some misfortune: he will become blind or lame or mad, or he or some member of his family will become ill or die, or he will lose some of his animals, or his corn crop will be bad. I was told that if a person who is not sexually clean visits the tomb of the Aglu saint Sîdi Daud, which is situated on an island in Southern Morocco, he will find that the water in the sea has suddenly risen to such a height that he cannot go back to the mainland, but has to wait till it has gone down. Sexual cleanness is required of those who have anything to do with the corn—the ploughman, the women who clear the crops of weeds in the spring, the reapers, the

[1] Macdonald, *Oceania*, p. 181.

[2] Labat, *Relation historique de l'Éthiopie occidentale*, i. 259 *sq.*

[3] See Westermarck, *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco*, p. 334 *sqq.*; *Idem*, *Moorish Conception of Holiness* (*Baraka*), p. 124 *sqq.*

threshers, the women who grind corn; such persons are otherwise supposed to pollute its *baraka*, or holiness, and also, in many cases, to do injury to themselves. So also if an unclean person goes into a granary, it is believed not only that the grain will lose its *baraka*, but that he himself will fall ill; a Berber from the Ait Waráin told me that he once got bad boils because he entered a granary in a state of sexual uncleanness. Nor must an unclean individual enter the vegetable garden, as such a visit would do harm both to the garden and to the person who went there.[1] If an unclean person goes among the sheep they will die because they are holy animals, or the person himself will suffer some misfortune. If a person who is sexually unclean rides a horse, another holy animal, some evil will happen either to the horse or the rider or both; the horse will get sores on its back, or fall down with its rider, and the latter will have boils, or become ill or die, or be late in arriving at his destination, or not succeed in his business. So also the person who robs the bees of their honey must be clean, lest they should leave the place or die, or the person himself be stung by them; for there is *baraka* in the bees. Sexual intercourse, moreover, destroys the magic efficacy of a charm if it is not removed before the act, and I have also heard that in such a case the person who wears it may become ill; but some people maintain that a charm enclosed in a metal case is not in danger of being defiled.

It should also be noticed that, owing to the injurious effect of pollution upon holiness, an act generally regarded as sacred would, if performed by an unclean individual, lack that magic efficacy which otherwise would be ascribed to it. Muhammad described the ablution which is a necessary preparation for prayer as "the half of faith and the key of prayer."[2] The Moors say that a scribe is afraid of evil spirits only when he is sexually unclean, because then his reciting of passages of the Koran—the most powerful weapon against such spirits—would be of no avail. The Syrian

[1] *Idem, Ceremonies and Beliefs connected with Agriculture, &c. in Morocco*, pp. 17, 22, 23, 28, 46, 47, 54.

[2] Hughes, *Dictionary of Islam*, p. 3.

philosopher Jamblichus speaks of the belief that "the gods do not hear him who invokes them, if he is impure from venereal connections."[1] A similar notion prevailed among the early Christians; with reference to a passage in the First Epistle of the Corinthians,[2] Tertullian remarks that the Apostle added the recommendation of a temporary abstinence for the sake of adding an efficacy to prayers.[3] To the same class of beliefs belongs the notion that a sacrificial victim should be clean and without blemish.[4] The Chibchas of Bogota considered that the most valuable sacrifice they could offer was that of a youth who had never had intercourse with a woman.[5]

If ceremonial cleanliness is required even of the ordinary worshipper it is all the more indispensable in the case of a priest;[6] and of all kinds of uncleanness none is to be more carefully avoided than sexual pollution. Sometimes admission into the priesthood is to be preceded by a period of continence.[7] In the Marquesas Islands no one could become a priest without having lived chastely for several years previously.[8] Among the Tshi-speaking peoples of the Gold Coast men and women, in order to become members of the priesthood, have to pass through a long novitiate, generally from two to three years, during which they live in retirement and are instructed by the priests in the secrets of the craft; and "the people believe that, during this period of retirement and study, the novices must keep their bodies pure, and refrain from all commerce with the other sex."[9] The Huichol of Mexico, again, are of opinion that a man who wishes to become a shaman must be faithful to his wife for five years, and that, if he violates this rule, he

[1] Jamblichus, *De mysteriis*, iv. 11. [2] 1 *Corinthians*, vii. 5.
[3] Tertullian, *De exhortatione castitatis*, 10 (Migne, *op. cit.* ii. 926).
[4] See Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. 295 *sq.*
[5] Simon, quoted by Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, iv. 363.
[6] *Cf.* Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. 352 *sq.*
[7] *Cf.* Landtman, *op. cit.* p. 118 *sqq.*
[8] Waitz-Gerland, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, vi. 387.
[9] Ellis, *Tshi-speaking Peoples*, p. 120.

is sure to be taken ill and will lose the power of healing.[1] In ancient Mexico the priests, all the time that they were employed in the service of the temple, abstained from all other women but their wives, and "even affected so much modesty and reserve, that when they met a woman they fixed their eyes on the ground that they might not see her. Any incontinence amongst the priests was severely punished. The priest who, at Teohuacan, was convicted of having violated his chastity, was delivered up by the priests to the people, who at night killed him by the bastinado."[2] Among the Kotas of the Nilgiri Hills the priests—who, unlike the "dairymen" of their Toda neighbours, are not celibates—are at the great festival in honour of Kāmatarāya forbidden to live or hold intercourse with their wives for fear of pollution, and are then even obliged to cook their meals themselves.[3] It seems that, according to the Anatolian religion, married *hieroi* had to separate from their wives during the period they were serving at the temple.[4] The Hebrew priest should avoid all unchastity; he was not allowed to marry a harlot, or a profane, or a divorced wife,[5] and the high-priest was also forbidden to marry a widow.[6] Nay, even in a priest's daughter unchastity was punished with excessive severity, because she had profaned her father; she was to be burned.[7]

Carried further, the idea underlying all these rules and practices led to the notions that celibacy is more pleasing to God than marriage,[8] and that it is a religious duty for those members of the community whose special office is to attend to the sacred cult. For a nation like the Jews, whose ambition was to live and to multiply, celibacy could never become an ideal; whereas the Christians, who professed the most perfect indifference to all earthly matters, found no difficulty in glorifying a state which, however opposed it

[1] Lumholtz, *Unknown Mexico*, ii. 236. [2] Clavigero, *op. cit.* i. 274.
[3] Thurston, in the Madras Government Museum's *Bulletin*, i. 193.
[4] Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, i. 136, 137, 150 *sq.*
[5] *Leviticus*, xxi. 7. [6] *Ibid.* xxi. 14. [7] *Ibid.* xxi. 9.
[8] *Cf.* Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. 358.

was to the interests of the race and the nation, made men pre-eminently fit to approach their god. Indeed, far from being a benefit to the kingdom of God by propagating the species, sexual intercourse was on the contrary detrimental to it by being the great transmitter of the sin of our first parents. This argument, however, was of a comparatively late origin. Pelagius himself almost rivalled St. Augustine in his praise of virginity, which he considered the great test of that strength of free-will which he asserted to be at most only weakened by the fall of Adam.[1]

An important question now calls for an answer:—Why is sexual intercourse looked upon as unclean and defiling, or in other words, as a mysterious source of danger? That the danger is supposed to be particularly alarming in the case of contact between the polluted individual and anything holy is merely an instance of the general belief that holiness is exceedingly sensitive to, and readily reacts against, external influences; indeed it is not only exceptionally susceptible to influences that are, or are supposed to be, injurious also in ordinary cases, but it is affected or influenced by various acts or omissions which are otherwise considered perfectly harmless.[2] Sexual uncleanness, as we have seen, belongs to the former kind of influences, even though its dangerous character chiefly displays itself when it comes into contact with holiness. Sometimes it is said to cause effeminacy either in the unclean man himself or in other men, who are contaminated by his company; this is the professed reason why among the Moánus of the Admiralty Islands a man must be continent for a couple of days before he goes to war or enters the bachelors' room.[3] Here we have evidently to do with a belief in the transmission of qualities—intercourse with a woman makes the man womanly, or makes him a medium by which womanliness is transferred to others; and such a belief may be supported, if not suggested, by the feeling of weakness or depression following upon sexual intercourse.[4]

[1] Milman, *op. cit.* i. 151, 153.
[2] See Westermarck, *Moorish Conception of Holiness*, p. 137 *sqq.*
[3] Parkinson, *op. cit.* p. 395. [4] *Cf.* Crawley, *op. cit.* p. 187.

This explanation, however, is by no means sufficient to account for all the various evils attributed to sexual uncleanness. It should be remembered that woman is frequently regarded as an unclean being; hence intimate contact with her may be considered polluting. Particularly during menstruation, or when with child, or at child-birth, she is supposed to be charged with mysterious baneful energy—no doubt on account of the marvellous nature of these processes and especially the appearance of blood. And it is probably such frequent temporary defilement of a specifically feminine character that has led to the notion of the permanent uncleanness of the female sex.[1] It is true that not only connection with a woman but any discharge of sexual matter is considered to pollute a man. The Nandi say that a man is "dirty" not only after sexual intercourse, but after an involuntary seminal emission.[2] A similar opinion is held by Muhammadans; once when I was staying in a country place in Morocco where the water supply had become extremely scarce, my Berber teacher, who had always before most regularly said his daily prayers, refrained from doing so for a couple of days because his clothes had been defiled by a pollution. And in Christian penitentials it is prescribed that a man who has a nightly pollution shall get up and sing a certain number of psalms, which varies according as he was polluted "ex cogitatione," or "non voluntate."[3] As woman, however, is the normal centre of sexual life, the notion of her uncleanness may have influenced the conception of its various manifestations. But at the same time I strongly believe that there are other reasons for the impurity

[1] See Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, i. 663 *sqq.*; *Idem*, *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco*, p. 337 *sqq.*

[2] Hollis, *Nandi*, p. 92.

[3] Gregory III., *Judicia congrua pœnitentibus*, ch. 24 (Labbe-Mansi, *op. cit.* xii. 293):—"In somno peccans, si ex cogitatione pollutus, viginti duos psalmos cantet: si in somno peccans sine cogitatione, duodecim psalmos cantet." *Pœnitentiale Pseudo-Theodori*, xxviii. 25 (Wasserschleben, *Bussordnungen der abendländischen Kirche*, p. 600):—"Qui in somno, non voluntate, pollutus sit, surgat, cantetque vii. psalmos pœnitentiales." *Cf. ibid.* xxviii. 6, 33 (Wasserschleben, p. 559 *sq.*).

ascribed to them. The sexual matter and the sexual organs are the seats of mysterious propensities, and the whole process of generation is a mystery. Among the Maori, says Mr. Best, " the organs of generation were deeply imbued with *tapu* (sacredness, sometimes ' uncleanness ') and *mǎna* (influence, prestige, supernatural power), both of an active and of a passive form. This may have sprung from an observance of the mystery of sex. . . . When a person repeated a magic spell, he would place his hand on his genital organs in order to give force, supernatural power (*mǎna*) to his incantation. This is quite Oriental. Observe sundry passages in the Bible, where a man, when making a solemn promise, is said to have placed his hand ' in the hollow of his thigh.' "[1] A similar practice occurs in Morocco in connection with swearing. In Tanna, one of the New Hebrides, *narak*, or bewitching force, is ascribed to a man's penis, even the sight of which is looked upon as dangerous.[2] And the widespread belief in the sorcery of indecent gestures indicates how commonly the organs of generation have been held to be the seat of evil-working power.[3] Moreover, there is the secrecy drawn over the sexual functions and the feeling of sexual shame, which give them the appearance of something illicit and therefore, it seems, has together with other factors led to the idea that they are defiling, or even sinful. In the next chapter we shall examine the nature and origin of this feeling.

[1] Best, ' Maori Marriage Customs,' in *Trans. and Proceed. New Zealand Institute*, xxxvi. 208. See also *Idem*, 'Maori Beliefs concerning the Human Organs of Generation,' in *Man*, xiv. 132 *sqq.*

[2] Sommerville, ' Ethnological Notes on New Hebrides,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxiii. 368.

[3] Hirn, *Origins of Art*, p. 217.

CHAPTER XII

SEXUAL MODESTY

SEXUAL shame may be defined as the shame caused by the idea of the sexual function or anything which is apt to lead to such an idea; and sexual modesty is the fear of, or the tendency to avoid, anything which would arouse sexual shame. It leads to the concealment of the sexual function itself; or of any part of the body the exposure of which may too openly call forth a thought of it, or to the avoidance of any gesture or word that may have a similar effect. I think there can be no doubt that sexual shame thus centres round the sexual function. It is felt at the exposure of certain parts of the body only when such exposure directs the thought to this function. As regards reticences of speech Dr. Havelock Ellis argues that they are not adequately accounted for by the statement that modesty tends to irradiate from the action to the words describing the action, because "there is a tendency for modesty to be more deeply rooted in the words than in the actions";[1] and in support of this view he quotes Kleinpaul's remark that modest women have a much greater horror of saying indecent things than of doing them, believing that "fig-leaves were especially made for the mouth."[2] So also Stendhal observes that "a woman of feeling betrays her sentiments for her lover sooner by deed than by word."[3] This, however, is no evidence against

[1] Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, vol. i. Evolution of Modesty, p. 66.

[2] Kleinpaul, *Sprache ohne Worte*, p. 309.

[3] Stendhal, *De l'amour*, p. 57 *sq.*

the view I am advocating, considering that the deed implies the gratification of a strong desire, and therefore may more easily overcome the resistance of modesty than the word, which possesses no such inducement. We must not, of course, compare words said in public with deeds committed in secret. Persons who indulge in indecent talk would certainly shrink at performing openly the acts which they speak of; this, as we shall see, is the case among savages as well as among ourselves.[1] That sexual modesty is fundamentally concerned with the sexual function is, in my opinion, a fact of the greatest importance for a right understanding of its genesis.

Some degree of sexual modesty is in all probability universal in mankind. There are peoples among whom men or women, or both men and women, go absolutely naked or cover themselves in a manner which could have nothing to do with the feeling of shame. But, as we shall see in a subsequent chapter, this by no means proves the absence of sexual modesty. Cook states that in Tahiti it was customary to "gratify every appetite and passion before witnesses," and that the principal topic in the conversation of the people was always that which was also the principal source of their pleasure, everything being mentioned without any restraint or emotion and in the most direct terms by both sexes.[2] The Nagas in the southern mountains of Assam, according to a Persian historian of the seventeenth century, "go about naked like beasts, and do not mind to copulate with their women in the streets and the bazaars, before the people and the chiefs"; yet the women covered their breasts.[3] Charlevoix tells us that among the Guaycurûs of Paraguay those actions which require most privacy were performed in

[1] Dr. Ellis remarks himself (*op. cit.* i. 68) that in modern Europe, as seems fairly evident from the early realistic dramatic literature of various countries, no special horror of speaking plainly regarding the sacro-pubic regions and their functions existed among the general population until the seventeenth century.

[2] Hawkesworth, *Account of Voyages in the Southern Hemisphere*, ii. 196.

[3] Blochmann, 'Koch Bihár, Koch Hájo, and A'sám, in the 16th and 17th Centuries,' in *Jour. Asiatic Soc. Bengal*, vol. xli. pt. i. 84.

the face of the whole world.[1] It may be fairly doubted, however, that these and similar statements represent the ordinary habits of the peoples concerned; they may refer either to individual cases or to obscenities practised at certain feasts or in connection with certain rites—occasions when the common rules of decency are frequently suspended. In no case must they be regarded as typical expressions of savage behaviour.

Cook says of the Maori that in their "carriage and conversation there was as much modest reserve and decorum with respect to actions, which yet in their opinion were not criminal, as are to be found among the politest people in Europe";[2] and from a later time we have the statement that between unmarried persons of both sexes among them "there is much delicacy of intercourse in the presence of others," although their songs, dances, and conversation are occasionally indelicate.[3] With reference to some tribes in South-East Australia, Ridley observes that "in their own way, within the limits of traditional rule, the Aborigines are very strict in the observance of the dictates of natural modesty."[4] Among the natives of Northern Queensland "a woman will rarely join in any filthy songs or stories indulged in by the men, and seldom converses upon any sexual matter except with other females. On the other hand, in times of quarrel, &c., she will give way to language of the most obscene character—the only method she can employ of showing her contempt—for the benefit of the man or men she may be angered with."[5] Like many other peoples,[6] these natives have both a decent and an indecent vocabulary for the sexual parts.[7] The savages of the Bismarck Archi-

[1] Charlevoix, *History of Paraguay*, i. 92. Baron Nordenskiöld says (*Indianliv i El Gran Chaco*, p. 82) that among the Ashluslay of the Gran Chaco several couples lie together after their dances, and that "spectators are not unusual." [2] Hawkesworth, *op. cit.* iii. 450.

[3] Thomson, *Story of New Zealand*, i. 177.

[4] Ridley, *Kamilaroi, Dippil, and Turrubul*, p. 157.

[5] Roth, *North Queensland Ethnography: Bulletin No. 8. Notes on Government, &c.*, p. 7. [6] Havelock Ellis, *op. cit.* i. 67.

[7] Roth, *op. cit.* p. 7. *Idem, Ethnological Studies among the North-West-Central Queensland Aborigines*, p. 184.

pelago, who are anything but chaste in their habits, make use of euphemistic expressions in speaking of those parts;[1] and we are told that in the district of Laur in New Ireland men and women, boys and girls, sometimes commit suicide when an indecent word is shouted to them as an insult.[2] Of some of the Marshall Islanders, Chamisso wrote:—"Unmarried women enjoy their freedom, under the protection of decorum. The girl requires presents from the man; but the veil of modesty is drawn over all the connections which unite the two sexes."[3] So also among the Mortlock Islanders, although a girl is at liberty to have intercourse with men belonging to other tribes, "decorum is strictly observed in every case."[4] In all the south-eastern parts of British New Guinea visited by Dr. Seligman, in spite of the great freedom granted to the unmarried of both sexes, the people "were absolutely modest in their behaviour and nowhere was an indecent gesture seen. The men carry their physical modesty further than do Europeans, for no one takes off his perineal bandage when bathing, and a native would be almost as much ashamed to remove this before a single kinsman as he would be to stalk naked through his hamlet. Women are equally particular and are said never to strip before one another."[5] Of the Koita—among whom "continence, except when ceremonially imposed on the man, is practically unknown, and the girls are habitually unchaste"—we are told that "the greatest decorum is, however, observed between the sexes, while in public they usually avoid each other."[6] Among the Mailu, whose culture is essentially of the same type as that of the Koita, much secrecy and reticence seem to obtain between man and woman in sex matters.[7] So also there is modesty in the relations between

[1] Pfeil, *Studien und Beobachtungen aus der Südsee*, p. 74.

[2] Stephan and Graebner, *Neu-Mecklenburg (Bismarck-Archipel)*, p. 110. [3] Kotzebue, *Voyage of Discovery into the South Sea*, iii. 172.

[4] Kubary, 'Die Bewohner der Mortlock Inseln,' in *Mittheil. Geograph. Geselisch. Hamburg*, 1878–79, p. 252.

[5] Seligman, *Melanesians of British New Guinea*, p. 568.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 134.

[7] Malinowski, 'Natives of Mailu,' in *Trans. Roy. Soc. South Australia*, xxxix. 564.

the sexes among the natives of Kaiser Wilhelm Land.[1] Their notions of decency require that a married man shall never be seen publicly in the company of his wife, nor take the slightest notice of her in the presence of others; if he has been long absent from his village, he, on his return, passes her without even looking at her.[2] According to Seemann, it was quite contrary to Fijian ideas of delicacy that husband and wife should sleep under the same roof; thus a man spent the day with his family, but absented himself on the approach of night, and *rendezvous* between the couple were arranged in the depths of the forest, unknown to anybody else.[3] A later writer, however, says that it is a mere fiction that the marriages of the Fijians were consummated in the bush.[4] But in various islands belonging to the Malay Archipelago, according to Riedel, sexual intercourse takes place in the forest, not in the house.[5] He says that in Ceram all natural functions, especially that of *coitus*, are performed in secret, by preference in the forest, and that two persons are forbidden to speak of sexual matters in the presence of a third.[6] Among the Veddas of Ceylon indecent language, so common in Sinhalese and Tamil villages, is said to be unknown; this, in the opinion of Mr. Nevill, "is probably due to the restraint felt in the presence of women known to be virtuous."[7] Among the Andamanese "coarse conversation appears to be of rare occurrence and to meet with little or no encouragement."[8]

[1] Vetter, 'Bericht über papuanische Rechtsverhältnisse, namentlich bei den Jabim,' in *Nachrichten über Kaiser Wilhelms-Land*, 1897, pp. 87, 93. Schellong, 'Ueber Familienleben und Gebräuche der Papuas der Umgebung von Finschhafen,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xxi. 18. [2] Neuhauss, *Deutsch Neu-Guinea*, i. 161 *sq.*

[3] Seemann, *Viti*, pp. 110, 191. [4] Thomson, *Fijians*, p. 202.

[5] Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua*, pp. 260 (Aru Islands), 448 (Wetter). For a similar custom among the Kaya-Kaya of Dutch New Guinea see Pöch, 'Vierter Bericht über meine Reise nach Neuguinea,' in *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserl. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, vol. cxv. pt. i. 902. [6] Riedel, *op. cit.* p. 96.

[7] Nevill, 'Vaeddas of Ceylon,' in *Taprobanian*, i. 178.

[8] Man, 'Aboriginal Inhabitants of the Andaman Islands,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xii. 94 n. 2.

Among the Kalmucks "lads and girls allow themselves no frivolous jokes. Even young men are ashamed to speak of things which offer the European youth materials for daily entertainment."[1] The Siberian Yukaghir, in spite of the sexual licence prevailing among them, are generally very bashful and modest in their speech.[2] Tessmann says that if you discuss anything sexual with a West African Pangwe negro, you will hear him repeatedly utter the word *oson*, which means "shame."[3] The Negroes of the Bali countries are not ashamed to speak of sexual matters even in the presence of women, but they have sexual intercourse only in private.[4] Of the Negroes of Accra, Monrad wrote that they, in spite of their licentiousness and obscene dances, otherwise observed in their relations to the fair sex a decency which is often lacking even among civilised Europeans.[5]

Among the Witoto and Boro of the North-West Amazons "the women are extraordinarily modest in their behaviour"; but at the same time we are told that "sexual matters appeared to be discussed freely and lewdly by both sexes, and even by young children."[6] On the other hand, Koch-Grünberg relates that when talking to some Desana Indians on sexual subjects, the conversation was stopped by them till the women were sent away, and only after their departure the men began to talk freely and broadly.[7] Among the Chiriguanos of the Gran Chaco, who allow the greatest freedom in the relations between the sexes, Father Chomé was struck by the propriety of their conversation and their behaviour in general; he never heard an indecent word among them.[8] But at present they are anything but modest in their speech.[9] Hans Stade, who in the middle of

[1] Bergmann, *Nomadische Streifereien unter den Kalmüken*, iii. 288.
[2] Jochelson, *Yukaghir*, p. 62 *sqq.*
[3] Tessmann, *Die Pangwe*, ii. 256.
[4] Hutter, *Wanderungen und Forschungen im Nord-Hinterland von Kamerun*, pp. 331, 374, 376.
[5] Monrad, *Bidrag til en Skildring af Guinea-Kysten*, p. 56 *sq.*
[6] Whiffen, *North-West Amazons*, p. 262.
[7] Koch-Grünberg, quoted by Whiffen, *op. cit.* p. 262.
[8] Chomé, 'Dritter Brief,' in Stoecklein, *Der neue Welt-Bott*, vol. iv. pt. xxix. 72. [9] Nordenskiöld, *op. cit.* p. 205.

the sixteenth century was a captive among the Tupinambase on the coast of Brazil, remarks that men and women "conduct themselves decently, and sleep with one another privately."[1] The Indians of British Guiana consider it extremely indecent if a married couple show any signs of mutual affection in the presence of others.[2] Speaking of certain North American Indians, Lafitau observes, "Ils n'osent aller dans les Cabanes particulieres où habitent leurs Epouses, que durant l'obscurité de la nuit; . . . ce seroit une action extraordinaire de s'y présenter de jour."[3] Among various other peoples it is considered indecent or is even prohibited to have sexual intercourse in the daytime.[4] The night is also the time for courtship.[5] Lahontan wrote of some Indians of Canada:—"Nothing of intrigue or courtship must be mention'd to the savage ladies in the day time, for they will not hear it; they'll tell you the night-time is the most proper season for that. . . . This is a general rule, that whoever designs to win the affection of a girl, must speak to her in the day-time, of things that lie remote from the intrigues of love."[6]

Sexual modesty shows itself in various ways in the preliminaries to, or the conclusion of, a marriage, not only on the part of the woman but on the part of the man.

[1] *Captivity of Hans Stade of Hesse, in A.D. 1547–1555, among the Wild Tribes of Eastern Brazil*, p. 144.

[2] Appun, 'Die Indianer von Britisch-Guayana,' in *Das Ausland*, xliv. 832.

[3] Lafitau, *Mœurs des sauvages ameriquains*, i. 576.

[4] Neuhauss, *op. cit.* i. 149 (people of Tami, Kaiser Wilhelm Land). Tessmann, *op. cit.* ii. 253 (Pangwe). Vergette, *Certain Marriage Customs of some of the Tribes in the Protectorate of Sierra Leone*, p. 8. Penna di Billi, *Breve notizia del regno del Thibet*, p. 70.

[5] Long, *Voyages and Travels of an Indian Interpreter*, p. 174 (Chippewa). Harmon, *Journal of Voyages and Travels in the Interior of North America*, p. 340 (Indians on the east side of the Rocky Mountains). Gomes, *Seventeen Years among the Sea Dyaks of Borneo*, p. 120 *sq.*; Ling Roth, *Natives of Sarawak*, i. 109 *sq.* (Dyaks). Seligman, *Melanesians of British New Guinea*, pp. 76, 502, 708.

[6] Lahontan, *New Voyages to North-America*, p. 453. See also Perrot, 'Memoir on the Manners, &c. of the Savages of North America,' in Blair, *Indian Tribes*, i. 69 (Algonkin); Carver, *Travels through the Interior Parts of North America*, p. 241 (Dakota).

Very frequently he avoids directly asking the parents of the girl for her hand. In Futuna, north of the Fiji group, the suitor, without saying anything, left a hog at the house of the parents and then retired; if they retained the animal it was a sign of consent to the marriage, whereas their returning it was a sign of refusal.[1] In Ugi and San Christoval, of the Solomons, where the marriage of a girl is arranged by her parents and friends, "if a man wants a wife, he cooks a dish full of yams and cocoa nuts and carries it to the house of his bride elect, whence he returns without uttering a word. The next morning he returns to take the dish away. If the food has not been eaten, he is not accepted, and he takes this as an insult; if, on the other hand, the bowl is empty and a couple of fathoms of money left instead of it, he is not accepted either, but the family wishes to keep on friendly terms with the suitor. Finally, if the dish be *entirely empty* he is accepted."[2] In Samoa, among the middle and lower classes, if a young man desired to marry a girl, "he either made known his wishes by means of a friend, *soa*, or else, preparing an oven of food as a present, he posted off with it himself to the family of the young girl. If it was refused, it was an intimation that his attentions were discouraged; but if accepted, it was understood that his visits would be approved by the family, and the marriage was soon arranged. . . . Among the higher ranks, however, proposals for marriage were always made through the medium of a third party, or *soa*, literally a companion."[3] Among the Koryak it frequently happens that a young man does not tell anybody of his intentions. "He goes to the house in which the girl lives whom he desires to marry, and, without saying a word, remains there, performing all house-work becoming to a man. The house-owner receives the suitor's services with the same silence as he renders them." This is particularly practised when parents disapprove of their son's choice

[1] Grézel, *Dictionnaire Futunien-Français*, p. 232.

[2] Elton, 'Notes on Natives of the Solomon Islands,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xvii. 94.

[3] Stair, *Old Samoa*, p. 171 *sq.*

and he does not want to submit to their disapproval; otherwise the parents or other elder relatives of the young man go to the bride's parents as match-makers for him.[1] The practice of employing one or more go-betweens for arranging a marriage is extremely widespread both among savages[2] and among more civilised nations.[3] It is common in the Muhammadan world,[4] as it was among the heathen

[1] Jochelson, *Koryak*, p. 739.

[2] Prichard, *Through the Heart of Patagonia*, p. 93 (Tehuelches). Candelier, *Rio-Hacha et les Indiens Goajires*, p. 210. Russell, 'Pima Indians,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethnol.* xxvi. 183. La Flesche, 'Osage Marriage Customs,' in *American Anthropologist*, xiv. 129. Dorsey, 'Omaha Sociology,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethnol.* iii. 259. Teit, 'Thompson Indians of British Columbia,' in *Memoirs American Museum Nat. Hist.*, Anthropology, i. 322. Jochelson, *Yukaghir*, p. 88. Scott Robertson, *Káfirs of the Hindu-Kush*, p. 533. Hutchinson, *Account of the Chittagong Hill Tracts*, p. 96 (Chukmas). Gurdon, *Khasis*, p. 128. Hodson, *Nāga Tribes of Manipur*, p. 87. Rose and Brown, 'Lisu Tribes of the Burma-China Frontier,' in *Memoirs Asiatic Soc. Bengal*, iii. 262. Davidson, *Island of Formosa*, p. 573 (Tsalisens). Worcester, *Philippine Islands*, p. 492 (Tagbanuas of Culion and Busuanga). Perelaer, *Ethnographische beschrijving der Dajaks*, p. 47. Meinicke, *Die Inseln des Stillen Oceans*, ii. 407 (certain Ladrone Islanders). Hahl, 'Ueber die Rechtsanschauungen der Eingeborenen des Innern der Gazelle Halbinsel,' in *Nachrichten über Kaiser Wilhelms-Land und den Bismarck-Archipel*, 1897, p. 78. Junod, *Life of a South African Tribe*, i. 103 (Thonga). Volkens, *Der Kilimandscharo*, p. 251 (Wadshagga). Baumann, *Usambara*, p. 45 (natives of the Tanga coast). Ling Roth, *Great Benin*, p. 38. Thomas, *Anthropological Report on Ibo-speaking Peoples of Nigeria*, i. 65.—Among various peoples the proposal is, often at least, made by the young man's father or parents (Goddard, *Life and Culture of the Hupa*, p. 55; Hutton, *Among the Eskimos of Labrador*, p. 76; Bogoras, *Chukchee*, p. 584; Jochelson, *Koryak*, p. 739; Batchelor, *Ainu and their Folk-Lore*, p. 224; Stack, *Mikirs*, p. 17; Proust de la Girondière, *Twenty Years in the Philippines*, p. 271 [Aëtas]; Walen, 'Sakalava' [Madagascar], in *Antananarivo Annual*, no. viii. 52; Kropf, *Das Volk der Xosa-Kaffern im östlichen Süd-Afrika*, p. 133; Weule, *Native Life in East Africa*, p. 306 [Wayao]; Cunningham, *Uganda*, p. 101 [Bakoki]; Ellis, *Yoruba-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast of West Africa*, p. 153).

[3] Bowring, *Kingdom and People of Siam*, i. 118; Young, *Kingdom of the Yellow Robe*, p. 89 (Siamese). Saunderson, 'Notes on Corea and its People,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxiv. 305.

[4] Westermarck, *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco*, p. 19.

Arabs;[1] it prevailed in ancient India;[2] it has existed, or still exists, in European countries.[3]

The bashfulness of the young man, as well as of the girl, may last after the match has been arranged. In the Banks Islands, according to Dr. Codrington, "boys and girls, and young people generally, who are engaged are very shy about it, and will hardly look at one another; but as the time for marriage draws on it is correct for the youth to make little presents and otherwise shew attention."[4] At Vanua Lava, in Port Patteson, says the same authority, "boys and girls who are engaged generally avoid one another, but through shyness, not by rule."[5] Among the Bororó Indians in Matto Grosso, if a man has accepted the proposal of marriage made by a girl, he still remains in the *bahito* (the men's house) one or two, or even ten or fifteen, days, because he is ashamed to be seen entering the house of his bride. Occasionally his prospective father-in-law fetches him late at night so that he may not be hurt by the gibes and mockings of the other men in the *bahito*. "This sense of shame is accentuated if neither of the two have had sexual intercourse before."[6] The bashfulness is particularly marked or symbolically accentuated at the wedding.[7] Among the Andamanese, "when the elders of the Sept are aware that a young couple are anxious to be married, the bride is taken to

[1] Freytag, *Einleitung in das Studium der Arabischen Sprache*, p. 202. Wellhausen, *Reste des arabischen Heidentums*, p. 433 n. 1.

[2] Haas, 'Die Heirathsgebräuche der alten Inder,' in Weber's *Indische Studien*, v. 181, 236, 276, 288, 291–293, 380, 411. Winternitz, 'Das altindische Hochzeitsrituell,' in *Denkschriften der Kaiserl. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Classe*, xl. 21, 39 *sq.* Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*, i. 482.

[3] Weinhold, *Die deutschen Frauen in dem Mittelalter*, i. 316 *sqq.* v. Schroeder, *Die Hochzeitsgebräuche der Esten und einiger andrer finnisch-ugrischer Völkerschaften, in Vergleichung mit denen der indogermanischen Völker*, p. 32 *sqq.* Sartori, *Sitte und Brauch*, i. 52.

[4] Codrington, *Melanesians*, p. 240. [5] *Ibid.* p. 43.

[6] Frič and Radin, 'Contributions to the Study of the Bororo Indians,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxvi. 390.

[7] See Parsons, 'The Reluctant Bridegroom,' in *Anthropos*, x.–xi. 65 *sq.*

a newly made empty hut and made to sit down in it. The bridegroom runs away into the jungle, but, after some struggling and pretence at hesitation, is brought in by force and made to sit down on the bride's lap. This is the whole of the ceremony. The newly married couple have little to say to, and are very shy of, each other, for at least a month after marriage, when they gradually settle down together."[1] Among the Roro of British New Guinea, when the bridegroom sees the bridal procession coming he hides in the men's clubhouse, but his companions soon drag him forth, and then, disregarding his complaints, paint and decorate him, and bring him to his father's house, to which the bride has already come. Here he is made to sit down near her, while the onlookers call out, "So-and-so is married to so-and-so." But the bridegroom and bride take no notice of each other, the former only talking to his friends; and in the evening he goes to sleep in the clubhouse, while the bride sleeps in the house of her father-in-law.[2] In New Britain the bride has to stay five days alone in the bridegroom's house, while he himself is hiding away in a place in the forest or the high grass known only to the men.[3] Among the Abkhasians of the Western Caucasus the bridegroom runs away and hides on his wedding night.[4] On the third night of an Apache wedding both bride and bridegroom suddenly disappear—until then they have not even been permitted to speak with each other, and when they come back the young bride assumes the air and pretences of extraordinary modesty.[5] In Morocco the bashfulness of bride and bridegroom is expressed or symbolised in their extremely reserved behaviour throughout the wedding, in many of the abstinences which they have to observe, and in the covering up of their faces, the shutting up of the bride in a box, and other

[1] Portman, *History of Our Relations with the Andamanese*, i. 42. See also Man, in *Jour. Authr. Inst.* xii. 137.

[2] Seligman, *op. cit.* p. 269. See also Williamson, 'Some unrecorded Customs of the Mekeo People of British New Guinea,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xliii. 276.

[3] Parkinson, *Im Bismarck-Archipel*, p. 98.

[4] v. Seidlitz, 'Die Abchasen,' in *Globus*, lxvi. 40.

[5] Cremony, *Life among the Apaches*, p. 248.

ceremonies.[1] The mock-capture of the bride and the resistance made by her will be dealt with later on.

We now come to the interesting question how to explain the origin of sexual modesty. Already St. Augustine asked why even conjugal intercourse, legitimate and honourable though it be, seeks retirement from every eye; but the only answer he could give was, "Because that which is by nature fitting and decent is so done as to be accompanied with a shame-begetting penalty of sin."[2] Stendhal observes:—"People have noticed that birds of prey hide themselves to drink; the reason being that, obliged to plunge their head in the water, they are at that moment defenceless. After a consideration of what happens at Tahiti, I see no other natural basis for modesty."[3] Several other writers have traced modesty at least in part to a similar origin.[4] Thus Tillier writes, "Il nous paraît évident que ce sentiment a eu comme origine première la nécessité de nous dérober au danger pendant l'accouplement: les individus accouplés étant absolument incapables de songer à leur conservation et d'y veiller, pendant l'union sexuelle, ont dû nécessairement rechercher la solitude."[5] It has been pointed out that this is done by certain animals; elephants are said to retire to the densest part of the jungle, and camels to the loneliest solitude of the desert, before they copulate.[6] And it is argued that if our domestic animals take no such precaution, the reason is that they are safe without it.[7] But would not the same apply to savage man, at least when he is in his shelter or when he is surrounded by friends, and to civilised man on practically all occasions?

[1] See Westermarck, *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco*, p. 345, and General Index, *s.v.* 'Bashfulness.'

[2] St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, xiv. 17 (Migne, *Patrologiæ cursus*, xli. 426 *sq.*).

[3] Stendhal, *De l'amour*, p. 55 (English translation by Woolf, p. 81).

[4] Mortimer, *Chapters on Human Love*, p. 40. Crawley, *Mystic Rose*, p. 134. Maupetit, 'La pudeur,' in *Bull. et mémoires Soc. d'Anthr. Paris*, ser. vi. vol. v. 412.

[5] Tillier, *L'instinct sexuel chez l'homme et chez les animaux*, p. 254.

[6] Lejeune, in *Bull. et mém. Soc. d'Anthr. Paris*, ser. vi. vol. v. 417. Mortimer, *op. cit.* p. 40.

[7] Tillier, *op. cit.* p. 254.

How is it, then, that an instinct which in the case of domesticated animals has been lost, when no longer needed, has been preserved, nay intensified, in mankind, though equally superfluous? Moreover, if the need of privacy or "the dread of the approach of enemies" were at the bottom of sexual modesty, might we not expect to find a feeling of bashfulness also with regard to sleep, which implies a much greater degree of defencelessness and a much longer exposure to danger than does the act of procreation?

According to another theory, closely allied to the one just discussed, the secrecy in sexual matters is the result of the fear of being disturbed by rivals. "The practice of stealing away to some solitary spot, where no rival could disturb the enjoyment of this pleasure," says Professor Lester Ward, "grew into a regular and permanent custom, and like all customs was continued after the cause which originated it and made it necessary ceased to exist. . . . Fear of being circumvented and prevented from consummating a pleasurable act otherwise entirely natural and proper—this was the originating cause of modesty. We see something approaching it in animals. The rivalries of wild animals, could we fully comprehend their effects, would show us some of the first steps in the direction of establishing such a custom as that which grew up among men. . . . Where there are several cocks, they seek to separate their chosen mates from the rest in order to enjoy perfect immunity."[1] The last-mentioned fact, instead of supporting the theory, discloses its weakness. The cock avoids the presence of other cocks, but not the presence of other hens besides its mate. So also the fear of rivals might have induced men to avoid intercourse in the presence of other men, not in the presence of women. But how, then, could such fear have been the originating cause of sexual modesty, considering that men exhibit this feeling chiefly towards *women*, and that it is even more marked in women than in men, or at least in young virgins compared with young men of the same age?

[1] Ward, *Dynamic Sociology*, i. 634 *sq.* *Cf.* Crawley, *op. cit.* pp. 150, 180; Mortimer, *op. cit.* p. 40.

Sexual modesty is further supposed to be due, in a large measure, to fear of causing disgust.[1] Dr. Havelock Ellis points out that even savages very low down in the scale feel repugnance to the public satisfaction of natural needs. Thus there are peoples who consider it immodest to eat in public.[2] When Dr. von den Steinen, in the presence of some Bakaïrí, ate a piece of fish offered him, they hung their heads and were ashamed.[3] But I strongly doubt that the custom of eating in solitude, where it exists, is really in the first place due to fear of causing disgust. As Mr. Crawley observes, it is a common belief that the presence of other persons may contaminate the food either involuntarily or through their evil eye.[4] At any rate, the rule of eating alone is by no means sufficiently widespread to justify the assumption that there is in man an instinctive disposition to feel disgust at the sight of eating; among ourselves there is not a trace of such a feeling, provided that the eating is conducted in the manner prescribed by the social etiquette. It is different with the satisfaction of certain other natural needs. But even in the case of the excretory functions it seems that publicity is naturally apt to cause disgust chiefly when the function is productive of an obnoxious smell, whereas the concealment of urination is largely a matter of sexual modesty. As for the sexual function, I fail to see on what ground it, in normal cases, could be a cause of disgust, unless it for some other reason were looked upon as something to be concealed. Sexual indecency is no doubt disgusting, but I am inclined to believe that it is disgusting *because* it is indecent, rather than indecent because it is

[1] Ellis, *op. cit.* i. 46 *sqq.* Renouvier and Prat, *La nouvelle monadologie*, p. 221: "La pudeur est d'abord une crainte qui nous avons de déplaire, d'avoir à rougir de nos imperfections de nature." Crawley, *op. cit.* p. 139.

[2] Ellis, *op. cit.* i. 48 *sq.* For instances of eating in solitude see Crawley, *op. cit.* p. 150 *sqq.*

[3] von den Steinen, *Unter den Naturvölkern Zentral-Brasiliens*, p. 66.

[4] Crawley, *op. cit.* p. 156 *sqq.* See also Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, i. 561.

disgusting. If the sexual function were intrinsically disgusting to outsiders, how could the feelings centering round it be the favourite topic of polite literature and the stage, whereas the excretory functions are at most the source of a vulgar joke ?

By this criticism I certainly do not mean to deny that there may have been in mankind an original desire to perform the sexual function in secret, apart from any feeling of shame. Fear of being attacked by an enemy, fear of being interrupted by a rival, fear of causing unsatisfied desire and unpleasant emotions in others—which Dr. Havelock Ellis and Mr. Crawley seem to include in the fear of causing disgust—may all have induced men to observe such secrecy. Indeed, the mere presence of a more or less curious onlooker may be sufficiently disturbing to be dreaded by a loving couple. Yet I do not believe that any of these factors can account for the essential characteristics of sexual modesty.

One of these characteristics is that it is chiefly, though by no means exclusively, displayed in the presence of persons of the opposite sex. Another is that it is more developed, or at least more ostensible, in women, or rather young women, than in men of the same age. The opinion has, it is true, been expressed that men are really more modest than women.[1] But I consider that Dr. Havelock Ellis is indisputably right in his statement that modesty—which he defines as " an almost instinctive fear prompting to concealment and usually centering around the sexual processes "—while common to both sexes, is more peculiarly feminine, so that it may almost be regarded as the chief secondary sexual character of women on the psychical side. The woman, he adds, who is lacking in this kind of fear is lacking, also, in sexual attractiveness to the normal and average man. The organic sexual demands of women call for coyness in

[1] Céline Renooz, *Psychologie comparée de l'homme et de la femme*, p. 86 *sq.* Sergi and Viazzi, quoted by Ellis, *op. cit.* i. 3. M. Tillier observes (*op. cit.* p. 255), " Nous n'avons aucune raison de croire que le sentiment *instinctif* de la pudeur soit plus développé chez la femme : la réserve de celle-ci est certainement plus grande, mais c'est là un phénomène différent."

courtship. Their modesty is not an artificial garment, which they throw off or on at will: it is organic, "but like the snail's shell, it sometimes forms an impenetrable covering, and sometimes glides off almost altogether. A man's modesty is more rigid, with little tendency to deviate toward either extreme. Thus it is, that, when uninstructed, a man is apt to be impatient with a woman's reticences, and yet shocked at her abandonments."[1] I think there can be no doubt that the coyness which the female animal shows when she is courted by the male is one root of sexual modesty in mankind. This accounts for the peculiarly feminine character of this feeling, for the attractiveness it possesses in the eyes of the men, for the readiness with which its behaviour becomes a cover of coquetry, and, partly, for the broad fact that it is particularly felt towards a person of the opposite sex. Even if sexual modesty had no other root than feminine coyness, some reserve would, among human beings, be displayed not only by women in the presence of men, but also by men in the presence of women. For both for prudential and altruistic motives the men would naturally avoid uselessly to hurt the feelings of the other sex and make the women blush for shame. And when once observed in the relations between the sexes, the reserve might be fossilised into general social customs in the shape of decency and thus in some measure also affect the men's behaviour towards persons of their own sex.

This theory of the origin of sexual modesty is of course very incomplete in so far that it accepts female coyness as a fact without trying to explain it. But an explanation of female coyness can only be attempted in connection with a general theory of courtship, and this requires a chapter by itself. At the same time our explanation of sexual modesty suffers from another defect. It is also incomplete because this feeling undoubtedly has more than one root. There are certain facts which cannot be explained as either the direct or indirect results of feminine coyness, but indicate a close connection between sexual modesty and the aversion to incest, or, more strictly

[1] Ellis, *op. cit.* i. 1, 4 *sq.*

speaking, the sexual aversion which prevails between members of the same domestic circle, with the exception, of course, of husband and wife.

In Morocco a young man is very shy of his parents in all sexual matters, even such relating to his marriage. This shyness shows itself from the moment when the marriage is first thought of till the wedding has passed and even longer. There is no conversation on the subject between the youth and his parents, or at least his father, and he sometimes entirely avoids the latter from the day when the arrangements for his marriage commence. At Fez the father keeps away from his son's wedding; on the great occasion when the bridegroom, after the arrival of the bride, comes to his parents' house to meet her, his father hides himself somewhere in the house or in another house, or stays in the street. Sometimes the bridegroom puts off his first intercourse with the bride till all the guests have gone away, or till the evening of that day, because, as I was told, he is shy of his parents. Among the Berbers of the tribe Aith Yúsi, in the neighbourhood of Fez, if he lives in the same tent as his parents or one of them, he will, out of bashfulness, stay away during the day even for a whole month, taking his meals somewhere else and visiting his wife only at night; and here, as in many other tribes, he resumes his intercourse with them by a special ceremony, that of kissing their heads. Among the neighbouring tribe the Aith Ndēr the young husband enters his parents' tent in the company of his "vizier," or best-man, and another bachelor, all three with the hoods of their cloaks pulled over their faces, and one after the other they kiss the parents' heads; he is too bashful to appear alone, and for some time afterwards he still shows great shyness of his parents. Among the Ait Waráin, south of Fez, it is the rule that the young husband does not show himself or speak to his parents till some three weeks have passed, when he kisses their hands; and when his wife becomes a mother he never holds the child in his arms in the presence of his father. There is also bashfulness in the relations between the bride and her parents. In Andjra, in Northern Morocco, she does not see

them as long as the wedding lasts. Among the Berbers of the Aith Sádděn, and at Fez, the girl avoids her father at the time of the betrothal. Nowhere in Morocco does the father go to his daughter's wedding. In some places her mother also stays at home, and the same may even be the case with her grown-up brothers.[1]

We are told that in some parts of Algeria[2] and Tunis, also, a son avoids his father or both his father and mother for a longer or shorter time after his marriage. Among some natives of Southern Tunis, " le fiancé est mis au courant huit jours avant la célébration du mariage, par des amis de son âge, des dispositions arrêtées entre parents ; il quitte alors la maison paternelle, car dès ce moment, par pudeur et par respect, il ne doit pas se montrer à ses parents, et cette interdiction dure encore pendant plusieurs mois après son mariage. Il va se cacher dans les jardins, où ses amis lui apportent à manger et viennent lui tenir compagnie."[3] Of some Arabs of the desert an old traveller, d'Arvieux, writes :—" All the relations assist at the wedding, except the bride's father, who leaves the house that evening out of an odd piece of niceness that will not suffer him to be at home whilst they are putting his daughter to bed with a man. The fathers make this a point of honour."[4] Among some other peoples, also, the parents of the bride do not attend their daughter's wedding.[5] In some parts of

[1] For some further details see my *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco*, p. 314 *sq.*

[2] Gaudefroy-Demombynes, *Les cérémonies du mariage chez les indigènes de l'Algérie*, p. 75 (Tlemcen). *Idem*, 'Coutumes de mariage,' in *Revue des traditions populaires*, xxii. 55 (Qalà' of the Beni Rached). Destaing, *Étude sur le dialecte berbère des Beni Snous*, p. 290.

[3] Menouillard, 'Un mariage dans le Sud Tunisien (Matmata),' in *Revue Tunisienne*, ix. 372.

[4] d'Arvieux, *Travels in Arabia the Desart*, p. 235.

[5] Majerus, 'Brautwerbung und Hochzeit bei den Wabende (Deutsch-Ostafrika),' in *Anthropos*, vi. 897. Among the Zulus the bride's mother must not be present at her daughter's wedding, and the father's presence is also forbidden when the bride is his eldest daughter (Hartland, 'Travel Notes in South Africa,' in *Folk-Lore*, xvii. 478).

England [1] and in the West of Ireland [2] the bride's mother refrains from doing so, and in Shropshire her father, too, rarely goes to the church.[3] At Bocking, in Essex, "the parents of the bride keep studiously out of the way at the time of the marriage ceremony." [4]

In Rájput families of Tirhut "it is considered contrary to etiquette for a young married couple to see each other by day so long as the husband's parents are alive, and in particular they must avoid being seen together by the husband's parents, and must not speak to one another in their presence." [5] Among the South African Basuto, "when a youth wishes to marry, he does not go to his father and ask for a wife. Such a course would be most disrespectful, and altogether wanting in etiquette. . . . He gets up very early one morning and takes out his father's cattle to the pasture without milking the cows, and lets the calves run with their mothers and drink all the milk. No notice of this is taken on his return, and the same course is pursued by him for thirty days. All his companions leave him severely alone, and nickname him 'the silly one.' On the thirtieth day his father says, 'Surely my son wants to get married.' This remark is repeated to the youth, and the next day the cattle return to their former habits and are milked as usual." [6] On some islands off the south-west coast of New Britain, when a young man has been accepted by the girl he desires to marry, he asks his brother to inform his mother about it, and she then visits the girl's parents to propose for the hand of their daughter on behalf of her son.[7] In Erromanga, of the New Hebrides, "the girl's father and his friends arranged the match, but,

[1] Miss Burne, *Shropshire Folk-Lore*, p. 291. Henderson, *Notes on the Folk-Lore of the Northern Counties of England and the Borders*, p. 34 (the presence of the bride's mother in the wedding party is inauspicious).

[2] Blake, 'Matrimonial Customs in the West of Ireland,' in *Folk-Lore*, xviii. 81. [3] Miss Burne, *op. cit.* p. 291.

[4] Evelyn Martinengo-Cesaresco, 'American Songs and Games,' in *Folk-Lore Journal*, ii. 246.

[5] Risley, *Tribes and Castes of Bengal. Ethnographic Glossary*, ii. 189. [6] Minnie Martin, *Basutoland*, p. 80.

[7] Vogel, *Eine Forschungsreise im Bismarck-Archipel*, p. 223.

according to their etiquette, the friends, not the father, made the first move ; for he was supposed to be *narumprum*, 'ashamed,' to take much part in the matter."[1] In the Mortlock Islands all frivolous talk is strictly prohibited in the presence of a woman, in case some other member of her "tribe" also happens to be present. Not even such words as those for stomach, girdle, and the covering of the hips must be mentioned ; and if a European, ignorant of native custom, transgresses this rule, the two persons in question will immediately blush for shame and turn away their faces.[2] On the same islands a brother is allowed to play with his sister only till he reaches the age of about seven years ; after this age he is chiefly in male company or plays with girls belonging to another "tribe."[3]

The custom of avoidance between brother and sister has been found in various islands in the Pacific Ocean and in some other parts of the world as well.[4] It has been held to imply the habitual existence in the past of sexual relations between brothers and sisters ; but this is only one of those arbitrary interpretations of customs as survivals of earlier hypothetical conditions which unfortunately are still only too common in social anthropology. M. de Rochas sees in the custom "an unreasonable exaggeration of a natural sentiment, the horror of incest" ;[5] and if he by this means that it is due to exaggerated sexual modesty inside the family

[1] Robertson, *Erromanga*, p. 396.

[2] Kubary, in *Mittheil. Geograph. Gesellsch. Hamburg*, 1878–79, p. 252. *Cf.* Kohler, 'Das Recht der Marschallinsulaner,' in *Zeitschr. vergl. Rechtswiss.* xiv. 433.

[3] Kubary, *loc. cit.* p. 261. See also Arago, *Narrative of a Voyage round the World*, ii. 17 (Caroline Islanders).

[4] de Rochas, *La Nouvelle Calédonie*, p. 239; Atkinson, 'Natives of New Caledonia,' in *Folk-Lore*, xiv. 254. Fox, 'Social Organization in San Cristoval, Solomon Islands,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xlix. 117. Rivers, *History of Melanesian Society*, i. 255 (Guadalcanar in the Solomon Group), 290 *sq.* (Fiji). Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, i. 542, 565 *sq.* (some Australian aborigines) ; ii. 77 *sq.* (Lepers' Island in the New Hebrides), 131 (Central New Ireland), 344 (Gilyak of the island of Saghalin), 638 (Betsimisaraka of Madagascar) ; iii. 245 (Navaho of Arizona and New Mexico, and Arapaho, an Algonkin tribe), 362 (Tsetsaut of British Columbia).

[5] de Rochas, *op. cit.* p. 239.

circle, I think he is right. In Penrhyn Island or Tongarewa "a sister and brother, on meeting after a long absence, cannot fondly rush into each other's arms, but must sit down facing each other, and nod their heads, one to one side, the other to the opposite";[1] this is obviously a rule of etiquette founded on sexual modesty, rather than a precaution against incest. And the same may be said of many of the other avoidance customs. On the Gazelle Peninsula in New Britain,[2] and in Lifu,[3] a married sister is not allowed to converse with her brother. Among the Arunta an elder sister may speak to her brother at all times, but a younger sister may not speak to or look at her brother after both are grown up; and a young woman must not speak to her father as soon as her marriage has been consummated.[4] There may be shyness even in the relations between brothers; in Lepers' Island a man who is laughing with a crowd will cease to laugh on the arrival of his brother.[5] Among the Malagasy men and women are particularly ashamed to expose certain parts of their body in the presence of very near relatives.[6] Dr. Jochelson says of the Yukaghir that "the sense of shame prevailing in a high degree among near relatives undoubtedly helped to prevent sexual intercourse among them."[7] In this connection the following statement made by Dr. Codrington with reference to the natives of the Northern New Hebrides deserves mentioning:—"A girl betrothed in childhood is taken to her father-in-law's house and brought up there; the boy often thinks she is his sister, and is much ashamed when he comes to know the relation in which he stands."[8]

[1] Lamont, *Wild Life among the Pacific Islanders*, p. 136.

[2] Hahl, in *Nachrichten über Kaiser Wilhelms-Land und den Bismarck-Archipel*, 1897, p. 80.

[3] Ray, 'People and Language of Lifu, Loyalty Islands,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xlvii. 287.

[4] Gillen, 'Notes on some Manners and Customs of the Aborigines of the McDonnell Ranges belonging to the Arunta Tribe,' in *Report on the Work of the Horn Scientific Expedition to Central Australia*, iv. 164, 166.

[5] Rivers, *op. cit.* ii. 154.

[6] Grandidier, *Ethnographie de Madagascar*, ii. 137.

[7] Jochelson, *Yukaghir*, p. 86.

[8] Codrington, *Melanesians*, p. 240

Facts like these show that among peoples in different parts of the world sexual modesty is especially strongly developed in relations between members of the same family circle or kin, whether of the same sex or of opposite sexes. We experience the same fact among ourselves—quite contrary to what is the case with the shame felt in connection with, for example, the excretory functions. A young man is certainly in sexual matters more shy of his parents than of strangers, and even between brothers there is commonly more reserve in such matters than between other friends of the same age. I have little doubt that the custom of going on a honeymoon is chiefly due to the same shyness of relatives. Whenever I have asked experienced persons on the subject, the answer, spontaneously given, has confirmed this view.

In the present connection mention should also be made of the taboos so frequently imposed on the intercourse between a married man and his parents-in-law or other members of his wife's family.[1] These taboos may be more or less strict and more or less comprehensive, and they may last for a longer or shorter time; but I think that they have all in the main the same foundation. I shall again give some instances from my experience in Morocco, where the avoidance is less radical than in many other countries, but for this reason not less instructive. Among the Igliwa, a Berber tribe in the Great Atlas Mountains, the bridegroom kisses his mother-in-law on the head when he first meets her after her arrival at his house, but shows much bashfulness in her presence. In the beginning he must not speak to her, and he can never eat with her, unless she comes and lives with her daughter in his house. So also he for some time refrains from speaking to his father- and brothers-in-law, and even later he never eats with them, nor is he seen

[1] For instances of such taboos see Tylor, *Researches into the Early History of Mankind*, p. 288 *sqq.*; Avebury, *Origin of Civilisation*, p. 8 *sqq.*; Andree, *Ethnographische Parallelen und Vergleiche*, p. 159 *sqq.*; Crawley, *op. cit.* p. 400 *sqq.*; Frazer, *Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, p. 84 *sqq.*; *Idem*, *Totemism and Exogamy*, Index, *s.v.* 'Avoidance'; *Idem*, *Psyche's Task*, p. 75 *sqq.*

together with them in public; should any of them come where he is sitting with other persons, he at once gets up and leaves the company. If a man meets a friend whom he has not seen for a while, he jokingly says, "Why have you been running away from me, am I your brother-in-law?" Among the Arabic-speaking Ulâd Buʻăzîz in the province of Dukkâla a man refrains from eating together with or in the presence of his father-, mother-, or grown-up brother-in-law, if they are of another village. If, on the other hand, his father- and brothers-in-law are of his own village, he can eat with them, but there must be no indecent talk in their presence; in case anything indecent is said, he goes away at once, and if it has reference to himself he may even complain of it to his governor, with the result that the offender is compelled to pay a fine. Between a man and his mother-in-law there is considerable mutual shyness. They speak to each other, but not much, and only "sensible words"; if they are from different villages they avoid looking at each other, while if they are from the same village she covers her face and refrains from eating in his presence, though he may eat in hers. In the Ḥiâina, not far from Fez, a man does not speak to his parents-in-law if his own parents are alive, but otherwise he begins to converse with them when a month or so has passed. He is still shyer of his father-in-law than of his mother-in-law, and also avoids a grown-up brother-in-law.[1]

I was told in Morocco that a man would naturally be shy of the persons with whose daughter or sister he has sexual intercourse, and this I take to be the true explanation of the restrictions in question. We hear of similar explanations given by the natives of other countries. Among the Baganda, according to the Rev. John Roscoe, "no man might see his mother-in-law, or speak face to face with her. . . . This was said to be because he had seen her daughter's nakedness."[2] Among the Bahuana of Congo a man may never enter the house of his parents-in-law, and if he meets

[1] For further details see my *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco*, p. 310 *sqq*.

[2] Roscoe, *Baganda*, p. 129.

them in a road he must turn aside into the bush to avoid them. "Repeated inquiries as to the reason of this avoidance on the part of a man of his parents-in-law," says Mr. Torday, "elicited the invariable reply 'that he was ashamed'; to a further inquiry of what he was ashamed, the answer would be 'of marrying their daughter.' No other reason could be obtained."[1] The shyness is naturally apt to be mutual. "All the Indians on the east side of the rocky mountain," says Harmon, "think it very indecent for a father or mother in law, to speak to, or look in the face of a son or daughter in law; and they never do either unless they are very much intoxicated. The reason which they give for this custom, when questioned on the subject, is, the peculiar intercourse which this person has had with their child."[2] Dr. Jochelson speaks of "the natural modesty and bashfulness of the Yukaghir, characterised by the belief that the souls of the father-in-law and his son-in-law are ashamed when they look at each other."[3]

The custom of avoidance between a man and members of his wife's family I thus take to be ultimately based on the sexual bashfulness felt inside the domestic circle. We shall see that the aversion to incest, through an association of ideas and feelings, gives rise to various prohibitions, and it is therefore all the more easy to understand that it has led to a custom like that which we are now discussing. It seems only natural that where this aversion is so exceedingly strong as it is among peoples at the lower stages of culture, a man should feel sexual shame in the presence of persons of his wife's family, who would not only at once come to think of his relations to their daughter or sister but feel aversion to the very idea of those relations, and that they, on their part, also should be anxious to avoid him. Among the West African Pangwe, whose sexual modesty is highly developed,[4] a woman bashfully avoids even the kinsfolk of her son-in-law.[5] Now it may be asked why, as is the

[1] Torday and Joyce, 'Notes on the Ethnography of the Ba-Huana,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxvi. 285 *sq.*

[2] Harmon, *op. cit.* p. 341.

[3] Jochelson, *Yukaghir*, p. 81.

[4] Tessmann, *op. cit.* p. 256.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 261.

case in Morocco, a married man's avoidance of his own parents should be of so much shorter duration than his avoidance of his parents-in-law, although it is, in a way, a more direct expression of the feeling which is at the bottom of both customs. But the answer is not difficult to find. There is no feeling which is more easily influenced by habit than shame, and it would be difficult for the son to avoid his own parents for long, when he lives in their vicinity, if not under the same roof, and has many interests in common with them. As appears from some statements relating to Morocco, already quoted, there is much less restraint in a man's relations to his parents-in-law, also, if they live in his own than if they live in another village, and his avoidance of them soon ceases if his own parents are dead and there, consequently, is more inducement for him to attach himself to his wife's family than would otherwise be the case.

These last-mentioned facts are at variance with Sir E. B. Tylor's conclusion that the avoidance between a man and his wife's family is intrinsically connected with the custom of the husband taking up his abode with the latter.[1] He argues as follows:—"If the customs of residence and the customs of avoidance were independent, or nearly so, we should expect to find their coincidence following the ordinary law of chance distribution. In the tribes where the husband permanently lives with his wife's family (sixty-five out of three hundred and fifty), we should estimate that ceremonial avoidance between him and them might appear in nine cases, whereas it actually appears in fourteen cases. On the other hand, peoples where the husband at marriage takes his wife to his home (one hundred and forty-one out of three hundred and fifty), would rateably correspond with avoidance between him and her family in eighteen cases, whereas it actually appears in nine cases only."[2] This argument, however, suffers from a very serious defect.

[1] Mr. Kidd (*The Essential Kafir*, p. 241) also observes that the statement that in nearly all cases where a man avoids his wife's people and especially his mother-in-law he has entered the wife's family, is hardly borne out in South Africa.

[2] Tylor, 'On a Method of investigating the Development of Institutions,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xviii. 247.

The fact that the avoidance in question has been *noticed* in a comparatively large number of tribes where the custom is for a man to reside with his wife's family by no means proves that it really is less common in tribes whose habit it is for the husband to take her to his own home; for it would naturally be much more conspicuous in the former cases than in the latter. This alone would be a sufficient reason for finding fault with Tylor's interpretation of the custom, when he says that "as the husband has intruded himself among a family which is not his own, and into a house where he has no right, it seems not difficult to understand their marking the difference between him and themselves by treating him formally as a stranger."[1] Accepting Tylor's conclusion that the taboo by the wife's relations of her husband is the result of his residence with the wife's kin, Dr. Hartland goes still further and declares that this taboo "beyond reasonable doubt" is a ceremonial expression of that secrecy in the connection between husband and wife which characterised the earliest stage of marital relations.[2] But we have no evidence whatever that there was such a "stage."

Another explanation of the avoidance between parents-in-law and son-in-law has been given by Lord Avebury. To him it "seems to be a natural consequence of marriage by capture. When the capture was a reality, the indignation of the parents would also be real; when it became a mere symbol, the parental anger would be symbolised also, and would be continued even after its origin was forgotten."[3]

[1] *Ibid.* p. 248. [2] Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, ii. 93.

[3] Avebury, *op. cit.* p. 103. Mr. Mathew (*Eaglehawk and Crow*, p. 115; *Two Representative Tribes of Queensland*, p. 163 *sqq.*) likewise thinks that the avoidance between mother-in-law and son-in-law among Australian tribes is a survival of marriage by capture. With reference to such avoidance among the Kurnai of Gippsland, Mr. Morgan (in his introduction to Fison and Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, p. 16 *sq.*) observes that it is, not unlikely, due to the hostile feelings aroused against the son-in-law in the mind of his mother-in-law in consequence of his elopement with her daughter. Mr. Kidd (*The Essential Kafir*, p. 241) is of opinion that the custom of avoidance among the Kafirs has undoubtedly deep connection with wife-capture, although this cannot account for all the features of the custom.

Against this view it may be said that marriage by capture has played a much more prominent part in the imagination of anthropologists than in the life of savages. According to M. Mauss, again, the avoidance between son-in-law and mother-in-law is the consequence of exogamy; they belong to different phratries, between which there is still a barrier although they have been brought nearer each other through the marriage. In the phratry with which the man has allied himself he has a right only over his wife, whereas her mother remains *sacrée* for him.[1] This hypothesis seems to presuppose that the avoidance in question has grown up in matrilineal exogamous societies, although as a matter of fact it exists in societies which are neither matrilineal nor exogamous.

Dr. Rivers maintains that the Melanesian rules of avoidance—which include prohibitions on the use of the personal name, on conversation, and on passing one another,—when applying to relatives by marriage of different sexes, "carry with them definite implications of potential sexual intercourse," and are connected with ancient sexual communism; whereas similar avoidances between persons of the same sex imply the idea of hostility and the possibility that one relative may injure the other, "evidently to be connected with the condition of hostility between the two moieties of the community."[2] An hypothesis which traces exactly similar rules when observed in the relations between persons of the same sex and in those between persons of different sexes to so widely different causes as sexual communism in one case and conditions of hostility between the members of the two moieties of the community in the other case does not inspire much confidence, especially as rules of the same kind are of almost world-wide prevalence. I have myself observed in a previous work[3] that the avoidance between a son-in-law and his parents-in-law may have something to do with the fact that he has deprived the latter of their daughter; but at the same time it is obvious from

[1] Mauss, at the International Congress of Ethnology and Ethnography at Neuchâtel, quoted in *L'Anthropologie*, xxv. 370 *sq.*

[2] Rivers, *op. cit.* ii. 168 *sqq.*

[3] *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco*, p. 316 *sq.*

various facts that this avoidance is essentially connected with sexual shame. In Morocco all indecent talk is particularly prohibited in the presence of a man and his father- or brother-in-law.[1] So also among the Konde people in "German East Africa" a son-in-law is not allowed to hear any improper talk in the presence of his father-in-law, and so particular are they in this respect that even the hair of the body is a tabooed subject.[2] The *hlonipa* custom of the Kafirs is obviously closely connected with sexual bashfulness—the word *hlonipa* itself is derived from a root which means "shame." A woman has to *hlonipa* all her husband's relations in the ascending line: she must not hold intercourse with them, or mention the emphatic syllable in their names, or even pronounce their names mentally to herself. And she must be specially careful not to uncover in the presence of people whom she has to *hlonipa* any part of the body which is usually covered up; to uncover any part of her body in the presence of her mother-in-law would be considered very shameful. Moreover, the *hlonipa* custom enjoins that the mother-in-law must avoid being seen by her son-in-law with her breasts exposed, "for it is not seemly that the breasts that suckled his wife should be seen by him."[3] Among the Baganda, "if a son-in-law accidentally saw his mother-in-law's breasts, he sent her a barkcloth in compensation, to cover herself, lest some illness, such as tremor, should come upon him."[4]

The avoidance between relatives by marriage of different sexes has frequently been explained as a means of preventing unlawful intercourse.[5] The most obvious weakness of this

[1] See *supra*, p. 440, and Westermarck, *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco*, p. 311.

[2] Fülleborn, *Das Deutsche Njassa- und Ruwuma-Gebiet*, p. 350 *sq.*

[3] Kidd, *op. cit.* pp. 236, 237, 241. Leslie, *Among the Zulus and Amatongas*, p. 141 *sq.* Maclean, *Compendium of Kafir Laws and Customs*, p. 95 *sq.*

[4] Roscoe, *op. cit.* p. 129.

[5] Fison, in Fison and Howitt, *op. cit.* p. 103 *sq.* Macdonald, *Oceania*, p. 189 (Efatese). Weeks, *Among Congo Cannibals*, p. 134 (Boloki). Mr. Kidd (*op. cit.* p. 243) thinks that one reason for the practice of *hlonipa* among the Kafirs was "to render the temptations to incest rare."

explanation has already been touched upon, namely, that it must be supplemented by another one for the avoidance between relatives by marriage who are of the same sex. Dr. Jochelson believes that among the Yukaghir mother- and son-in-law, father- and daughter-in-law, and the elder brother and the wife of the younger one, are on terms of avoidance "probably for the prevention of sexual cohabitation between them"; whereas the avoidance between father- and son-in-law and the elder brother and the husband of his younger sister are on such terms on account of the feeling of bashfulness. But he seems to maintain that in the former cases also this feeling has been a co-operative cause of the avoidance.[1] To Sir James G. Frazer the rules of avoidance likewise appear to have been adopted in order to prevent incest between persons who were deemed too nearly related by marriage; and he argues that the avoidance between persons of opposite sexes were extended "by false analogy to include avoidance between persons of the same sex who stood in a similar relation to each other."[2] I cannot believe, however, that any people could have been so utterly unreasonable as to apply rules established for the express purpose of preventing sexual intercourse between certain persons to other persons between whom such intercourse is entirely out of the question; and least of all can I conceive that a very large number of peoples, many of whom are not even savages, could be guilty of a like absurdity.

But even apart from the awkward necessity of resorting to different explanations of similar rules among the same people, I find it very hard to believe that the intention of preventing incestuous intercourse is at the bottom of the avoidances between relatives by marriage of opposite sexes —even if these avoidances were better suited for the purpose than many of them actually are. Provided that sexual intercourse between the persons of different sexes who are

[1] Jochelson, *Yukaghir*, p. 81 *sq.*

[2] Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, iii. 112 *sq.*; iv. 108 *sqq.* *Idem. Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, p. 85 n. 6. *Idem, Psyche's Task*, p. 93 *sqq.*

subject to these taboos is really looked upon as incestuous—which is by no means certain—one may ask why not similar taboos have been applied to the other persons between whom sexual relations are condemned as incestuous. May we suppose that the mother-in-law—who is a particularly conspicuous figure in the rules of avoidance—is more than other forbidden women an object of sexual attraction for a man who probably in most cases is young enough to be her son? Rather might we suspect that a father-in-law is in danger of falling in love with the wife of his son. Now there are among many peoples rules of avoidance between them also—and there are such rules even between a married woman and her mother-in-law. These rules are quite analogous to those relating to a man and his relatives by marriage, and I believe that they have a similar origin. Among the Bushongo, according to Mr. Torday, "le mari et sa femme doivent tous deux éviter de se rencontrer avec leurs beaux-parents respectifs, et la raison alléguée en faveur de cette coutume est qu'on est 'honteux d'avoir marié son enfant.'"[1] But the avoidance between a daughter-in-law and her father-in-law seems to be less strict or less frequent than that between a son-in-law and his mother-in-law,[2] although we might rather have expected the reverse if the purpose of the avoidances really had been to prevent incestuous intercourse. In Morocco there is no special avoidance at all noticeable in the relations between a wife and her parents-in-law, although—or, as I should say, probably because—they live in very near contact with each other. Moreover, the avoidance of either kind is in many cases only temporary; it may cease or become less strict when a child is born.[3]

[1] Torday and Joyce, *Les Bushongo*, p. 116.

[2] Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, iii. 113. Crawley, *op. cit.* p. 407.

[3] Tylor, in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xviii. 249. Frazer, *Psyche's Task*, pp. 78, 79, 81. Pallas, *Reise durch verschiedene Provinzen des Russischen Reichs*, iii. 47 (Ostyak). Kidd, *op. cit.* p. 238 (Basuto). Majerus, 'Brautwerbung und Hochzeit bei den Wabende (Deutsch-Ostafrika),' in *Anthropos*, vi. 899. The Yakut say that in ancient times "a bride concealed herself for seven years from her father-in-law, and from the brothers and other masculine relatives of her husband" (Sieroshevski, 'Yakuts,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxi. 93).

This seems hard to explain if the taboo was intended to prevent incest but is easy to understand if it is merely an expression of sexual modesty, which, as already said, is readily influenced by habit and necessity. The birth of a child is a signal that the union is to be more or less permanent.[1] Grandparental feelings may help to ease the relations between those who had to avoid each other. And besides, as the brothers Goncourt said, " les petites pudeurs n'existent pas pour les mères."[2]

Like the hypothesis that the rules of avoidance were intended to prevent incestuous intercourse, so Mr. Crawley's explanation could apply only to avoidances between persons of different sexes. He looks upon the avoidances between son-in-law and mother-in-law and between daughter-in-law and father-in-law as merely cases of that taboo between the two sexes which, according to him, is such a prominent feature of primitive society. The female sex is taboo to the male, " because of those qualities which spoil a man," and the male sex is likewise considered dangerous, and is consequently taboo, to the female. Hence the separation between brothers and sisters, boys and girls, as soon as puberty draws near ; hence the avoidance between engaged couples and between the married man and his wife ; hence also the avoidance between relatives by marriage of different sexes. The avoidance between son-in-law and mother-in-law " seems to be causally connected with a man's avoidance of his own wife."[3] But is there really among primitive peoples such a widespread and radical separation between the sexes as Mr. Crawley assumes ? If there were, why should the avoidance between a man and his mother-in-law have attracted the attention of travellers in all parts of the world, whereas so very little is heard of the avoidance of a man and his wife ? There must after all be something peculiar about the relations between son- and mother-in-law, they could hardly be similar to those between men and women in general. Mr. Crawley says " it will be found that the mother-in-law taboo tends to disappear when the

[1] *Cf.* Crawley, *op. cit.* p. 407 *sq.* [2] *Journal des Goncourt*, iii. 5.
[3] Crawley, *op. cit.* p. 408 *sqq.*

taboos between husband and wife are intensified, and *vice versâ*." As sexual taboo must be kept up for safety, also in the case of married people, "a substitute to receive the onus of taboo is useful, and the best substitute is the mother-in-law; if the husband avoids her, his relations with his wife will be secure, and if the mother-in-law avoids him, her daughter's safety will be secured likewise."[1] This is ingenious, but where is the evidence for the fundamental statement that the taboos between son- and mother-in-law and between husband and wife alternate with one another? The avoidance between relatives by marriage of the same sex Mr. Crawley makes no attempt to explain. He has undoubtedly minimised its prevalence and importance.[2] In the Ḥiâina in Morocco, as we have seen, a man is still shyer of his father-in-law than of his mother-in-law. Among the Batoro, south of Lake Albert Nyanza, the avoidance between son- and father-in-law is even more rigid than that between son- and mother-in-law; and among the Lendu, another tribe in Uganda, the father-in-law can never visit his son-in-law, except in the event of the serious illness of his daughter, whereas the mother-in-law may visit her son-in-law and his wife when two months have passed since the marriage.[3] I have no doubt that cases of this kind are exceptional, and believe that the common view is correct, that the rules of avoidance relating to persons of different sexes are more frequent or more rigid than those relating to persons of the same sex. But this is only what may be expected if they are due to sexual modesty, which is most strongly shown towards people of the opposite sex. The presence of a son-in-law is apt to call forth in his mother-in-law associations of ideas that make her blush both as a woman and as a mother; and a daughter-in-law would naturally feel more

[1] *Ibid.* p. 412.

[2] He quotes, for instance (*ibid.* p. 406 *sq.*), Mr. Howitt's denial ('Notes on the Australian Class Systems,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xii. 503) of any taboos between a man and his father-in-law among the Australian natives. But there are such taboos among them, as appears from Curr, *The Australian Race*, iii. 461 (Mount Gambier blacks), and Strehlow, *op. cit.* vol. iv. pt. i. 90 (Arunta).

[3] Cunningham, *Uganda*, pp. 54, 331.

shy of her father- than of her mother-in-law. Among the Yakut the male relatives of the husband had formerly to avoid the young wife; they said, "Ah, poor child, she is bashful." Nowadays they must avoid showing her the body uncovered above the elbow or the sole of the foot, and refrain from indecent expressions and vulgar vituperatives in her presence; and it is a shame for her to show them her uncovered hair and foot.[1] If sexual intercourse between two persons related by marriage is regarded as incestuous, decency would for that reason also require particular reserve in their mutual relations.

A very curious explanation of the avoidance between son- and mother-in-law has been given by M. Reinach. He says that if a man in his intercourse with his wife's family were allowed to see his mother-in-law, there would soon spring up between them such intimacy as to induce him to call her "mother." But if thus both the husband and wife called the same woman "mother" and behaved towards her as if they were both her children, it would appear to others that they were brother and sister and consequently had been guilty of the greatest of all crimes, incest. Now the savage knows only one means of avoiding such an appearance, and that is to have nothing at all to do with his mother-in-law.[2] I should have imagined, however, that another alternative also would have occurred to him. If the use of the term "mother" for the mother-in-law gave rise to misunderstanding (I never heard that it did so among ourselves) he might—simply have refrained from using it.

Some other attempts to explain the rules of avoidance may still be mentioned. According to Mr. Atkinson, they are due to jealousy. The avoidance between mother- and son-in-law is "a measure of protection for the marital rights of the husband of the former." The avoidance between the wife and her husband's relations applies to the relations in the ascending line, that is, his seniors, because

[1] Sieroshevski, in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxi. 93. Miss Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, p. 111.

[2] Reinach, 'Le gendre et la belle-mère,' in *L'Anthropologie*, xxii. 659 *sq.*

" against his juniors he can defend himself, against his seniors he needs the protection of law." The avoidance between father- and son-in-law is a consequence of the unrestricted power and right which the patriarch in primitive times had exercised over his daughters. It originated " during that stage of the transition era, when, incest still lingering, the immigrant suitor was so far acknowledged that his entry into a group was not always delayed till the death of his proposed father-in-law. As they were thus possible rivals there was a chance of friction, only to be averted by the law in question."[1] The last-mentioned explanation need not detain us here : it is based on Mr. Atkinson's view that the primitive social group consisted of a single patriarch and a group of wives and daughters, with all of whom he entertained sexual relations ; and this view, as will be seen in a subsequent chapter, is a mere construction for which there is no foundation in fact. Again, the suggestions that a man has to avoid his mother-in-law owing to the jealousy of his father-in-law and that a woman has to avoid her father-in-law owing to the jealousy of her husband might possess some plausibility only if it could be shown that the former avoidance were regularly connected with matrilocal marriage and the latter with patrilocal marriage ; for it is difficult to see why a man should be more jealous of his son-in-law or of his father-in-law than of other men, or require special precautions against them, unless they lived in particularly close contact with his wife. Now, for reasons already stated, the data relating to the connection between rules of avoidance and the place where the husband takes up his abode must necessarily be unreliable. But we have seen that the avoidance between son- and mother-in-law does occur among many tribes where the husband at marriage takes his wife to his own home. As for the avoidance between the wife and the husband's family, Tylor says that there are no cases of such avoidance where the husband lives with the wife's family.[2] But, as Mr. Crawley remarks, there are such cases ;[3] and in my own

[1] Lang and Atkinson, *Social Origins and Primal Law*, p. 269 *sqq.*
[2] Tylor, in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xviii. 247. [3] Crawley, *op. cit.* p. 406.

notes I find several instances of the two kinds of avoidance being spoken of as co-existent among the same people.[1] It may be added that Mr. Atkinson, in his explanations, ignores the avoidance between a wife and her mother-in-law.

Professor Kohler, again, looks upon the avoidance between a man and his parents-in-law as a survival of a previous custom of group-marriage: it shows that individual marriage is something unusual and novel, and was formerly illegitimate.[2] This is quite in agreement with Kohler's tendency to interpret all sorts of customs as relics from a mythical group-marriage stage, for the existence of which we have no evidence whatever. But the most original explanation comes from Mr. Keane. He says that the strange reluctance of the mother-in-law to meet her son-in-law seems accounted for by a Patagonian practice which persisted till quite recent times. On the death of any young person the head of the family was required to despatch some aged woman, a mother-in-law by preference. Hence through fear of such a fate women acquired the habit of avoiding all contact with their sons-in-law, and the feeling continued after the motive had been forgotten.[3] Mr. Keane does not tell us how it happened that the murder of the Patagonian mother-in-law caused a panic among mothers-in-law all over the world.

In order to obtain a full and detailed explanation of the rules of avoidance between relatives by marriage, as they are found among different peoples, it would no doubt be necessary to examine those rules and the conditions under

[1] Mason, *Ethnology of the Salinan Indians* (California), p. 164. Strehlow, *Die Aranda- und Loritja-Stämme in Zentral-Australien*, vol. iv. pt. i. 102 (Western Loritja). Seligman, *Melanesians of British New Guinea*, p. 485 *sq.* (Southern Massim). Parkinson, *Dreissig Jahre in der Südsee*, p. 67 (natives of Gazelle Peninsula, New Britain). Decle, *Three Years in Savage Africa*, p. 159 (Matabele). Torday and Joyce, *Les Bushongo*, p. 116. Weeks, *Congo Cannibals*, p. 133 *sq.* (Boloki).

[2] Kohler, 'Rechtsphilosophie und Universalrechtsgeschichte,' in v. Holtzendorff, *Enzyklopädie der Rechtswissenschaft*, i. 30.

[3] Keane, *Ethnology*, p. 219.

which they occur much more minutely than has been done hitherto. But I feel confident that they are in the main due to that feeling of sexual shame which a person is naturally apt to experience in the presence of a member of the family circle of his (or her) mate, as well as in the presence of a member of his (or her) own family circle. That there is such a tendency is beyond all dispute ; nor can there be any doubt about its origin. It must be an offshoot of that aversion to sexual intercourse between parents and children, brothers and sisters, and generally persons who have grown up in the same home, which is normally felt among all races of men. This feeling throws a veil of secrecy over the relations between husband and wife and imposes a taboo on sexual matters in all other relations inside the domestic circle. Nay, through the influence of early sentiments and habits, it has also become a motive force of sexual modesty outside that circle. Female coyness could never account for the peculiar sexual reserve between near relatives, nor do I think that it could account for the genuine shyness which characterises true modesty. As Dr. Havelock Ellis points out, it is the sign of sexual emotion, and it easily becomes an invitation.[1] Montaigne speaks of the "artifice" of virgin modesty.[2] "It is the most pudent girl," says Restif de la Bretonne, "the girl who blushes most, that is most disposed to the pleasures of love";[3] and the same thought is more coarsely expressed in the Welsh saying, "The more prudish the more unchaste."[4] The man, again, is excited by the woman's coyness, and thus, as Stendhal puts it, modesty "is the mother of love."[5] At the same time he must lay restraint on his behaviour, he must not make the woman blush for shame ; but what is required of him is outward decency only, and it is doubtful how far female coyness could be the

[1] Ellis, *op. cit.* i. 45 *sq.*

[2] Montaigne, *Essays*, book ii. ch. 15, vol. ii. 332.

[3] Restif de la Bretonne, quoted by Ellis, *op. cit.* i. 46. So also, according to Venette (*La génération de l'homme*, i. 375 *sqq.*), "la femme timide aime plus que la hardie et l'enjouée."

[4] Ellis, *op. cit.* i. 46. [5] Stendhal, *De l'amour*, p. 56.

cause of any deeper sexual bashfulness in a man than that resulting from a breach of etiquette. On the other hand, in the sexual shame felt in the presence of a near relative there is nothing pleasing or exciting when displayed by a woman and nothing conventional when displayed by a man. Why? Because it is rooted not in love but in aversion.

CHAPTER XIII

COURTSHIP

WHEREVER we are able to observe an external difference between the male and the female reproductive cells of plants, the male cell behaves actively in the union and the female cell passively.[1] In this respect there is an analogy between plants and many of the lower animals. In the case of some lowly-organised animals, which are permanently affixed to the same spot, the male element is invariably brought to the female. There are other instances in which the females alone are fixed, and the males must be the seekers. Even when the males and females of a species are both free, it is almost always the males that first approach the females.[2]

As Darwin points out, we can see the reason why, in the first instance, the male plays the active part :—"Even if the ova were detached before fertilisation, and did not require subsequent nourishment or protection, there would yet be greater difficulty in transporting them than the male element, because, being larger than the latter, they are produced in far smaller numbers."[3] He adds, however, that, with respect to forms of which the progenitors were primordially free, it is difficult to understand why the males should invariably have acquired the habit of approaching the females, instead of being approached by them. Perhaps the explanation may be that the seeker is more exposed to danger than the one sought after, and that the death of a male at the pairing time is less disadvantageous for the existence of the species than the death of a female. At any rate, we

[1] Sachs, *Text-Book of Botany*, p. 897.

[2] Darwin, *Descent of Man*, i. 343 *sq.*

[3] *Ibid.* i. 343.

may say with Darwin that it is necessary that the males should be endowed with strong passions in order that they may be efficient seekers; and the acquirement of such passions would naturally follow from the more eager males leaving a larger number of offspring than the less eager.[1]

The sexual desire of the male is commonly considered to be stronger than that of the female.[2] But, so far as mankind is concerned, Dr. Havelock Ellis thinks that there is now a tendency to minimise unduly the sexual impulse in women —as in earlier ages there was generally a tendency to credit them with an unduly large share of it—and that, roughly speaking, the distribution of the sexual impulse between the two sexes is fairly balanced.[3] He also observes that before sexual union the male tends to be more ardent, whereas after sexual union it is the female that tends to be so.[4] This tendency has been noticed in some birds as well as among men. Mr. Selous remarks concerning gulls:—"In actual courting, before the sexes are paired, the male bird is usually the most eager, but after marriage the female often becomes the wooer. Of this, I have seen marked instances." He mentions especially the plover, kestrel hawk, and rook.[5] Sir R. Heron even states that with pea-fowl the first advances are always made by the female; and something of the same kind takes place, according to Audubon, with the older females of the wild turkey.[6]

In human courtship, also, the male generally plays a more active and the female a more passive part; the woman "requires to be courted." Yet, as among the lower animals, there are exceptions to the rule. Among not a few uncivilised peoples the women are said to be the courters, or to make proposals of marriage.

Among the Indians of Paraguay, whose women according

[1] *Ibid.* i. 344.

[2] See, *e.g.*, Burdach, *Die Physiologie als Erfahrungswissenschaft*, i. 409; Tillier, *L'instinct sexuel chez l'homme et chez les animaux*, p. 71 *sq.*; *Idem*, *Le mariage*, p. 173.

[3] Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (vol. iii.), Analysis of the Sexual Impulse, &c., pp. 179, 203. [4] *Ibid.* p. 193 *sq.*

[5] Selous, *Bird Watching*, p. 112.

[6] Darwin, *op. cit.* ii. 134.

to Rengger were endowed with stronger passions than the men,[1] they were also allowed to make proposals.[2] This is still the case among the Choroti of the Gran Chaco. During the algaroba season, when marriages are usually contracted among them, those young men and women who want to marry wander about from village to village. In each village dances are performed on four successive evenings. "Free love is connected with these dances and the girls play the most active part in them although they do not actively engage in the entertainment. After each dance, and particularly after the last one, the *avúsye*, each girl may choose herself a temporary lover for the night. The *avúsye* which is held on the fourth evening is supposed to be decisive: those girls who have found men whom they like and want to marry, then keep them, not only for that night but for ever. After this the young man is taken to the house and village of the girl, where he thenceforwards remains as her husband and becomes a member of his wife's family."[3] Of the Sotegaraik or Tapieti, on the Pilcomayo, a recent German explorer writes:—"The women and girls dance behind the men, now separately, now in groups. On this occasion the girls also choose their husbands, quickly removing the spouse elect from the row of the dancers and then disappearing with him. There is no marriage ceremony."[4] Among the Bororó Indians of Matto Grosso the proposal of marriage likewise comes from the woman. "The young man sits in the *bahito* (the men's house), the young girl sends him *mingan* of maize; if he accepts, he is a bridegroom." But if he eats only a portion or does not eat any at all, he thereby signifies that he either wishes to postpone his decision or rejects the proposal outright.[5]

Among the Tarahumare of Mexico, says Dr. Lumholtz,

[1] Rengger, *Naturgeschichte der Säugethiere von Paraguay*, p. 11.

[2] Moore, *Marriage Customs*, p. 261.

[3] Karsten, *Indian Dances in the Gran Chaco*, p. 30. See also Nordenskiöld, *Indianliv i El Gran Chaco*, pp. 79, 82, 84.

[4] Herrmann, 'Die ethnographischen Ergebnisse der Deutschen Pilcomayo-Expedition,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xl. 129.

[5] Frič and Radin, 'Contributions to the Study of the Bororo Indians,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxvi. 390.

"the custom of the country requires the girl to do all the courting. She is just as bashful as the young swain whom she wishes to fascinate, but she has to take the initiative in love affairs. The young people meet only at the feasts, and after she has got mildly under the influence of the native beer that is liberally consumed by all, she tries to attract his attention by dancing before him in a clumsy way, up and down on the same spot. But so bashful is she that she persistently keeps her back towards him. . . . If occasion requires, the parents of the girl may say to the parents of the boy, 'Our daughter wants to marry your son.' Then they send the girl to the boy's home, that the young people may become acquainted. For two or three days, perhaps, they do not speak to each other, but finally she playfully begins to throw pebbles at him. If he does not return them, she understands that he does not care for her. If he throws them back at her, she knows that she has won him. She lets her blanket drop and runs off into the wood, and he is not long in following her." Sometimes a boy who very much likes a certain girl may make the first advances, but even then he has to wait until she throws the first pebbles and drops the blanket; for among these Indians "it is the woman who seeks the man, and the fair who deserve the brave."[1] So also among the Pueblos "the usual order of courtship is reversed; when a girl is disposed to marry she does not wait for a young man to propose to her, but selects one to her own liking and consults her father, who visits the parents of the youth and acquaints them with his daughter's wishes. It seldom happens that any objections to the match are made."[2] Among the Indians of the interior of British Columbia "a dance was held at certain seasons to permit the young men and women to choose life

[1] Lumholtz, *Unknown Mexico*, i. 267 *sq.* Of another Mexican tribe, the Huichol, the same traveller says (*ibid.* ii. 93) that among the young people the man seeks the woman but among the persons of more mature age the woman seeks the man.

[2] Bancroft, *Native Races of the Pacific States*, i. 547 *sq.* See also Schoolcraft, *Archives of Aboriginal Knowledge*, iv. 86 (Moqui); Solberg, 'Gebräuche der Mittelmesa-Hopi (Moqui) bei Namengebung, Heirat und Tod,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xxxvii. 629.

partners. A young man might choose a wife at a certain period of the dance by taking hold of her belt or by merely laying his hand upon her. If accepted, she allowed him to dance with her to the even, when the couple were led out before the people by the chief and proclaimed man and wife. A girl could choose a man in the same way."[1] Among the Thompson Indians the girls generally touched the young men on either the head or the arm. The man usually took to wife the girl who had touched him, but he was not compelled to do so; and we are told that some girls who touched a man and were not accepted felt so ashamed that they committed suicide.[2]

Mr. Batchelor says that it occurs among the Ainu that the young woman does the wooing and courting, in which case she gets the mother and father to call upon the parents of her choice; and in such a case, if the proposal is accepted, the bridegroom is removed from his own family to take up his abode close to the hut of his father-in-law.[3] But Pilsudski states that though the custom of women trying to win men did formerly exist, it is no longer observed, and that Ainu women "are even very much displeased at any hint of such a thing." Their mythology ascribes this custom to Tungus women.[4] In Borneo, also, there is a tribe who is accused by its neighbours of practising such a custom: it is a common statement made by the Kayans that "among the Kalabits the initiative in all love-making is taken by the women."[5]

Among the Western Islanders of Torres Straits "it was the custom for the young women to propose marriage to the young men, but this has been interdicted by the missionaries." Dr. Haddon believes that young men never made

[1] Teit, 'Indian Tribes of the Interior,' in *Canada and its Provinces*, vol. xxi. The Pacific Province, pt. i. 309. See also *Idem*, 'Lillooet Indians,' in *Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, ii. 268.

[2] *Idem*, 'Thompson Indians of British Columbia,' in *Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, i. 324.

[3] Batchelor, *Ainu and their Folk-Lore*, p. 223 *sqq*.

[4] Miss Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, p. 103.

[5] Hose and McDougall, *Pagan Tribes of Borneo*, ii. 176, 246 *sq*.

the first definite proposal to matrimony, although by scenting themselves they might indicate that they were ready to be sued. The custom is mentioned in the folk-tales.[1] In various tribes of New Guinea, also, the marriage proposal or initiative generally comes from the girl.[2] Among the Sulka, in the central part of New Britain, when a girl has made up her mind as to the young man she wants to marry, she mentions it to her father or some other near relative, who then goes to the man and proposes on her behalf.[3] In many places in New Hanover and Northern New Ireland it is likewise the girl who takes the initiative and sends a go-between to the bridegroom elect to inform him about her choice.[4] Among the Maori, when the young people gathered together at night in the play-houses, they made advances to each other, and these advances often came from the girls, "the recognised sign being a pinch, or the scratching of the finger-tip on the hand of the desired person."[5] Mr. Tregear even states that "in almost every case the first advances were made by the woman, either directly or through one of her friends"; and in old Maori legends girls are represented as quarrelling about men.[6]

Among the Garos of Assam it is not only the privilege but even the duty of the girl to speak first. "If a male makes advances to a girl," says Dalton, "and the latter, rejecting them, chooses also to tell her friends that such tenders of affection have been made to her, it is looked on as an insult to the whole 'mahári' (motherhood) to which

[1] Haddon, in *Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits*, v. 222.

[2] Seligman, *Melanesians of British New Guinea*, pp. 76, 499, 709. Malinowski, 'Natives of Mailu,' in *Trans. Roy. Soc. South Australia*, xxxix. 560. Guise, 'Tribes inhabiting the Mouth of the Wanigela River, New Guinea,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxviii. 209.

[3] Parkinson, *Dreissig Jahre in der Südsee*, p. 177. On some islands at the south-west coast of New Britain girls occasionally propose to men (Vogel, *Eine Forschungsreise im Bismarck-Archipel*, p. 223).

[4] Parkinson, *op. cit.* p. 267.

[5] Best, 'Maori Marriage Customs,' in *Trans. and Proceed. New Zealand Institute*, xxxvi. 33.

[6] Tregear, *The Maori Race*, p. 285 *sq.* See also Colenso, *Maori Races of New Zealand*, p. 25.

the girl belongs, a stain only to be obliterated by the blood of pigs, and liberal libations of beer at the expense of the 'mahâri' to which the man belongs."[1] The only exception to this rule occurs when one daughter of a family is given in marriage to the son of her father's sister.[2]

Among the Wangoni, a Zulu tribe, women have the right to propose. When a girl has had her puberty feast she goes to the house of the man she desires to marry, accompanied by her girl friends, all carrying green branches and singing, and declares in songs that he is her bridegroom elect. If the man shows himself unwilling to accept the proposal, they all go back, crying aloud; whereas, if he accepts it, they shout for joy and take the girl, who is now looked upon as a bride, to her family. Next day the man pays a visit to the girl's father, and begins to negotiate with him for the bride price, which is no easy matter to settle. This custom, however, is nowadays on the verge of disappearing, as a father is generally inclined to sell his daughter to the man who sends him the largest number of oxen.[3] Among the Konde people in "German East Africa" the daughters of chiefs are said to have the right to make proposals of marriage.[4] Among the Bantu Kavirondo, if a girl is not asked in marriage, she may go off and offer herself to a man of another village, who, if he accepts her, has to negotiate for the payment of a marriage gift;[5] and among the Nilotic Kavirondo, if a woman remains unmarried for a longer period than usual, she often goes off to a chief or wealthy man and states that she has come to stay and cook for him, in which case he generally takes her to wife, paying for her only a small present.[6] Among some peoples the

[1] Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal*, p. 64. *Cf. ibid.* pp. 142, 233 (Bhúiyas, Muásís); Playfair, *Garos*, p. 67.

[2] Playfair, *op. cit.* p. 68.

[3] Wiese, 'Beiträge zur Geschichte der Zulu im Norden des Zambesi, namentlich der Angoni,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnologie*, xxxii. 191. *Cf.* Shooter, *Kafirs of Natal*, p. 52; Tyler, *Forty Years among the Zulus*, p. 200 *sq.*

[4] Fülleborn, *Das Deutsche Njassa- und Ruwuma-Gebiet*, p. 346.

[5] Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, p. 748. Hobley, *Eastern Uganda*, p. 18. [6] Johnston, *op. cit.* p. 791. Hobley, *op. cit.* p. 29.

father or parents of a girl take the initiative and choose a husband for the daughter.[1]

The male very frequently fights with other males for the possession of the female. Thus, during the season of love, the males even of the most timid animal species engage in desperate combats. This fighting for a female occurs among insects,[2] and is extremely prevalent in the order of the Vertebrata. Among the mammals lower than man there is certainly a normal co-existence of combat and courtship; and there can be no doubt that our primeval human ancestors also fought for the possession of females. Fights of this kind seem even now to be of frequent occurrence among various savage peoples.

Azara tells us that among the Guanas on the left bank of the Upper Paraguay the men often refrain from marrying until they are twenty years old or more, as before that age they cannot defeat their rivals.[3] In his description of Brazilian savages, von Martius states that among the Muras on the Madeira the wives are mostly gained in a combat with fists between all the lovers of the same girl, and that the like is the case with the Passés.[4] Among the Patwin of California it occasionally happened that men who had a quarrel about a woman fought a duel with bows and arrows at long distances.[5] Speaking of the Northern Indians, Hearne states that "it has ever been the custom among those people for the men to wrestle for any woman to whom they are attached; and, of course, the strongest party always carries off the prize. A weak man, unless he be a good hunter and well-beloved, is seldom permitted to keep a wife that a stronger man thinks worth his notice. . . . This custom

[1] Appun, 'Die Indianer von Britisch-Guayana,' in *Das Ausland*, xliv. 124 (Arawaks). Coudreau, *Chez nos Indiens*, p. 127 (Roucouyennes, of French Guiana). Hrdlička, 'Notes on the Indians of Sonora, Mexico,' in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. vi. 69 (Yaqui). Teit, 'Thompson Indians,' in *Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, i. 322. Kropf, *Das Volk der Xosa-Kaffern*, p. 132.

[2] Darwin, *op. cit.* i. 459, 501.

[3] Azara, *Voyages dans l'Amérique méridionale*, ii. 94.

[4] v. Martius, *Beiträge zur Ethnographie Amerika's*, i. 412, 509.

[5] Powers, *Tribes of California*, p. 221 *sq.*

prevails throughout all their tribes, and causes a great spirit of emulation among their youth, who are upon all occasions, from their childhood, trying their strength and skill in wrestling."[1] Richardson also saw, more than once, a stronger man assert his right to take the wife of a weaker countryman. "Any one," he says, "may challenge another to wrestle, and, if he overcomes, may carry off his wife as the prize. . . . The bereaved husband meets his loss with the resignation which custom prescribes in such a case, and seeks his revenge by taking the wife of another man weaker than himself."[2] With reference to the Slave Indians, Mr. Hooper says:—"If a man desire to despoil his neighbour of his wife, a trial of strength of a curious nature ensues: they seize each other by the hair, which is worn long and flowing, and thus strive for the mastery, until one or another cries *peccavi*. Should the victor be the envious man, he has to pay a certain number of skins for the husband-changing woman."[3] Among the Eskimo about Bering Strait Mr. Nelson was told by an old man that in ancient times, when a husband and a lover quarrelled about a woman, they were disarmed by the neighbours and then settled the trouble with their fists or by wrestling, the victor in the struggle taking the woman.[4]

In the islands outside Kamchatka, if a husband found that a rival had been with his wife, he would admit that the rival had at least an equal claim to her. "Let us try, then," he would say, "which of us has the greater right, and shall have her." After that they would take off their clothes and begin to beat each other's backs with sticks, and he who first fell to the ground unable to bear any more blows lost his right to the woman.[5] Among the Yukaghir, when a young man

[1] Hearne, *Journey from Prince of Wales's Fort to the Northern Ocean*, p. 104 *sq.*

[2] Richardson, *Arctic Searching Expedition*, ii. 24 *sq.* *Cf.* Mackenzie, *Voyages from Montreal to the Frozen and Pacific Oceans*, p. 145; Ross, 'Eastern Tinneh,' in *Smithsonian Report*, 1866, p. 310.

[3] Hooper, *Ten Months among the Tents of the Tuski*, p. 303.

[4] Nelson, 'Eskimo about Bering Strait,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethnol.* xviii. 292. *Cf.* Nansen, *First Crossing of Greenland*, ii. 319.

[5] Steller, *Beschreibung von dem Lande Kamtschatka*, p. 348.

finds a rival in the tent of the girl he visits at night, he compels him to come out and fight. The vanquished one goes off home, and the conqueror re-enters the tent. In olden times, according to the tales of the Yukaghir, rivals used to go away from the tents and fight until one or the other was killed.[1] Romantic marriages in which a young man obtains his bride, not through serving for her, but through braving dangers and overcoming enemies and competitors, are very popular in the tales of the Chukchee, and occur even at the present day among them. In one story we are told of a girl who caused her suitors to run foot-races with her and took in marriage the one who succeeded in distancing her; and sometimes a series of contests is said to take place before a man succeeds in obtaining his wife.[2]

Fighting for women is of frequent occurrence among the Australian natives. Speaking of those near Herbert Vale in Northern Queensland, Dr. Lumholtz says that "if a woman is good-looking, all the men want her, and the one who is most influential, or who is the strongest, is accordingly generally the victor." Hence the majority of the young men must wait a long time before they get wives, as they have not the courage to fight the requisite duel for one with an older man.[3] Narcisse Peltier, who during seventeen years was detained by a tribe of Queensland Australians, states that the men "not unfrequently fight with spears for the possession of a woman."[4] In the tribes of Western Victoria described by Mr. Dawson a young chief who cannot get a wife, and falls in love with one belonging to a chief who has more than two, can, with her consent, challenge the husband to single combat, and if the husband is defeated, the conqueror makes her his legal wife.[5] "On the Hunter," says Mr. Ridley, "when a man seeks a wife he goes to a camp where men and women are sitting together round a fire, and throws in a boomerang. If one of the men throws back a

[1] Jochelson, *Yukaghir*, p. 63. [2] Bogoras, *Chukchee*, p. 579 *sqq.*
[3] Lumholtz, *Among Cannibals*, pp. 213, 184.
[4] Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, i. 601.
[5] Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, p. 36. *Cf.* Ridley, *Aborigines of Australia*, p. 6.

boomerang at him he has to fight for the privilege sought; but if no one challenges him, he quickly steps in and takes one of the young women for his wife."[1] Among the aborigines of New South Wales, says Dr. Fraser, it happens that two rivals fight for a girl, and that she is the prize of victory.[2]

Among the Kiwai Papuans of British New Guinea, according to Dr. Landtman, most fighting inside a tribe is occasioned by the fair sex; and in their tales about a mythical hero, by name Sído—the first man who was killed by another—the two men are, characteristically enough, represented as fighting for a woman.[3] The principal causes of war among the Maori are well put in one of their aphorisms, "By women and land are men lost." In ancient days women were the causes of many sanguinary wars among them, although they were not an exogamous people.[4] We are told that if a Maori lady had two or more lovers, a feud might take place between them, assisted by their relatives, and the conqueror seized the lady, who often fared badly in the scuffle.[5] In Samoa and Fiji, also, women were one of the chief causes of fighting;[6] and of the natives of Makin, of the Gilbert Group, it is said that "they have no wars, and very few arms, and seldom quarrel except about their women."[7]

In some of the Bushman communities in South Africa "a youth who desired to take to himself a girl was obliged to prove himself a man by fighting with others for her and winning her by victory."[8] Among the Mountain Damara, "if one person feels himself stronger than another he will

[1] Ridley, *Kamilaroi, Dippil, and Turrubul*, p. 157.

[2] Fraser, *Aborigines of New South Wales*, p. 26.

[3] Landtman, *Nya Guinea färden*, p. 81.

[4] Best, 'Notes on the Art of War, as conducted by the Maori of New Zealand,' in *Jour. Polynesian Soc.* xi. 13.

[5] Polack, *Manners and Customs of the New Zealanders*, i. 139 *sqq.* See also Colenso, *op. cit.* p. 25 *sq.*

[6] Pritchard, *Polynesian Reminiscences*, pp. 55, 269.

[7] Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition*, v. 72.

[8] Theal, *Yellow and Dark-skinned People of Africa south of the Zambesi*, p. 47. *Cf.* Lichtenstein, *Travels in Southern Africa*, ii. 48.

consider himself perfectly at liberty to take away by force any female to whom he takes a fancy."[1] The chief cause of quarrels and fights on the Congo, says Mr. Weeks, is about women; "if you push the matter to its real origin you will in nine cases out of ten find a woman at the bottom of it."[2] The people of Wadaï are notorious for their desperate fights for women; and among the young men of Baghirmi bloody feuds between rivals are far from rare.[3]

In other cases the rivalry of the suitors takes less violent and more playful forms. Among the Maori, if a girl had two suitors with equal pretensions, a kind of "pulling-match," called *he puna rua*, was arranged in which the girl's arms were dragged by each of them in opposite directions, the stronger man being the victor.[4] They also had the following custom, known as *kai tamāhine*. "A party of young, active, and presentable men would form themselves into a party and go on a visit to some village where resided a young woman noted for her good looks and qualities. The visit was for the express purpose of showing themselves and their accomplishments to the girl, in the hope that she would accept one of them as a husband. The period of the visit would be quite a gay time, for the party of young men would give performances of various kinds, in order to exhibit their skill, grace, dexterity, and so forth, each endeavouring to excel his companions. They would perform *haka*, or posture dances, of various kinds, and play games of skill. Each would hope that the girl would select him as a husband."[5] Among the Dongolowees of Kordofan, as we are informed by Dr. Felkin, if two men are suitors for a girl, and there is a difficulty in deciding between the rivals, the following method is adopted. The fair lady has a knife tied to each forearm, so fixed that the blade of the knife projects

[1] Stow, *Native Races of South Africa*, p. 260.

[2] Weeks, *Among Congo Cannibals*, p. 226.

[3] Barth, *Reisen und Entdeckungen in Nord- und Central-Afrika*, iii. 352.

[4] Dieffenbach, *Travels in New Zealand*, ii. 36 *sq.* Taylor, *Te Ika a Maui*, p. 337.

[5] Best, 'Maori Marriage Customs,' in *Trans. and Proceed. New Zealand Institute*, xxxvi. 36.

below the elbow. She then takes up a position on a log of wood, the young men sitting on either side with their legs closely pressed against hers. Raising her arms, the girl leans forward, and slowly presses the knives into the thighs of her would-be husbands. The suitor who best undergoes this trial of endurance wins the bride, whose first duty after marriage is to dress the wounds she has herself inflicted.[1] The Kirghiz have a race called the "love chase," which may be considered a part of the form of marriage among them. "In this the bride, armed with a formidable whip, mounts a fleet horse, and is pursued by all the young men who make any pretensions to her hand. She will be given as a prize to the one who catches her, but she has the right, besides urging on her horse to the utmost, to use her whip, often with no mean force, to keep off those lovers who are unwelcome to her, and she will probably favour the one whom she has already chosen in her heart. As, however, by Kirghiz custom, a suitor to the hand of a maiden is obliged to give a certain *kalym*, or purchase-money, and an agreement must be made with the father for the amount of dowry which he gives his daughter, the 'Love Chase' is a mere matter of form."[2] Among some of the Pepos of Formosa "there was a custom of holding, on a certain day specially announced, a running race in which all young bachelors competed. The prize was the privilege of marrying the most beautiful girl of the tribe."[3]

In ancient India it was a custom in royal circles when a princess became marriageable for a tournament to be held, and the victor was chosen by the princess as her husband.

[1] Wilson and Felkin, *Uganda and the Egyptian Soudan*, ii. 310.

[2] Schuyler, *Turkistan*, i. 42 *sq.* Valikhanof (*Russians in Central Asia*, p. 84) mentions a Kirghiz game in which the youth who finds most favour in the eyes of one of the girls has to perform some dexterous feat or sing a song; if his performance is creditable the girl rewards him with a hearty kiss.

[3] Davidson, *Island of Formosa*, p. 581 *sq.* According to Dr. Müller ('Ueber die Wildenstämme der Insel Formosa,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xlii. 230), the form of marriage among some Formosa savages consists "in einem Wettbewerb zwischen den Bräutigam und einen anderen (fingierten) Bewerber."

This custom, known as the Swayamvara or "Maiden's Choice," is often mentioned in the legends.[1] So also we meet with several instances of emulation for women in Greek legends and myths. Pausanias tells us that Danaus established a race for his daughters, and that "he that outran all the rest was to have the first choice, and take her whom he most approved; he that was next in order was to have the second choice, and so on to the last; and those who had no suitors were ordered to wait till new ones came to the course." Icarus likewise proposed a race for the suitors of Penelope.[2] And according to Pindar, Antæus, father of a fair-haired and greatly-praised daughter, who had many suitors, stationed the whole company of them at the end of the race-course, saying that he should have her for his bride who should prove foremost in the race and first touch her garments.[3]

On Palm Sunday, the day for presentiments of love, South Slavonian youths wrestle with each other, believing that he who proves the stronger will get the prettier wife.[4] Arthur Young informs us of the following strange custom which prevailed in the interior of Ireland in his time:—"There is a very ancient custom here," he says, "for a number of country neighbours among the poor people to fix upon some young woman that ought, as they think, to be married; they also agree upon a young fellow as a proper husband for her; this determined, they send to the fair one's cabin to inform her that on the Sunday following 'she is to be horsed,' that is, carried on men's backs. She must then provide whisky and cider for a treat, as all will pay her a visit after mass for a hurling match. As soon as she is horsed the hurling begins, in which the young fellow appointed for her husband has the eyes of all the company fixed on him: if he comes off conqueror, he is certainly married to the girl; but if another is victorious, he as certainly loses her, for she is the prize of the victor. . . .

[1] Samuelson, *India, Past and Present*, p. 48.
[2] Pausanias, *Descriptio Graeciae*, iii. 12. 1 *sq.*
[3] Pindar, *Pythia*, ix. 117.
[4] Krauss, *Sitte und Brauch der Südslaven*, p. 163 *sq.*

Sometimes one barony hurls against another, but a marriageable girl is always the prize."[1]

A suitor may also be anxious to display his manliness in the presence of his girl without any emulation with rivals. Pitrè tells us that in Sicily " the youth who wishes to marry seeks to give some public proof of his valour and to show himself off. In Chiaramonte, not to speak of other districts, in evidence of his virile force, he bears in a procession the standard of some confraternity, a very high and richly adorned standard which makes its staff bend to a semicircle, of such enormous weight that the bearer must walk in a terribly bent position, his head and loins thrown back and his feet forward. On reaching the house of his betrothed he makes a great many proofs of his boldness and skill in wielding this accursed standard, which in that moment seems a plaything in his hands, but may yet prove fatal to somebody."[2]

Among savages, as among ourselves, a young man tries by various means to gain the favour of the girl he desires to marry. Dr. Eylmann states that the courtship of a South Australian black does not fundamentally differ from that of a white man ; he, too, expresses his love by soft glances, a pleasant smile, and courtesies of various kinds.[3] Among the Gila of Northern Mexico, " when a young man sees a girl whom he desires for a wife, he first endeavours to gain the good-will of the parents ; this accomplished, he proceeds to serenade his lady-love, and will often sit for hours, day after day, near her house, playing on his flute. Should the girl not appear it is a sign she rejects him ; but if, on the other hand, she comes out to meet him, he knows that his suit is accepted, and he takes her to his house."[4] In primitive human courtship, as Dr. Havelock Ellis observes, music frequently plays a very considerable, though not usually the sole, part, being generally found as the

[1] Young, ' Tour in Ireland,' in Pinkerton, *Collection of Voyages and Travels*, iii. 860.

[2] Pitrè, *Usi e costumi credenze e pregiudizi del popolo siciliano*, ii. 24.

[3] Eylmann, *Die Eingeborenen der Kolonie Südaustralien*, p. 129.

[4] Bancroft, *op. cit.* i. 549. *Cf.* Fletcher and La Flesche, ' Omaha Tribe,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethnol.* xxvii. 319.

accompaniment of the song and the dance at erotic festivals.[1] Dancing is a frequent means of sexual excitement and method of courtship.[2] Among the Hos in Chota Nagpur "it is at the village dances that most of the courting takes place."[3] In the Mortlock Islands the young men who wish to marry saunter about in the villages neat and trim; at night there is singing and dancing, and most marriages are concluded on such occasions.[4] Among the Western Islanders of Torres Straits, "during the numerous and prolonged dances of former days, the young women watched the active movements of the capering youths, admired their glossy skin, their frizzly hair, their numerous gay ornaments, and took delight in their wonderful activity. . . . Pre-eminence had its reward, for, as the former chief of Mabuiag put it—'In England, if a man has plenty of money, women want to marry him; so here, if a man dances well, they want him too.'" "It is no wonder," says Dr. Haddon, "when the natives described to me their courtship customs that they generally began with a reference to dancing."[5]

[1] Ellis, *op. cit.* (vol. iv.) Sexual Selection in Man, p. 130.

[2] *Ibid.* (vol. iii.) Analysis of the Sexual Impulse, &c., p. 34 *sqq* Klemm, *Allgemeine Cultur-Geschichte der Menschheit*, i. 257 *sqq.* Kulischer, 'Die geschlechtliche Zuchtwahl bei den Menschen in der Urzeit,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* viii. 143 *sqq.* Wallaschek, *Primitive Music*, p. 199 *sqq.* *Idem*, *Anfänge der Tonkunst*, p. 226 *sqq.* Hirn, *Origins of Art*, p. 233 *sq.* Groos, *Play of Man*, p. 273. Stoll, *Das Geschlechtsleben in der Völkerpsychologie*, p. 580 *sqq.* Whiffen, *North-West Amazons*, p. 198 n. 2. Ehrenreich, 'Ueber die Botocudos,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xix. 33. Powers, *Tribes of California*, p. 57. Teit, quoted *supra*, p. 458 *sq.* (tribes of the interior of British Columbia). *Idem*, 'Thompson Indians,' in *Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, i. 324. Geiseler, *Die Oster-Insel*, p. 41 (Easter Islanders). Turner, *Samoa*, p. 95. Waitz-Gerland, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, vi. 754 (Australian aborigines). Strehlow, *Die Aranda- und Loritja-Stämme in Zentral-Australien*, vol. iv. pt. i. 94. Bonwick, *Daily Life and Origin of the Tasmanians*, p. 38. v. Rosen, *Träskfolket*, p. 272 *sq.* (Batwa in North-Eastern Rhodesia). See also *infra*, i. 501 *sq.*

[3] Bradley-Birt, *Chota Nagpore*, p. 102.

[4] Kubary, 'Die Bewohner der Mortlock Inseln,' in *Mittheil. Geograph. Gesellsch. Hamburg*, 1878–79, p. 252.

[5] Haddon, *Head Hunters*, p. 158. *Idem*, in *Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits*, v. 222.

Similar statements are made with reference to the natives of Kaiser Wilhelm Land, among whom the young men carefully study the art of dancing and not infrequently for this purpose make long journeys to other tribes which are famous for their skill in dancing.[1]

It is not in the human species alone that we find courtship consisting in a more or less prolonged peaceful activity on the part of the male. In many species of moths the males assemble round the freshly emerged female, which sits apparently motionless while the little crowd of suitors buzz around her for several minutes. Suddenly, and, as far as one can see, without any sign from the female, one of the males pairs with her and all the others immediately disappear. In these cases the males do not fight or struggle in any way.[2] In spiders of the family *Attidæ* "the males vie with each other in making an elaborate display, not only of their grace and agility but also of their beauty, before the females, and . . . the females, after attentively watching the dances and tournaments which have been executed for their gratification, select for their mates the males that they find most pleasing."[3] Among birds there is courtship by means of antics or dances, the display of unusual or beautiful forms or colours, and songs or love-notes. The male of the Argus pheasant, noted for the extreme beauty of his plumage, shows himself off before the female by erecting his tail and expanding his magnificent wing-feathers into a great, almost upright, circular fan or shield, which is carried in front of the body.[4] Mr. Belt has seen the female of *Florisuga mellivora* sitting quietly on a branch, and two males displaying their charms in front of her:—"One would shoot up like a rocket, then suddenly expanding the snow-white tail like an inverted parachute, slowly descend in front of her, turning

[1] Neuhauss, *Deutsch Neu-Guinea*, i. 389 *sq.*

[2] Poulton, *Colours of Animals*, p. 291.

[3] Peckham, 'Observations on Sexual Selection in Spiders of the Family Attidæ,' in *Occasional Papers of the Natural History Society of Wisconsin*, i. 60.

[4] Darwin, *op. cit.* ii. 99 *sq.* *Cf.* Forbes, *A Naturalist's Wanderings in the Eastern Archipelago*, p. 131.

round gradually to show off both back and front. . . . The expanded white tail covered more space than all the rest of the bird, and was evidently the grand feature in the performance."[1] The bullfinch "makes his advances in front of the female, and then puffs out his breast, so that many more of the crimson feathers are seen at once than otherwise would be the case"; whilst the male goldfinch, when courting the female, "sways his body from side to side, and quickly turns his slightly expanded wings first to one side, then to other, with a golden flashing effect."[2] Among mammals outside the human species, however, courtship of this peaceful kind is hardly known Darwin says that proof is wanting that the males of mammals make any effort to display their charms to the female;[3] but as exceptions to this rule are mentioned the males of some baboon species, who are said to turn their coloured surfaces to the females.[4] So also there is very little that deserves to be called vocal art in the courtship of mammals, most of them confining their acoustic demonstrations to a passionate howl, roar, shriek, or growl, or to the simple call. But here again some monkeys form a notable exception: the howling apes collect in companies and frequently give concerts that last for hours.[5] Thus we may say that the phenomena of courtship in mankind more closely resemble those found among birds than those of other mammals.

Where the male is the courter, as is generally the case, the female on her part does not remain completely passive. She may in fact display considerable activity in the proceedings which form the prelude to the act of pairing. Speaking of the courting of some eider-ducks, Mr. Selous observes that "the females seemed themselves almost as active agents in the sport of being wooed as were their lovers in wooing them."[6] And in the case of the stone-curlew, or great plover, the dancing, which is often

[1] Belt, *The Naturalist in Nicaragua*, p. 112.
[2] Darwin, *op. cit.* ii. 104 *sq.*
[3] *Ibid.* ii. 320. [4] Groos, *Die Spiele der Tiere*, p. 285.
[5] *Ibid.* p. 289 *sqq.* See also Darwin, *op. cit.* ii. 299.
[6] Selous, *op. cit.* p. 144.

immediately followed by intercourse, is common to both the male and the female.[1] So also among savage peoples both sexes often take part in their erotic dances.[2] In various animal species the female invites the male's approach, by call-notes or otherwise,[3] although the invitation be followed by that resistance or fleeing which on the part of the female is a regular and most important feature of the performance of courtship. The doe, in her pairing-time, calls to the buck in clear tones that bring him to her side at once; then she, "half in coyness, half in mischief, takes to flight at his eager approach, makes toward an open space, and runs in a circle. The buck naturally follows, and the chase grows hot and as exciting as a race of horses on a track. To the frequent high calls of the fleeing doe are added the deep, short cries of the panting buck; but suddenly the roguish doe disappears like a nymph into the thicket near at hand, and the baffled buck stands with head erect and ears thrown forward; then we see his head lowered as he catches the scent, and he too vanishes in the wood."[4] Alternate seeking and fleeing are exceedingly common among birds. Thus "the female cuckoo answers the call of her mate with an alluring laugh that excites him to the utmost, but it is long before she gives herself up to him. A mad chase through tree tops ensues, during which she constantly incites him with that mocking call, till the poor fellow is fairly driven crazy."[5] The female kingfisher often torments her devoted lover for half a day, coming and calling him, and then taking to flight. "But she never lets him out of her sight the while, looking back as she flies and measuring her speed, and wheeling back when he suddenly gives up the pursuit."[6]

[1] *Ibid.* p. 18 *sqq.*

[2] See, *e.g.*, Wallaschek, *Primitive Music*, p. 213; *Idem*, *Anfänge der Tonkunst*, p. 239 *sq.*

[3] Häcker, *Der Gesang der Vögel*, p. 49 *sqq.*

[4] Müller, quoted by Groos, *Play of Animals*, p. 284 *sq.*; *Idem*, *Die Spiele der Tiere*, p. 306 *sq.*

[5] *Idem*, *Play of Animals*, p. 285. *Idem*, *Die Spiele der Tiere*, p. 307 *sq.*

[6] *Idem*, *Play of Animals*, p. 286. *Idem*, *Die Spiele der Tiere*, p. 308.

Thus the female often must be long courted before she yields; she has an instinctive impulse to prevent the male's approach, which can only be overcome by persistent pursuit and the exercise of all his arts.[1] This is a feminine characteristic found in mankind as well as among the lower animals. Both in savage and civilised countries courtship may mean a prolonged making of love to the woman. Mariner's words with reference to the women of Tonga has a much more general application. "It must not be supposed," he says, "that these women are always easily won; the greatest attentions and most fervent solicitations are sometimes requisite, even though there be no other lover in the way. This happens sometimes from a spirit of coquetry, at other times from a dislike to the party, &c."[2] Among the Uppiliyans of the Trichinopoly District, Southern India, a girl "has to be asked in marriage a number of times, before consent is given, lest it be thought that she is yielding too easily."[3] Among the Omaha "a man of twenty-five or thirty will court a girl for two or three years. Sometimes the girl pretends to be unwilling to marry him, just to try his love, but at last she usually consents."[4] When the Apache lover has proposed to a girl by staking his horse in front of her dwelling, four days are allowed her for an answer. A ready acceptance is apt to be criticised with some severity, while a tardy one is regarded as the extreme of coquetry. Scarcely any girl will show that she favours the suitor, by leading his horse to water, before the second day, so as not to be suspected of having an unusual desire to be married.[5] In Greenland it was considered the proper thing for a lady "to show no partiality whatever for her suitor however fond she might be of him."[6] Among the Bakongo "the

[1] Büchner, *Liebe und Liebesleben in der Thierwelt*, p. 39 *sqq*. Groos, *Die Spiele der Tiere*, p. 304 *sq*. *Idem*, *Play of Animals*, p. 283 *sq*.

[2] Mariner, *Natives of the Tonga Islands*, ii. 174. *Cf*. Fritsch, *Die Eingeborenen Süd-Afrika's*, p. 445 (Bushmen).

[3] Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, vii. 238.

[4] Dorsey, 'Omaha Sociology,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethnol.* iii. 260.

[5] Cremony, *Life among the Apaches*, p. 246 *sq*.

[6] Nansen, *op. cit.* ii. 317.

young people go through a courtship. When the lover formally introduces himself, the young girl flies across the fields screaming as if she had seen a wolf, but she does not run away far when the wolf pleases her."[1] We shall see subsequently that at the weddings of many peoples virgin coyness finds a ceremonial expression in the resistance made by the bride.

At the end of the performance the female may also take an active part by accepting or refusing her lover or, if there are several lovers, by selecting one of them. We are told that she may exercise such a choice even when the rivals are fighting for her; but in such cases force is probably the chief factor in determining the possession of the female by the male.[2] In mankind the woman's liberty of choice is often hampered by social factors unknown among the lower animals; but even among savages it is not the rule that women are married without having any voice of their own in the matter. This is a subject which will be treated in detail in a subsequent chapter.

From this sketch of the principal features of courtship we shall proceed to a discussion of their origin. In a previous chapter I have dealt with the passion of masculine jealousy, which is the immediate cause of the combats of males for the possession of females; and I ventured to suggest that its remarkable violence, even in otherwise timid animals, may possibly be due to its usefulness to the species as a means of preventing promiscuity.[3] But it may be useful in other respects as well. Already Burdach observed that through the fights between rivals "the weak are excluded from propagation and a more vigorous procreation is secured."[4] And according to later writers the fighting acts as a sexual stimulant both on male and female. But how shall we explain the peaceful activities of the courting male? In these activities certain secondary sexual characters play a most important part, and the question of their genesis can therefore not be passed over in silence. The

[1] Johnston, *George Grenfell and the Congo*, ii. 678.
[2] Tillier, *L'instinct sexuelle*, p. 136.
[3] *Supra*, p. 334 *sq.* [4] Burdach, *op. cit.* i. 413.

discussion of it may seem rather remote from the subject of human courtship; but it will be found to have indirectly a bearing also on points which are of great importance for a right understanding of sex relations in mankind. It at once takes us to Darwin's theory of sexual selection.

CHAPTER XIV

SECONDARY SEXUAL CHARACTERS IN ANIMALS—FEMALE COYNESS

BESIDES natural selection, which depends on the success of both sexes, at all ages, in relation to the general conditions of life, Darwin introduced another principle, sexual selection, which depends on the success of certain individuals over others of the same sex in relation to the propagation of the species. According to the former principle, those individuals who are most successful in the struggle for existence survive the others, and characters useful to the species are thus inherited; according to the latter, those individuals who have the greatest success in the struggle for mates have the most numerous offspring, and the characters which gave them the preference pass on to the new generation, and are afterwards intensified by the operation of like causes. The sexual struggle is of two kinds. In both it is carried on by individuals of the same sex; but in one these individuals, generally the males, try to drive away or kill their rivals; in the other, they seek to excite or charm those of the opposite sex, generally the females, who select the most attractive males for their partners. Therefore the characters acquired through sexual selection, and transmitted chiefly to offspring of the same sex, generally the males, are, on the one hand, weapons for battle, vigour and courage; on the other hand, certain colours, forms, ornaments, sounds, or odours, which are felt to be pleasant. The secondary sexual characters of the latter sort are thus due to the preference given to them by the females. They have been acquired because they are

beautiful or otherwise agreeable, whereas the characters resulting from natural selection have been acquired because they are useful. "The senses of man and of the lower animals," says Darwin, "seem to be so constituted that brilliant colours and certain forms, as well as harmonious and rhythmical sounds, give pleasure and are called beautiful; but why this should be so we know not."[1] According to Darwin, natural and sexual selection are thus two different sources from which animal characters have arisen.

Far from co-operating with each other, these two kinds of selection seem even to work in opposite directions. Sexual selection, as described by Darwin, produces effects disadvantageous to the species. "It is evident," he says, "that the brilliant colours, top-knots, fine plumes, &c., of many male birds cannot have been acquired as a protection; indeed, they sometimes lead to danger."[2] When we consider what an important part is played by colours, as means of protection, in the whole animal kingdom, it is certainly surprising that many male animals display brilliant hues, which cannot fail to make them conspicuous to their enemies. The strong odours emitted by certain reptiles and mammals, during the pairing season, and the sounds produced by various species at the same period, have also the effect of attracting hostile animals that are searching for food. And the danger arising for the species from these secondary sexual characters is all the greater because they generally appear at the time when offspring are about to be produced. Thus, besides colours, structures, and functions, adapted in the most marvellous way to the requirements of each species, there are others highly dangerous, which, according to Darwin, depend upon an æsthetic sense, or taste, in the females, the origin of which we do not know.

Darwin has shown how immense is the influence exercised by natural selection on the organic world. A disciple, therefore, naturally feels perplexed when he is told of a series of facts, which, according to the explanation given by the master, seem actually opposed to the theory of natural selection. When realising the contradiction between the two theories of

[1] Darwin, *Descent of Man*, ii. 384. [2] *Ibid.* ii. 252.

selection, he is inclined to ask :—Can we, after all, be sure that the secondary sexual characters have no useful function to fulfil? If they have, they, also, may be explained by the principle of the survival of the fittest. The larger size and greater strength of the males, and the weapons of offence or defence many of them possess, may easily be so accounted for, as, among the higher animals, the males generally fight with each other for the possession of the females. The point is whether the other secondary sexual characters can be due to the same cause.

It is an established fact that the colours of flowers serve a definite end. Through them the flowers are recognised by insects in search of honey; and the insects, during their visits, involuntarily carry the pollen of one flower to the stigma of another, and thus effect cross-fertilisation, which is proved to be of great importance for the vigour and fertility of the next generation of plants. Now it is extremely interesting to note that brilliant colours are found only in species of flowers to which they are useful as means of attracting insects; they never occur in plants which are fertilised by the wind.[1] Wallace observes that plants rarely need to be concealed, because they obtain protection by their spines, or their hardness, or their hairy covering, or their poisonous secretions. Hence there are very few cases of what seems to be true protective colouring among them.[2] In animals, on the contrary, colour is greatly influenced by their need of protection from, or warning to, their numerous enemies; colours of other kinds must always, to a certain extent, be dangerous for the species. Is it probable, then, that, whilst gay colours occur only in the flowers of those plants to which they are of real use, conspicuous colours should occur in animals to which they are of real danger—merely because the females find them attractive?

Wallace, in his well-known criticism of Darwin's theory of sexual selection,[3] suggests that the very frequent

[1] Müller, *Fertilisation of Flowers*, p. 14.

[2] Wallace, *Tropical Nature*, p. 223.

[3] Wallace, 'Colours of Plants and the Origin of the Colour-Sense,' in *Tropical Nature*, p. 221 *sqq.* *Idem*, *Darwinism*, ch. x.

superiority of the male bird or insect in brightness or intensity of colour is due to the greater vigour and activity and the higher vitality of the male. This intensity of coloration is therefore most manifest in the male during the breeding season, when the vitality is at a maximum. It would be further developed by the combats of the males for the possession of the females; and the most vigorous and energetic usually leaving the most numerous and most healthy offspring, natural selection would indirectly become a preserver and intensifier of colour.[1] This view has been criticised by G. W. and Elizabeth G. Peckham in the record of their observations on sexual selection in spiders of the family *Attidæ*. "First," they say, "we found no evidence that the male spiders possess greater vital activity; on the contrary, it is the female that is the more active and pugnacious of the two. Second, we found no relation, in either sex, between development of colour and activity; the *Lycosidæ*, which are among the most active of all spiders, having the least colour development, while the sedentary orb-weavers show the most brilliant hues."[2] But even if Wallace is right in his opinion that there is some connection between vigour and colour, it may be asked whether this connection, depending on some unknown physiological law, is so necessary that it takes place even when colour is positively disadvantageous to the species. Nothing of the kind is found in the vegetable kingdom. We know, as Wallace himself remarks, that colours which rarely or never appear in the species in a state of nature continually occur among cultivated plants and domesticated animals —a fact which shows that the capacity to develop colour is ever present.[3] Among wild plants such colour variations are never preserved except when they are useful. Is it not most reasonable to suppose that the like is the case with animals?

[1] *Idem, Tropical Nature*, p. 193 *sqq.*

[2] G. W. and Elizabeth G. Peckham, 'Observations on Sexual Selection in Spiders of the Family Attidæ,' in *Occasional Papers of the Natural History Society of Wisconsin*, i. 59.

[3] Wallace, *Tropical Nature*, p. 187.

The truth seems to be that colour subserves the same purpose in both of the great kingdoms of the organic world. Just as flowers are coloured that insects may recognise where honey is to be found, and thus may be led to promote fertilisation, so the sexual colours of animals have been developed to make it easier for the sexes to find each other during the pairing time. Protective colours are useful so far as they conceal the animal from its enemies, but at the same time they conceal it from individuals of its own species. Sexual colours are therefore useful as well, because they make the animal more visible. It is quite in accordance with the theory of natural selection that, where such colours occur, the advantage from them should be greater than the disadvantage. We can see the reason for the brilliant colours of humming-birds, as these birds, on account of their great activity, "are practically unmolested,"[1] and for the bright hues of the rose chafers, who are saved from attack by a combination of protecting characters.[2] But generally there is danger in sexual colours, so that nature has given them with the utmost cautiousness. They are not developed till the age of reproduction, and they appear, in a great many species, only during the pairing season, or are concealed except during courtship.[3] Usually they occur in males only, because of the females' greater need of protection.[4] The greatest advantage is won with the least possible peril.

It is a fact of great importance that sexual colours occur exactly in those species whose habits make these colours most visible. Thus the nocturnal moths, taken as a body, are much less gaily decorated than butterflies, all of which are diurnal in their habits, although, according to Wallace, the general influence of solar light and heat is no adequate cause for the variety, intensity, and complexity of the colours. The females of the ghost moth are yellow with darker markings, whereas the males are white, that they may

[1] *Ibid.* p. 213.
[2] Wallace, *Contributions to the Theory of Natural Selection*, p. 73 *sq.*
[3] Poulton, *Essays on Evolution*, p. 380.
[4] Wallace, *Contributions, &c.*, p. 259 *sqq.*

be more easily seen by the females whilst flying about in the dusk; and it is remarkable that in the Shetland Islands the male of this moth, instead of differing widely from the female, frequently resembles her closely in colour—as Mr. Fraser suggests, because, at the season of the year when the ghost moth appears in these northern latitudes, the whiteness of the males is not needed to render them visible to the females in the twilight night.[1] Both Darwin[2] and Wallace[3] think that, in this case, colour may be a means of recognition.

Generally speaking, bright sexual colours are found almost exclusively in species which are diurnal or semi-diurnal in their habits, and are excluded from those parts of the body which move too rapidly to be seen.[4] Moreover, they occur chiefly in species which, because of their manner of living, are to be seen at a distance; they seldom occur in sedentary or slowly moving terrestrial animals.[5] The members of the lowly organised order Thysanura are wingless and dull-coloured. The Hemiptera, which usually lurk about plants and prey upon hapless insects, are not, as a rule, remarkable for conspicuous hues. The Orthoptera are all terrestrial in their habits, generally feeding upon plants, and although some exotic locusts are beautifully ornamented, their bright tints, according to Darwin, do not seem to fall under the head of sexual coloration. On the other hand, the dragon-flies, which live in the open air, possess splendid green, blue, yellow, and vermilion metallic tints, and the sexes often differ in their coloration. Every one has admired the extreme beauty of many butterflies, especially of the males. Amongst the Fishes, living in a medium through which bright colours may be observed at a distance, we often find, besides protective colours, conspicuous hues which are especially intense and visible during the pairing time. Among the Reptiles the little lizards of the genus Draco especially deserve attention: they glide through the air on their

[1] Fraser, 'Sexual Selection,' in *Nature*, iii. 489.

[2] Darwin, *op. cit.* i. 485. [3] Wallace, *Darwinism*, p. 270.

[4] Poulton, *op. cit.* p. 380.

[5] The Gallinaceæ, however, form an exception; though almost wholly terrestrial, they have the most pronounced sexual colours. But they are active and wander much.

rib-supported parachutes, and the beauty of their colours baffles description. Mammals, on the other hand, do not generally present the splendid tints so common among male birds; and the brighter colours of certain arboreal mammals serve chiefly as means of concealment.

These phenomena show that sexual colours have been evolved for the purpose of *being seen*. They could scarcely be due merely to the fact that coloration is connected with the degree of vitality, since the Mammals, for instance, are certainly not less vigorous than any of the other Vertebrate orders. It may perhaps be suggested that, as flying animals more easily escape their enemies than terrestrial, they may with less danger be decorated with conspicuous hues. But here we have to observe the most important fact that animals which do not possess sexual colours generally have some other means of making themselves discoverable.

Flowers which need the help of insects for fertilisation attract them, in some cases, not by bright colours, but by peculiar odours. And as we do not find conspicuous colours in plants fertilised by the wind, so flowers have no perfume except where it is of real use. The most brilliant flowers, as a rule, are those which possess least odour, whilst many of them have no scent at all. White or very pale flowers are generally the most odoriferous. M. Mongredien gives a list of about 160 species of hardy trees and shrubs with showy flowers, and another list of sixty species with fragrant flowers; but only twenty of the latter are included among the showy species, and these are almost all white-flowered.[1] Most of the white flowers are scented only at night, or their perfumes are most powerfully emitted at that time; the reason being that white flowers are fertilised chiefly by night-flying insects. We arrive thus at two conclusions: first, that powerful odours and conspicuous colours as guides to insect fertilisers are, as a rule, complementary to each other; secondly, that they occur alternately in the way most useful to the species.

In the animal kingdom various odours and sounds are closely connected with the reproduction of the species.

[1] Wallace, *Tropical Nature*, p. 230 *sq.*

During the season of love a musky odour is emitted by the submaxillary glands of the crocodile, and pervades its haunts. At the same period the anal scent-glands of snakes are in active function, and so are the corresponding glands of the lizards. Many mammals are odoriferous. In some cases the odour appears to serve as a defence or a protection, but in other species the glands are confined to the males, and almost always become more active during the rutting season. Again, a great many insects have the power of producing stridulous sounds. In two families of the Homoptera and in three of the Orthoptera the males alone possess organs of sound in an efficient state, and these are used incessantly during the pairing season. Some male fishes have sound-producing instruments, and the fishermen of Rochelle assert that the males alone make the noise during the spawning time. Of frogs and toads the males emit various sounds at the pairing time, as in the case of the croaking of our common frog. During the rutting season, and at no other time, the male of the huge tortoise of the Galapagos Islands utters a hoarse bellowing noise, which can be heard at a distance of more than a hundred yards. Professor Aughey states that on two occasions, being himself unseen, he watched from a little distance a rattle-snake coiled up with head erect, which continued to rattle at short intervals for half an hour; at last he saw another snake approach, and when they met they paired. Among Birds the power of song, or of giving forth strange cries, or even instrumental music, is exceedingly common, particularly in the males during the pairing season; and almost all male mammals use their voices much more during that period than at any other time. Some, as the giraffe and porcupine, are stated to be completely mute except during the rutting season.

The colours, odours, and sounds of animals, like the colours and odours of plants—so far as they may be assumed to be in some way connected with the reproductive functions—are, as a rule, complementary to each other. Stridulating insects are generally not conspicuously coloured. Among the Homoptera there do not seem to be any well-marked cases of ornamental differences between the sexes. Among crickets,

the Locustidæ, and grasshoppers, some species are beautifully coloured, but Darwin says:—"It is not probable that they owe their bright tints to sexual selection. Conspicuous colours may be of use to these insects by giving notice that they are unpalatable." Other species have directly protective colours. The bright hues of stridulating beetles seem to be of use chiefly for protective and warning purposes; whereas species belonging to the orders Neuroptera and Lepidoptera, often extremely conspicuously coloured, are not remarkable for any stridulous sounds. Frogs and toads, which have an interesting sexual character in the musical powers possessed by the males, are evidently coloured according to the principle of protection, or sometimes tinted with conspicuous hues in order to be more easily recognised by their enemies as a nauseous food. Of Reptiles, the Lacertilia excel mainly in bright tints; the Chelonia, Crocodilia, and Ophidia, in sounds and odours. Among Birds, in one instance at least, the male is remarkable for his scent. "During the pairing and breeding season," says Gould, with reference to the Australian musk-duck, ". . . this bird emits a strong musky odour"; it is not ornamented with any conspicuous hues.[1] Sexual colours and the power of song are generally complementary to each other among Birds. "As a general rule," Mr. Wood remarks, "it is found that the most brilliant songsters among the birds are attired in the plainest garb; and it may safely be predicted of any peculiarly gorgeous bird, that power, quality, and sweetness of voice are in inverse ratio to its beauty of plumage."[2] Thus, of the British birds, with the exception of the bullfinch and goldfinch, the best songsters are plain-coloured, and the brilliant birds of the tropics are hardly ever songsters. The wild camel in the desert of Kum-tagh has a reddish, sandy hue, and the males, "even during the rutting season, utter no sound, but find their consorts by scent."[3] The musk-deer, well known for the intolerable

[1] Gou'd, *Handbook to the Birds of Australia*, ii. 383.
[2] Wood, *Illustra'ed Natural History*, ii. 257.
[3] Prejevalsky, *From Kulja to Lob-nor*, pp. 94, 92.

perfume which the males emit at the pairing time, is also entirely silent.[1]

Moreover, as appears from what has just been said, the sexual colours, scents, and sounds in the animal kingdom are complementary to each other *in the way that is best suited to make the animals easily discoverable.* As bright colours would be of no advantage to flowers fertilised by night-flying insects, so they would be of comparatively little advantage to animals living among grass and plants, in woods and bushes; whereas sounds and scents make the animal recognisable at a considerable distance. We have also seen that it is among flying and aquatic animals that sexual colours chiefly occur, whereas terrestrial animals excel in sounds and scents. Thus most of the stridulating insects are terrestrial. Whilst brightly-coloured lizards, living on trees or running from stone to stone, must attract attention by the brilliance of their covering, crocodiles inhabiting rivers and jungles, and frogs crawling among the grass, allure their mates, the former by emitting musky odours, the latter by producing loud sounds. The odour of the Australian musk-duck, which depends for its food and for its preservation from danger upon its powers of diving rather than upon those of flying, is, as Gould observes, often perceptible long before the animal can be seen.[2]

Darwin remarks, as regards birds:—"Bright colours and the power of song seem to replace each other. We can perceive that, if the plumage did not vary in brightness, or if bright colours were dangerous to the species, other means would be employed to charm the females; and melody of voice offers one such means."[3] But if we accept Darwin's theory of sexual selection, we are compelled to suppose that that inexplicable æsthetic sense of the females has been developed in the way most dangerous to the species. Conspicuous colours are admired by the females of those animals which, by means of such colours, are most easily discovered by their enemies, and sounds and odours are appreciated exactly in those species to which they are most perilous. If,

[1] Brehm, *Thierleben*, iii. 94. [2] Gould, *op. cit.* ii. 382 *sq.*
[3] Darwin, *op. cit.* i. 62.

on the contrary, we accept the explanation that, although sexual colours, odours, and sounds are in some ways hurtful to the species, they are upon the whole advantageous, inasmuch as they make it easier for the sexes to find each other, we have a theory in accordance with all known facts, as well as with the great principle of natural selection. With reference to the singing of birds it is worth noticing that in various species the males, when calling or singing, are in the habit of selecting a free and open place from which their voices can be heard afar.[1] It may be objected that it is not the females but the males that are the seekers, whilst the secondary sexual characters generally occur in the males only. But the females are not entirely passive during the pairing season; and several of the statements collected by Darwin directly indicate that females are attracted by the sounds of their future partners. Moreover, among butterflies and beetles there are species in which the females alone, or both females and males, during the pairing season attract the attention of the opposite sex through odours, sounds, or colours; and among birds call-notes are also produced by the less developed voices of females.[2]

In his work on 'Darwinism,' Wallace expresses the opinion that the various sounds and odours which are peculiar to the male serve as a call to the female, or as an indication of his presence; and, as he says, "the production, intensification, and differentiation of these sounds and odours are clearly within the power of natural selection."[3] Wallace has also shown the immense importance of colour as a means of recognition. The theory here set forth thus, in fact, very nearly approaches his views. The main difference is that the sexual colours have been classified under the head of "colour for recognition," whether the positive cause by which they

[1] Häcker, *Der Gesang der Vögel*, p. 47. [2] *Ibid.* p. 49 *sqq.*

[3] Wallace, *Darwinism*, p. 284. Häcker (*op. cit.* p. 40 and *passim*) has more recently expressed a similar opinion with reference to the singing of birds. He says, "Es wird Niemand, der selber das Frühlingsleben der Vögel Jahr für Jahr mit offenem Auge verfolgt, die Auffassung von sich weisen können, dass die ursprünglichste Bedeutung der einfacheren sexuellen Laute der männlichen Vögel die Anlockung der Weibchen ist."

have been produced be a surplus of vital energy or not. But the argument on which I have based my conclusions differs from his, although, as he points out, it is "in general harmony with it."[1] It is the way in which the sexual colours, sounds, and odours are distributed among the different animal species that, in my opinion, is the strongest evidence against Darwin's theory of sexual selection, because this distribution is invariably such as to make the animal distinguishable at a distance. And now I am prepared to go a step further. It seems to me probable that these secondary sexual characters are useful to the species not only because they facilitate reproduction by making it easier for the sexes to find each other, but also because they tend to prevent in-breeding by attracting individuals from a distance. They would thus influence the species not only quantitatively but qualitatively. Professor Häcker is of opinion that the singing of birds serves such a purpose,[2] and I venture to believe that the same is equally true of sexual colours and odours.

Indeed, so far as the mere propagation of the species is concerned, these characters would, in the case of gregarious animals and many others besides, be quite unnecessary and therefore harmful to the species, because there would be no difficulty in finding a mate from the immediate neighbourhood. Why then those sounds or colours or odours which are apt to attract enemies from a distance? Among gregarious animals the pairing instinct is during the sexual season much stronger than the herding instinct; and if we knew more about their habits, it might be found that they commonly prefer mating with animals outside their own herd. As will be seen in a subsequent chapter, a preference for strangers is noticeable in our domestic animals; in certain wild species pairing is known to be avoided in the nest; and there are yet other arrangements in the animal world tending to prevent in-breeding.[3] If the sexual sounds, colours, and odours serve the same purpose, the analogy between them and the colours and odours of the flowers

[1] See Mr. Wallace's 'Introductory Note.'

[2] Häcker, *op. cit.* pp. 48, 90 *sq.*

[3] See *infra*, on Exogamy.

of plants becomes as complete as possible. In many cases it may really be their main, if not their only, object.

There are some further secondary sexual characters which according to Darwin must be regarded as ornaments —such as the great horns which rise from the head, thorax, and clypeus of many male beetles; the appendages with which some male fishes and reptiles are provided; the combs, plumes, crests, and protuberances of many male birds; and various crests, tufts, and mantles of hair which are found in certain mammals. But some of these characters may also serve as means of recognition, or be of use to the males in their fights for females. Wallace suggests that crests and other erectile feathers may have been safeguards for the bird by making it more formidable in appearance and thus frightening away enemies; that long tail- or wing-feathers might serve to distract the aim of a bird of prey; and that the ornamental appendages of birds and other animals are due to a surplus of vital energy, leading to abnormal growths in those parts of the integument where muscular and nervous action are greatest.[1]

If the primary object of secondary sexual characters is to make it easier for individuals of different sex but of the same species to find and recognise each other, we can understand the immense variability of those characters in different species—it is precisely what might be expected. If, on the other hand, they were due to female choice, why should the characters which appeal to the females differ to such an extent that there are not two species in which they are the same? This difficulty did not escape Darwin. "It is a curious fact," he says, "that in the same class of animals sounds so different as the drumming of the snipe's tail, the tapping of the woodpecker's beak, the harsh trumpet-like cry of certain water-fowl, the cooing of the turtle-dove, and the song of the nightingale, should all be pleasing to the females of the several species." And further, "What shall we say about the harsh screams of, for instance, some kinds of macaws; have these birds as bad taste for musical sounds as they apparently have for colour, judging by the

[1] Wallace, *Darwinism*, p. 293 *sq.*

inharmonious contrast of their bright yellow and blue plumage?"[1]

It has been said that the hypothesis of sexual selection has often been placed in a false light by the introduction of the unnecessary supposition that the female animal is guided by æsthetic feelings in her choice of mate, and that Darwin himself—although many of his expressions undoubtedly give support to such an interpretation—also states that the colours or sounds or other characteristics of the male are an appeal to the female's sexual emotions, a stimulus to sexual excitement, an allurement to sexual contact.[2] I think, however, that the difference between the two "theories" is more verbal than real. When Darwin speaks of the female's "æsthetic" appreciation of certain characters of the male, he evidently does not mean that she takes a disinterested pleasure in his beauty, but that she is attracted by it in a manner that leads to pairing. In no case does the difference affect either my criticism or the explanation I have given of the characters in question. This explanation implies, of course, that the female is allured by the colours she sees, the sounds she hears, or the odour she smells—otherwise they would be entirely useless. But instead of tracing their origin to an inexplicable tendency in the female to be attracted sometimes by certain colours, sometimes by certain sounds, sometimes by certain odours, it shows *why* she is so attracted in different species: the stimulus to which she responds is of such a nature as to make it possible for her to recognise the male at a distance. Thus her tendency to be affected by male characters of a certain kind has been acquired through natural selection owing to the fact that those characters are useful for propagation or—if I am right in my supposition that they are apt to prevent in-breeding—for the production of a vigorous offspring. They would, naturally, never have come into general existence unless the females had been allured by them—that is, unless the females as well as the males had possessed a sexual instinct—

[1] Darwin, *op. cit.* i. 74, 67.

[2] See Lloyd Morgan, *Animal Behaviour*, p. 263; Ellis, *Psychology of Sex*, (vol. iii.) Analysis of the Sexual Impulse, p. 19 *sqq.*

but, on the other hand, the females would not have had an occasion to be allured by them unless they had been useful to the species. Nor can I believe that the delight which the females undoubtedly take in them could have made them develop beyond the limit for their usefulness. For in animals in a state of nature there could be no luxurious evolution of characters so dangerous for the species as the sexual colours and sounds and odours for the most part are. They may, indeed, be useful not only as means of recognition and attraction, but as means of further stimulating the sexual instinct and of promoting important physiological processes; but among wild animals natural selection could never have allowed them to pass out of its control.

Secondary sexual characters the primary object of which is to bring male and female together may also play a part in the prelude to pairing after that object has been achieved. A notorious instance of this is the singing of birds, and another instance is the display of sexual colours, although the bright surfaces displayed may also be such as have been previously concealed. There can be little doubt that these performances, as also the antics or dances of the courting males, are occasioned by the unwillingness of the female to pair at once, since it is hard to believe that the excited male would of his own accord for any length of time postpone the gratification of his desire. That they are due to a conscious endeavour on his part to overcome the coyness of the female by charming her, we have no right to assume. They are most probably the spontaneous outcome of his excitement. Even the activity which is most suggestive of an express purpose, namely, the display of peculiarly coloured surfaces which are generally hidden, may be thus explained. Display in courtship occurs in plainly coloured as well as in ornamental species; and if a bright spot appears on a part of the body which is exposed only in courtship, natural selection may leave it uninterfered with if harmless, and even preserve and develop it if useful as a sexual stimulant. The central problem in the theory of courtship is thus to explain the coyness of the female, which more than anything else makes it—to use a phrase of Darwin—" a prolonged affair."

It should, first, be noticed that in various cases at least the coyness of the female may be regarded as a modified continuation of a previous absolute refusal of the sexual approaches of the male.[1] As Mr. Heape observes, the sexual season of an individual male and an individual female of the same species is not necessarily coincident, and when the male has a sexual season all the year round this is not always the case with the female.[2] In all animals which have been investigated coition is not allowed by the female until some time after the swelling and congestion of the vulva and surrounding tissue are first demonstrated.[3] And frequently also the male seems disposed to have intercourse when the heat of the female has already been succeeded by a marked repugnance to it.[4] It is impossible, however, to believe that a quality so intimately connected with the all-important function of reproduction as feminine coyness could owe its origin merely to a whimsical tendency to continue playfully a rather embarrassing habit which no longer has a meaning. We must assume that the coyness of the female also when she is in heat serves some useful purpose, and it is therefore necessary to look for another explanation of it.

Montaigne said long ago that nothing whets our taste so much as rarity and difficulty, and that the artifice of virgin modesty serves the object of increasing in us the desire to overcome all obstacles.[5] Burdach made the same observation the basis of a biological theory. He wrote that the male's endeavours to catch, overcome, and hold the resisting female make him more and more ardent and increase his fitness for procreation, while the physical and mental excitement of the female at the same time seems to promote her fecundity.[6] On this point Burdach, although his book appeared some thirty years before the 'Origin of Species,'

[1] *Cf.* Burdach, *Die Physiologie als Erfahrungswissenschaft*, i. 411; Ellis, *op. cit.* vol. i. Evolution of Modesty, &c. p. 39 *sq.*

[2] Heape, 'Sexual Season of Mammals,' in *Quarterly Jour. Microscopical Science*, xliv. 5, 12.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 55.

[4] Tillier, *L'instinct sexuel*, p. 89.

[5] Montaigne, *op. cit.* book ii. ch. 15, vol. ii. 329, 332.

[6] Burdach, *op. cit.* i. 370, 411.

was really more Darwinian than Darwin himself, who never seems to have realised the great importance of female coyness for the existence of the species.[1] The first writer after Darwin, so far as I know, who emphasised this was Tillier (in 1889). Speaking of the long-winded procedure of courtship, he says :—" It is natural to think that its object and result are to make the male more ardent. The excitement which produces a delay in the pairing increases also perhaps in a certain measure the secretion of the glands and thus renders the chances of fecundation more numerous."[2] And in another place :—" Is it not possible to admit that this long-continued display leads to a kind of sexual excitement which is profitable to fecundation when the individuals arrive at the point of uniting definitely ? "[3] Some years later, although evidently without knowing Tillier's treatise, Groos likewise suggested that the primary object of courtship is to produce sexual excitement. He quotes Ziegler's statement that " in all animals a high degree of excitement of the nervous system is necessary to procreation," and proceeds :—" Since the sex impulse must necessarily have extraordinary strength, the interests of the preservation of species are best served by a long preliminary condition of excitement and by some checks to its discharge. The instinctive coyness of the female serves this purpose."[4] Similar views have been expressed by Havelock Ellis, Hirn, Lloyd Morgan, Häcker, and others.[5]

In support of this theory it may be said that the activity of the male which is the consequence of the coyness of the female is not only, as already said, reflexes of excitement, but undoubtedly at the same time a sexual stimulant. Häcker points out that the call-cries and song of birds at

[1] *Cf.* Ellis, *op. cit.* (vol. iii.) Analysis of the Sexual Impulse p. 21.

[2] Tillier, *L'instinct sexuel*, p. 74. [3] *Ibid.* p. 127.

[4] Groos, *Die Spiele der Tiere*, pp. 263, 265. *Idem*, *Play of Man*, p. 265.

[5] Ellis, *op. cit.* (vol. iii.) Analysis of the Sexual Impulse, p. 181. Hirn, *Origins of Art*, p. 192 *sqq.* Lloyd Morgan, *op. cit.* p. 265 *sq.* Häcker, *op. cit.* pp. 48, 51, 57, 58, 89. Mortimer, *Chapters on Human Love*, p. 36. Marro, *La puberta*, quoted by Ellis, p. 181.

the pairing season become methods of producing excitement, in the male by the muscular energy required and in the female through the ear.[1] So also the males are excited by their own nuptial display, antics, and dances. Muscular movement is by itself calculated to produce sexual excitement, and dancing, as the highest and most complex form of muscular movement, is therefore among the most various kinds of animals, from insects and birds to man, a prelude to coition.[2] It has been called " the spur of lust," or " a circle of which the devil himself is the centre." [3] And not only is movement itself a sexual stimulant, but even the spectacle of movement tends to be so. Hence, as Dr. Havelock Ellis points out, we so frequently find, both among the lower animals and savage peoples, that one sex alone, usually the male, takes an active part in dancing and similar movements calculated to stimulate the sexual passion of the other sex as well.[4] Sir Basil Thomson tells us of a case in which a young Fiji woman was so excited by a young man who surpassed all his fellows in the war-dance that she, unable to contain herself, rushed into the middle of the dancing ground, and clutching him, took his loin-cloth in her teeth—a most terrible breach of decorum.[5] It is also highly probable that the females are excited by the males' display of their sexual colours.[6] Professor Hirn gives instances of the stimulating effect of brilliancy, and points out, for example, that the luminous spheres on the tails of pheasants and peacocks will, in virtue of their very smallness and brilliancy, provoke a stimulation in the mind of the hen before whom they are vibrated.[7]

To lead to stimulating activity, however, can only be the immediate object of feminine coyness, not its ultimate object. The question now to be answered is, *why* such stimulating activity is of importance for the maintenance of the species. It is here the difficulties begin. Far from

[1] Häcker, *op. cit.* pp. 48, 51, 57 *sq.*

[2] *Cf.* Ellis, *op. cit.* (vol. iii.) Analysis of the Sexual Impulse, p. 47; Groos, *Play of Man*, p. 273.

[3] Burton, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, iii. 2. 2. 4, p. 540.

[4] Ellis, *op. cit.* (vol. iii.) Analysis of the Sexual Impulse, p. 48 *sq.*

[5] Thomson, *Fijians*, p. 240.

[6] See Wallace, *Darwinism*, p. 285. [7] Hirn, *op. cit.* p. 193 *sqq.*

agreeing with one of the writers referred to above that the importance of the instinctive coyness of the female is "self-evident," I think, on the contrary, that in the present state of our physiological knowledge it is a problem which cannot be definitely solved. But hypothetical suggestions may prove to be useful.

The first question which presents itself is whether the sexual instinct in animals is so feeble that it requires some other stimulus besides the mere presence of a suitable individual to lead to intercourse. Dr. Havelock Ellis says that we are deceived by what we see among highly fed domesticated animals, and among the lazy classes of human society, when we imagine that the sexual instinct is normally ever craving to be satisfied, and that throughout nature it can always be set off at a touch whenever the stimulus is applied. "So far from the instinct of tumescence naturally needing to be crushed, it needs, on the contrary, in either sex to be submitted to the most elaborate and prolonged processes in order to bring about those conditions which detumescence relieves. . . . The whole object of courtship, of the mutual approximation and caresses of two persons of the opposite sex, is to create the state of sexual tumescence."[1] I cannot help thinking that this is a somewhat exaggerated statement of difficulties experienced by wild animals and savage men in obtaining tumescence, if by tumescence is merely meant the vascular congestion which is an essential preliminary to acute sexual desire.[2] Dr. Malinowski is probably right in saying that in the majority of savage races sexual life is carried on very intensely;[3] the restrictions to pre-nuptial intercourse which we have found among many of them are certainly no evidence of a feeble sexual impulse. And among wild animals this impulse is probably intensified by being more or less limited to a special season of the year. It seems to me that the excitement resulting from the coyness of the female can hardly be needed in order to produce acute sexual desire in the male, which is easily obtained

[1] Ellis, *op. cit.* (vol. iii.) Analysis of the Sexual Impulse, p. 44 *sq.*
[2] See *ibid.* p. 21.
[3] Malinowski, 'Baloma,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xlvi. 417.

without it; whilst in the case of the female it would be somewhat absurd to maintain that her coyness exists simply for the purpose of being overcome. But the prolonged excitement which follows from her coyness has another effect, which may be of the utmost importance for the species: it increases the secretions of the sexual glands. This was hinted at by Tillier, who pointed out that the excitement might thereby render the chances of fecundation more numerous. So it does, because it is only when mixed with the prostatic fluid that the spermatozoa gain their full vitality. The profuse secretion of the prostate, resulting from prolonged excitement, would give motility to a larger number of spermatozoa than would otherwise gain the necessary vitality, and thus there would be an increased prospect of fecundation. Or, more generally and vaguely speaking, the prolonged excitement may be supposed to serve the same object as that enormous production of spermatozoa, estimated at 180 millions in a single ejaculation,[1] which has never yet been satisfactorily explained. Again, as for the effect of courtship upon the female organism, we may assume, with Dr. Havelock Ellis, that the mucus which is so profusely poured out over the external sexual organs in woman during the excitement of sexual desire has for its end the lubrication of the parts and the facilitation of the passage of the intromittent organ.[2]

I doubt whether at present anything more can be said about the biological importance of courtship and female coyness.

[1] Tigerstedt, *Lehrbuch der Physiologie des Menschen*, ii. 459.

[2] Ellis, *op. cit.* (vol. iii.) Analysis of the Sexual Impulse, p. 186 *sq.*

CHAPTER XV

PRIMITIVE MEANS OF ATTRACTION

In the present and the next chapter I shall deal with means of various kinds by which primitive people endeavour to make themselves sexually attractive to persons of the opposite sex. They are used by both sexes—by men who court and by women who want to be courted. They all fall under the heading " self-decoration."

The desire for self-decoration, although a specifically human quality, is exceedingly old. The ancient barbarians who inhabited the south of Europe at the same time as the reinde r and the mammoth brought to their caves brilliant and ornamental objects.[1] Nowadays there are savages destitute of almost everything which we regard as necessaries of life, but there is no people so rude as not to take pleasure in ornaments. The women of the wretched Veddas in Ceylon decorate themselves with necklaces of brass beads, and bangles cut from the chank shell.[2] The Fuegians " are content to be naked," but " ambitious to be fine."[3] The Australian native, without taking the slightest pride in his appearance so far as neatness or cleanliness is concerned, is yet very vain of his own rude decorations.[4] And of the Tasmanians Cook tells us that they had no wish to obtain

[1] *Cf.* Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, i. 64.

[2] Emerson Tennent, *Ceylon*, ii. 443.

[3] Hawkesworth, *Account of Voyages in the Southern Hemisphere*, ii. 55.

[4] Eyre, *Journals of Expeditions of Discovery into Central Australia*, ii. 209

useful articles, but were eager to secure anything ornamental.

The predilection of savages for ornaments has been sufficiently shown by travellers in almost every part of the world. Feathers and beads of different colours, flowers, rings, anklets, and bracelets are common embellishments. A fully-equipped Santal belle, for instance, carries two anklets, and perhaps twelve bracelets, and a necklace weighing a pound, the total weight of ornaments on her person amounting to thirty-four pounds of bell metal—"a greater weight," says Captain Sherwill, "than one of our drawing-room belles could well lift."[1] We may without much exaggeration say with Grosse that "the primitive man attaches to his body all the ornaments he can get, and that he adorns all the parts of his body that can bear an ornament."[2]

It is true that the things which people attach to their bodies are not all ornaments, even though they look as if they were.[3] They may be trophies of war or of the chase, intended to show off strength, courage, or skill, or substitutes for trophies having some resemblance to them.[4] They may be valuables worn chiefly for producing an impression of wealth.[5] They may be badges, or indications of social status—like the necklaces of iron and ear-rings worn by Masai women in order that it shall be known that they are married.[6] They may be signs of mourning—like the cassowary feathers worn by widowers among the Koita of Port Moresby.[7] They may be charms for good luck—for example to secure favour with women or courage in war.[8] They may be used for curative purposes or serve as a protection against illness, malevolent spirits, bewitching, or

[1] Sherwill, 'Tour through the Rájmahal Hills,' in *Jour. Asiatic Soc. Bengal*, xx. 584. [2] Grosse, *Beginnings of Art*, p. 84.

[3] See Finck, *Primitive Love and Love Stories*, p. 233 *sqq.*

[4] Spencer, *op. cit.* ii. 183 *sqq.*

[5] v. Barth, *Ost-Afrika vom Limpopo bis zum Somalilande*, p. 32. Schneider, *Die Naturvölker*, i. 107. Hirn, *Origins of Art*, p. 222.

[6] Hollis, *Masai*, p. 282.

[7] Seligman, *Melanesians of British New Guinea*, p. 166.

[8] Parkinson, *Dreissig Jahre in der Südsee*, p. 146 *sqq.*

the evil eye.[1] Among the East African Nandi, for instance, if a person dies his next younger brother or sister has to wear a certain ornament for ever after to escape being attacked by "the evil spirit or disease"; [2] and in Morocco it is often impossible to distinguish between an ornament and an amulet. Certain gems, corals, and other ornamental objects are worn there as charms against the evil eye; and the designs of Moorish decorative art largely serve the same purpose.[3] But a recent American writer is certainly mistaken in his statement that when we subject the primitive custom of "ornamentation" to a critical examination we find in nearly every case that it is either not at all or only indirectly connected with the relations of the sexes. He argues that, even in the few instances when the decorations of savages have subsequently come to be used as means of pleasing the women, "this was not as things of beauty but indirectly and unintentionally through their association with rank, wealth, distinction in war, prowess, and manly qualities in general."[4] Very often such decorations have nothing whatever to do with either wealth or rank or manliness, and are worn by women as well as men. Dr. Karsten, again, suggests that the so-called ornaments of the South American Indians have been primarily used "for purely religious and magical ends, either to protect the wearer and to give him strength, or directly to conjure and exorcise the supernatural enemies by whom the Indian constantly believes himself to be surrounded"; and that their character of being means of decoration is a secondary development.[5] In many instances he has undoubtedly proved his case. But I think it is an indisputable fact that savages, at present at least, practise ornamentation on a large scale as a sexual allurement

[1] See, *e.g.*, Hollis, *Nandi*, p. 29; v. Rosen, *Träskfolket*, p. 302 (Batwa of North-Eastern Rhodesia); Hirn, *op. cit.* p. 224; Finck, *op. cit.* p. 236 *sqq.* Karsten, *Studies in South American Anthropology*, i. *passim*.

[2] Hollis, *Nandi*, p. 29.

[3] See Westermarck, 'Magic Origin of Moorish Designs,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxiv. 213 *sqq.*

[4] Finck, *op. cit.* pp. 232, 259.

[5] Karsten, *op. cit.* i. 121.

Burton, in his 'Anatomy of Melancholy,' said long ago that "stronger provocations proceed from outward ornaments, than such as nature hath provided";[1] and this is true of savage as well as civilised man. It is significant that in all parts of the world the desire for self-decoration is strongest in youth. Concerning the Dakota, Prescott states that both sexes adorn themselves at their courtships to make themselves more attractive, and that "the young only are addicted to dress."[2] The Oráon of Bengal is likewise particular about his personal appearance "only so long as he is unmarried."[3] Among the Let-htas in Indo-China it is the unmarried youths who are profusely bedecked with red and white bead necklaces, wild boars' tusks, brass armlets, and a broad band of black braid below the knee.[4] Among the Nagas of Assam, again, the women in some cases put aside on marriage the ornaments which as girls it was their privilege to wear.[5] Among the Bangerang tribe of Victoria the youth at about sixteen years of age "affected the use of red ochre, adorned his head with plumes, and made himself an opossum-rug, which he scored and coloured in the approved way. . . . To please the ladies was evidently the chief object of his solicitude."[6] Speaking of the Encounter Bay tribe of South Australia, the Rev. A. Meyer says that "the plucking out of the beard and anointing with grease and ochre (which belong to the initiatory ceremony) the men may continue if they please till about forty years of age, for they consider it ornamental, and fancy that it makes them look younger, and gives them an importance in the eyes of the women."[7] When Bulmer once asked an Australian native why he wore his ornaments, the latter answered "that he wore them in order to look well,

[1] Burton, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, iii. 2. 2. 3, p. 522.
[2] Schoolcraft, *Indian Tribes of the United States*, iii. 237 *sq.*
[3] Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal*, p. 249 *sq.*
[4] Colquhoun, *Amongst the Shans*, p. 76.
[5] Hodson, *Nāga Tribes of Manipur*, p. 77.
[6] Curr, *Recollections of Squatting in Victoria*, p. 254.
[7] Meyer, 'Manners and Customs of the Aborigines of the Encounter Bay Tribe,' in Woods, *Native Tribes of South Australia*, p. 189.

and to make himself agreeable to the women."[1] In Fiji, says Mr. Anderson, the men "who like to attract the attention of the opposite sex don their best plumage."[2] Among the Wataveta "young men ornament themselves profusely";[3] and the young Thonga who goes, with two or three of his friends, to look for a wife in the villages "puts on his most brilliant ornaments and his most precious skins."[4] Among the Fors, again, the girls "wear bells on their ankles and bangles round their necks and waists, and perfume themselves extensively in the hope of attracting lovers."[5] In British Nigeria, "when an unbetrothed girl arrives at the age of puberty, she advertises the fact by decking herself out in her best clothes and ornaments, and parading the town or village, accompanied by a bevy of girls. This usually produces a suitor."[6] Cruickshank says that on the Gold Coast "both men and women are at the greatest pains to render themselves mutually agreeable to each other. With this view, they decorate themselves with much care, and indulge in the greatest coquetry."[7] At dances and festivals of many savages the young men and women endeavour to please each other by painting themselves with brilliant colours and decorating themselves with

[1] Brough Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, i. 275.

[2] Anderson, *Notes of Travel in Fiji and New Caledonia*, p. 136.

[3] New, *Life, Wanderings, &c. in Eastern Africa*, p. 357.

[4] Junod, *Life of a South African Tribe*, i. 102 *sq.*

[5] Felkin, 'Notes on the For Tribe of Central Africa,' in *Proceed. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh*, xiii. 233. On the erotic influence of odour and the use of perfumes as sexual stimulants see Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, (vol. iv.) Sexual Selection in Man, p. 91 *sqq.*; Stoll, *Das Geschlechtsleben in der Völkerpsychologie*, p. 802 *sqq.* Dr. Ellis observes that nearly all the perfumes of animal origin in use by civilised man are odours which have a specifically sexual object among the animals from which they are derived. This is particularly the case with musk—the most cherished perfume of the Islamic world and still the most popular of European perfumes—which is an odour chiefly emitted during the sexual season. Indeed, the sexual odours of most animals seem to be modifications of musk.

[6] Mockler-Ferryman, *British Nigeria*, p. 232. See also Adams, *Sketches taken during Ten Voyages to Africa*, p. 7 *sq.* (Fanti).

[7] Cruickshank, *Eighteen Years on the Gold Coast*, ii. 212.

all sorts of ornaments.[1] Thus among the Akikúyu in East Africa the young men come to the moonlight dances where the girls choose their own partners properly adorned and turned out, because if they did not, as they say, "none of the girls would dance with them."[2]

In order to attach some object to their bodies many savages submit to more or less painful operations. The lips, the nose, and the lobes of the ears are especially ill-treated.[3] The Shulis in the Egyptian Sudan bore a hole in the under-lip and insert in it a piece of crystal three or four inches long, which sways about as they speak.[4] In Eastern Central Africa women wear a lip-ring; they say it makes them look pretty, and "the bigger the ring, the more they value themselves."[5] Similar practices are found in other parts of Africa,[6] where they are likewise considered to improve the appearance,[7] and among various tribes in America.[8] Among the Pawumwa Indians of Brazil, as soon as the girls are old enough to be courted, they have their lips pierced and a plug is inserted in either lip, which is a sign that the boys and unmarried men may court the girl.

[1] Harmon, *Journal of Voyages and Travels in the Interior of North America*, p. 305 (Takulli). Hardenburg, *Putumayo*, p. 161 *sq.* (Huitoto Indians). Wallace, *Travels on the Amazon*, p. 281 (Uaupés). Dalton, *op. cit.* p. 250 (Oráons). Waitz-Gerland, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, vi. 604 (Ysanel Islanders). Turner, *Samoa*, p. 121. Finsch, *Neu-Guinea und seine Bewohner*, p. 139 (Papuans of Humboldt Bay). [2] Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People*, p. 124.

[3] Stoll, *op. cit.* p. 98 *sqq.* Hovorka, 'Verzierungen der Nase,' in *Mittheil. Anthrop. Gesellsch. Wien*, xxv. 155 *sqq* Mathew, 'Beiträge zur Ethnographie der Australier,' *ibid.* xxxvii. 18 *sq.* Harrison, 'On the Artificial Enlargement of the Earlobe,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* ii. 190 *sqq.*

[4] Wilson and Felkin, *Uganda and the Egyptian Soudan*, ii. 62.

[5] Macdonald, *Africana*, i. 17.

[6] Barth, *Reisen und Entdeckungen in Nord- und Central-Afrika*, ii. 514. Livingstone, *Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa*, p. 577.

[7] Petherick, *Travels in Central Africa*, i. 248 (Djour). Ankermann, 'Kulturkreise und Kulturschichten in Afrika,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xxxvii. 64.

[8] v. Martius, *Beiträge zur Ethnographie Amerika's zumal Brasiliens*, i. 351. Wallace, *Travels on the Amazon*, p. 514.

When they are married, the plug of the lower lip is taken out, a larger incision is made, and a piece of polished white quartz is inserted in the lip; this serves as a kind of marriage certificate.[1] In the north-western part of North America, when boys and girls approach puberty, they have their lower lip perforated for the labret;[2] and Holmberg, who is probably our best authority on the Tlingit, says that the men undergo this operation to make themselves agreeable to the young women.[3] It is about the same age that among various savages the septum of the nose is pierced for the reception of a piece of bone, wood, or shell, or some other small object;[4] and this, too, is said to be done for the sake of adornment.[5] Of the Banâkâ people on the Gaboon Coast in West Africa Mr. Leighton Wilson writes:—"Their women disfigure their faces very much by making large holes in their ears, and through the cartilaginous parts of the nose. Weights are attached to make the hole large enough to pass the finger through. Pieces of fat meat are frequently worn in these holes, but whether for ornament or fragrance is not known. I inquired of one of them once why she did it, and received the laconic answer, 'My husband likes it.'"[6] To pierce, enlarge, or somehow mutilate the ear-lobes is a very widespread practice. Some American[7] and African[8] savages pull them down almost to

[1] Haseman, 'Some Notes on the Pawumwa Indians of South America,' in *American Anthropologist*, N. S. xiv. 341.

[2] Armstrong, *Personal Narrative of the Discovery of the North-West Passage*, p. 194. Lisiansky, *Voyage round the World*, p. 243. v. Langsdorf, *Voyages and Travels*, ii. 115. Dixon, *Voyage round the World*, p. 187.

[3] Holmberg, 'Ethnographische Skizzen über die Völker des russischen Amerika,' in *Acta Soc. Scient. Fennicae*, iv. 301.

[4] Franklin, *Second Expedition to the Shores of the Polar Sea*, p. 118 (Eskimo). Holub, *Seven Years in South Africa*, i. 35 (Masarwas). Angas, *Savage Life and Scenes in Australia*, ii. 225. Seligman, *Melanesians of British New Guinea*, pp. 72, 73, 256, 489.

[5] Mathew, *Two Representative Tribes of Queensland*, p. 108. Eylmann, *Die Eingeborenen der Kolonie Südaustralien*, p. 108.

[6] Wilson, *Western Africa*, p. 288.

[7] Carver, *Travels through the Interior Parts of North America*, p. 227. v. Martius, *op. cit.* i. 319 (Botocudos), 620 (Arecunas).

[8] Johnston, *Kilima-njaro Expedition*, p. 429 *sq.* (Wataita).

the shoulders. Among the Easter Islanders, says Beechey, "the lobe, deprived of its ear-ring, hangs dangling against the neck, and has a very disagreeable appearance, particularly when wet. It is sometimes so long as to be greatly in the way; to obviate which, they pass the lobe over the upper part of the ear, or more rarely, fasten one lobe to the other, at the back of the head."[1] The Warega of the Belgian Congo look upon the enormous holes in the ear-lobes of their women as very ornamental.[2]

The object of these practices is certainly obscure. Considering that the parts of the body which are subject to them are its main entrance gates—the mouth, the nose, and the ears—it is tempting to surmise that their object may have been to provide the body with a guard, in the form of a permanent charm, against the attacks of invisible enemies, whether spirits or impersonal evil influences, ever ready to enter and cause sickness or destruction or other injury.[3] I remember an occasion in Morocco when my Berber teacher, horrified by the foul odour emitted by a dog, closed with his fingers not only the nose but the ears, in order to shut out what is looked upon by the Moors as a sort of obnoxious miasma associated with the *jnūn*, or evil spirits. Mr. Crawley suggests that the insertion of plugs or sticks or the like in the nose, lips, or ears was probably intended to secure the safety of those sense-organs by diverting evil influences from them "as lightning is diverted from an object by the lightning-rod";[4] but in the absence of any direct evidence for this suggestion I find it difficult to believe that those organs, which are not particularly sensitive or exposed to injury, would for the sake of their own safety be subjected to the painful process necessary for the reception of the amulet. Nor can I agree with Mr. Crawley that there is ample evidence that "savage mutilation" is never due to the desire for oanament, the savage being averse to the doctrine, "Il faut souffrir pour être belle."[5] On the other hand, there is ample evidence that the practices in question

[1] Beechey, *Voyage to the Pacific and Beering's Strait*, i. 38.
[2] Delhaise, *Les Warega*, p. 170. [3] See Karsten, *op. cit.* i. 122 *sqq.*
[4] Crawley, *Mystic Rose*, pp. 135, 138. [5] *Ibid.* p. 135.

are nowadays looked upon as ornamental, whatever may have been their original object. And as any theory as to their origin is merely conjectural, there is no justification for the dogmatic assertion that "it is erroneous to attribute these practices to the desire for ornament."

The teeth are often subject to ill-treatment of some kind or other;[1] and various reasons for the custom are in different cases given by the natives who practise it. The Dieri in South-Eastern Australia, on being asked why they knock out two front teeth of the upper jaw of their children, answer that when they were created the good spirit Mura-mura did this to the first child and, pleased at the sight, commanded that the like should be done to every male or female child for ever after.[2] The savages of Northern Formosa knock out the eye-teeth of all the children when they reach the age of six or eight years, "in the belief that it strengthens their speed and wind in hunting."[3] The Bantu Kavirondo, both men and women, usually pull out the two middle incisor teeth in the lower jaw, as it is thought that if a man retains all his lower incisor teeth he will be killed in warfare, and that if his wife has failed to pull out her teeth it might cause her husband to perish.[4] The Nilotic tribes of Kavirondo, again, draw the six middle incisors in the lower jaw; and if a man does not submit to this operation it is said that his wife will die soon after marriage.[5] But more often we are told that the extraction or mutilation of teeth is considered to improve the appearance. This holds true of various African peoples[6]—for example, the Boloki

[1] See Stoll, *op. cit.* p. 247 *sqq.*; Mathews, 'Beiträge zur Ethnographie der Australier,' in *Mitteil. Anthrop. Gesellsch. Wien*, xxxvii. 19 *sq.*; v. Jhering, 'Die künstliche Deformirung der Zähne,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xiv. 213 *sqq.*; Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, iv. 180 *sqq.*

[2] Gason, 'Manners and Customs of the Dieyerie Tribe,' in Woods, *op. cit.* p. 267.

[3] Taintor, *Aborigines of Northern Formosa*, p. 22.

[4] Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, p. 728. Hobley, *Eastern Uganda*, p. 20.

[5] Hobley, *op. cit.* p. 31.

[6] Ankermann, in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xxxvii. 64.

on the Upper Congo River, who chisel the upper incisors to V-shaped points,[1] and the Herero, who pull out the four middle teeth in the lower jaw and file the eye-teeth into the form of a swallow's tail.[2] Of the former operation, as practised by the men among some of the Congo natives, Tuckey says that it is "principally done with the idea of rendering themselves agreeable to the women."[3] Dr. Holub states that one of the Makalaka tribes, north of the Zambesi, and the Matongas, on its bank, "break out their top incisor-teeth from the sheerest vanity. Their women say that it is only horses that eat with all their teeth, and that men ought not to eat like horses."[4] The Bagonjo in Uganda, who file the front teeth to a point, say that this helps them to laugh well; but "in days gone by the maiden who had her teeth unfiled was not desired in marriage."[5] Speaking of the Malays of Naning, north of the Malacca lands, Newbold says that "the Malays consider the process of filing down the teeth, together with the subsequent operation of blackening them, indispensable for personal beauty";[6] and Crawfurd makes a similar remark with reference to the same practice in the Malay Archipelago, where it is a necessary prelude to marriage, the common way of expressing the fact that a girl has arrived at puberty being that "she has had her teeth filed."[7] In other countries also the filing or mutilation of teeth takes place at that age.[8] Among the Kádars, a wild jungle tribe in the Cochin State in South India, the operation of chipping "all or some

[1] Weeks, *Among Congo Cannibals*, p. 141.

[2] Dannert, 'Über die Sitte der Zahnverstümmelung bei den Ova-herero,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xxxix. 948, 949, 952. 'Zahnverstümmelung der Hereros,' in *Verhandl. Berliner Gesellsch. Anthrop.* 1908, p. 930 *sqq.* v. François, *Nama und Damara Deutsch-Süd-West-Afrika*, p. 198.

[3] Tuckey, *Expedition to explore the River Zaire*, p. 80 *sq.*

[4] Holub, *Seven Years in South Africa*, ii. 256.

[5] Cunningham, *Uganda*, p. 262.

[6] Newbold, *Account of the British Settlements in the Straits of Malacca*, i. 253.

[7] Crawfurd, *History of the Indian Archipelago*, i. 215 *sqq.*

[8] v. François, *op. cit.* p. 198 (Herero). Roscoe, *Northern Bantu*, p. 78 (Banyoro). See also v. Jhering, in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xiv. 218.

of the incisor teeth, both upper and lower, into the form of sharp pointed, but not serrated cone," is performed on boys at the age of eighteen and girls at the age of ten or thereabouts.[1] Among the Nicobarese the men blacken their teeth from the period of puberty, and this disfigurement is so favourably regarded by the fair sex that a woman "would scorn to accept the addresses of one possessing white teeth, like a dog or pig."[2] It is at the same period of life that the Pelew Islanders,[3] the natives of New Britain,[4] and the Chaymas of New Andalusia,[5] have their teeth blackened, which is considered an indispensable condition of beauty.

Many savage men take particular pride in their hair-dress. Sometimes the hair is painted in a showy manner, sometimes decorated with beads and tinsel, sometimes combed and arranged with the most exquisite care. The Kandhs of Central India have their hair, which is worn very long, drawn forward and rolled up till it looks like a horn projecting from between the eyes. Around this it is their delight to wear a piece of red cloth, and they insert the feathers of favourite birds, as also a pipe, comb, &c.[6] The men of Tanna, of the New Hebrides, wear their hair " twelve and eighteen inches long, and have it divided into some six or seven hundred little locks or tresses " ;[7] and among the Latuka a man requires a period of from eight to ten years to perfect his coiffure.[8] In North America Hearne saw several men, about six feet high, who had preserved " a single lock of their hair that, when let down, would trail on the ground as they walked."[9] Other Indians practise the custom of

[1] Anantha Krishna Iyer, *Cochin Tribes and Castes*, i. 24 *sq.*

[2] Man, ' Account of the Nicobar Islanders,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xv. 441.

[3] Dahlgren, ' Om Palau-öarna,' in *Ymer*, iv. 317.

[4] Powell, *Wanderings in a Wild Country*, p. 254.

[5] v. Humboldt, *Personal Narrative of Travels to the Equinoctial Regions of the New Continent*, iii. 224.

[6] Dalton, *op. cit.* p. 301.

[7] Turner, *Samoa*, p. 308.

[8] Baker, *Albert N'yanza*, i. 198.

[9] Hearne, *Journey from Prince of Wales's Fort to the Northern Ocean*, p. 306 note.

shaving the head and ornamenting it with the crest of deer's hairs; and wigs are used by several savage peoples.[1]

Fashions relating to the hair-dress may certainly owe their origin to different motives. Sometimes, as Frazer has pointed out, the savage may arrange his hair so as to assimilate himself to his totem and put himself more fully under its protection. Thus the Buffalo clans of the Iowa and Omaha wear two locks of hair in imitation of horns; the Small Bird clan of the Omaha "leave a little hair in front, over the forehead, for a bill, and some at the back of the head, for the bird's tail, with much over each ear for the wings"; and the Turtle subclan cut off all the hair from a boy's head, except six locks which are arranged so as to imitate the legs, head, and tail of a turtle.[2] Dr. Karsten believes that the hair customs of the South American Indians are based on the idea "that the hair is, as it were, the seat of the spirit or soul."[3] But there is abundant evidence that the hair-dress serves as a sexual stimulant.

It is the young and unmarried who pay the greatest attention to it. Among the Acholi in the Nile Province the young men, "the bucks of society," are much more elaborately ornamented than the old men and chiefs, the hair-dress being their distinguishing feature; it consists of "a curiously worked cone of matted hair, with beads neatly stitched in a pattern round it, and an empty cartridge-case stuck in at the top."[4] Young unmarried Zulus allow their hair to grow, and dress it in a variety of fantastic shapes; "now it looks like a sugar loaf, now like two little hills with valleys between."[5] Among the Bunjogees, a Chittagong Hill tribe, the young men "stuff a large ball of black cotton into their topknot to make it look bigger."[6] In the Tenimber Group of the Malay Archipelago the lads decorate their long locks with leaves, flowers, and feathers, as Riedel says,

[1] Catlin, *North American Indians*, ii. 23.
[2] Frazer, *Totemism*, p. 26 *sqq.*
[3] Karsten, *op. cit.* i. 59.
[4] Cunningham, *Uganda*, p. 352.
[5] Tyler, *Forty Years among the Zulus*, p. 60.
[6] Lewin, *Wild Races of South-Eastern India*, p. 240.

" only in order to please the women."[1] In the Admiralty Islands, according to Professor Moseley, " only the young men of apparently from eighteen to thirty, or so, wear the hair long and combed out into a mop or bush," whilst the boys and older men wear the hair short.[2] Among the Takulli, an ethnic group of Athapascan Indians, " the elderly people neglect to ornament their heads, in the same manner as they do the rest of their persons, and generally wear their hair short. But the younger people of both sexes, who feel more solicitous to make themselves agreeable to each other, wash and paint their faces, and let their hair grow long."[3] Sibree tells us that when king Radàma attempted to introduce European customs among the Hovas of Madagascar, and ordered that all his officers and

[1] Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua*, p. 292.

[2] Moseley, ' Inhabitants of the Admiralty Islands,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* vi. 400.

[3] Harmon, *Journal of Voyages and Travels in the Interior of North America*, p. 288. Short hair is often regarded as a symbol of chastity. Every Buddhist " novice "—that is, a person admitted to the first degree of monkhood—has to cut off his hair, in order to prove that " he is ready to give up the most beautiful and highly-prized of all his ornaments for the sake of a religious life " (Monier Williams, *Buddhism*, p. 306); and in Mexico the religious virgins, as also men who decided upon a life of chastity, had their hair cut (Acosta, *Natural and Moral History of the Indies*, ii. 333; Bancroft, *Native Races of the Pacific States of North America*, ii. 251 *sq.*). A similar idea probably underlies the custom which requires that women, when they marry, shall be deprived of their hair, the husband trying in this way to preserve the fidelity of his wife (see Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition*, iii. 354; Waitz-Gerland, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, vi. 567; Palmer, ' Notes on some Australian Tribes,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xiii. 286; de Rubruquis, ' Travels into Tartary and China,' in Pinkerton, *Collection of Voyages and Travels*, vii. 32; Heriot, *Travels through the Canadas*, p. 335). This custom is not only found among savages but prevailed at Sparta and Athens (Rossbach, *Untersuchungen über die römische Ehe*, p. 290) and among the Anglo-Saxons (Wright, *Womankind in Western Europe*, p. 68). Among the Tlascalans of ancient Mexico it was customary to shave the head of a newly-married couple, both man and woman, " to denote that all youthful sports ought in that state to be abandoned " (Heriot, *op. cit.* p. 333).

soldiers should have their hair cut, this command produced so great a disturbance among the women of the capital that they assembled in great numbers to protest against the king's order, and could not be quieted till they were surrounded by troops and their leaders cruelly speared.[1]

Scarcely anything has a greater attraction for the savage than showy colours. "No matter," says Dr. Holub, "how ill a traveller in the Marutse district may be, and how many bearers he may require, if he only has a good stock of blue beads he may always be sure of commanding the best attention and of securing the amplest services; his beads will prove an attraction irresistible to sovereign and subject, to man, woman, and child, to freeman and bondman alike."[2] The practice of ornamenting one's self with gaudy baubles is indeed extremely prevalent. Of Santal men at a feast Sir W. Hunter says that, "if all the colours of the rainbow were not displayed by them, certainly the hedgehog, the peacock, and a variety of the feathered tribe had been laid under contribution in order to supply the young Santal beaux with plumes."[3] Especially does the savage delight in paint. We know that the practice of applying paint to the body existed in Europe already at the end of the Quaternary and during the Neolithic periods.[4] Red ochre is generally looked upon as the chief embellishment. Goethe praises the incomparable power of yellowish-red over the emotions, and says that "the fondness of savage men for it has been noticed everywhere."[5] Yet, as Grosse observes, painting with red would hardly have been so generally diffused in the lowest stages of civilisation if the red colouring material had not been everywhere so easily and so abundantly procurable.[6] Of the other colours black and white are probably most in use. The Dakota paint their faces red and black, "which they esteem as

[1] Sibree, *The Great African Island*, p. 211.

[2] Holub, *op. cit.* ii. 351. [3] Hunter, *Rural Bengal*, i. 185.

[4] Déchelette, 'La peinture corporelle et le tatouage,' in *Revue archéologique*, ser. iv. vol. ix. 38 *sqq.*

[5] Goethe, *Zur Farbenlehre*, § 775, vol. i. 293.

[6] Grosse, *Beginning of Art*, p. 62 *sq.*

greatly ornamental."[1] Among the Guaycurûs many men paint their bodies half red, half white.[2] Throughout the Australian continent the natives stain themselves with black, red, yellow, and white.[3] In Fiji a small quantity of vermilion is esteemed "as the greatest possible acquisition."[4]

The practice of painting the body may also, no doubt, be traced to different motives. Its object may be to frighten enemies in battle,[5] or to protect the body from the weather and from insects.[6] Among the Hottentots, for instance, the coat of grease and clay was intended for the latter purpose as well as for ornament.[7] The Cross River natives have their bodies painted partly for decorative purposes but partly also as "medicine."[8] In time of war the men of most Upper Congo tribes blacken their faces and necks with palm-oil and powdered charcoal in resemblance to a certain species of monkey, and explain that by so doing they derive "monkey cunning."[9] The figures which the Kiwai Papuans in British New Guinea paint on their bodies when they are dancing may symbolise their totems.[10] And many savages paint themselves for mourning, according to Frazer with a view to disguising themselves from the ghost of the dead man.[11] In Morocco the well-known henna, a colouring

[1] Carver, *op. cit.* p. 227.

[2] v. Martius, *op. cit.* i. 230.

[3] Waitz-Gerland, *op. cit.* vi. 738.

[4] Wilkes, *op. cit.* iii. 356.

[5] v. Martius, *op. cit.* i. 321, 738. Joest, *Tätowien, Narbenzeichnen und Körperbemalen*, p. 19 *sq.*

[6] Bancroft, *op. cit.* i. 159. Heriot, *op. cit.* p. 305. von den Steinen, *Unter den Naturvölkern Zentral-Brasiliens*, p. 185 *sq.* Hahn, 'Die Ovaherero,' in *Zeitschr. Gesellsch. Erdkunde Berlin*, iv. 248. Joest, *op. cit.* p. 18 *sq.*

[7] Theal, *Yellow and Dark-skinned People of Africa south of the Zambesi*, p. 74.

[8] Partridge, *Cross River Natives*, p. 168.

[9] Ward, *Voice from the Congo*, p. 258.

[10] Landtman, *Nya Guinea färden*, p. 80. See also Frazer, *Totemism*, p. 30.

[11] Frazer, 'Certain Burial Customs as illustrative of the Primitive Theory of the Soul,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xv. 73. *Idem*, 'Folk-Lore in the Old Testament,' in *Anthropological Essays presented to E. B. Tylor*, p. 110.

matter produced from the leaves of the Egyptian privet (*Lawsonia inermis*), is not merely a favourite cosmetic among the women, but is also frequently used as a means of protection against evil influences on account of the *baraka*, or holiness, ascribed to it. So also there is *baraka* in walnut root or bark (*swak*), with which women paint their lips and teeth brownish, and in antimony (*kḥol*), with which they paint their eyes black; and though chiefly used by the women, all these paints are also on special occasions, for ritual purposes, used by men.[1] Dr. Karsten maintains that among the South American Indians the painting of the body was originally intended to be a prophylactic against evil spirits.[2] But with reference to the Toba girls' custom of painting their faces he writes himself:—"When I inquired as to the reason for this, I sometimes simply received the answer that it was considered beautiful, sometimes that it was done to attract the men. The girls paint themselves, I was told, when they are desirous of a man."[3]

That the painting of the body is regarded as an embellishment or sexual attraction is suggested by various other statements, in addition to those already referred to. Among the Guarayos in South-Western Amazonia a suitor paints himself from head to foot, and armed with his battle club promenades for several days round the cabin of the mistress of his heart, until on a day of feasting and dancing the marriage is consummated.[4] Among the Matacos of the Gran Chaco a man paints himself with red, blue, and black when he is courting a girl,[5] and among the Onas of Tierra del Fuego he on a similar occasion paints small white spots in his face.[6] Among the Witoto and Boro, of the North-West Amazons, men and women are painted, or paint themselves, before

[1] Westermarck, 'Popular Ritual of the Great Feast in Morocco,' in *Folk-Lore*, xxii. 132 *sqq.* *Idem*, *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco*, *passim* (see Index, *s.v.* 'Antimony,' 'Henna,' 'Walnut root or bark'). *Idem*, *Moorish Conception of Holiness* (*Baraka*), p. 66 *sq.*

[2] Karsten, *op. cit.* i. 8 *sqq.* [3] *Ibid.* i. 20.

[4] v. Martius, *op. cit.* i. 217. Church, *Aborigines of South America*, p. 115. [5] Baldrich, quoted by Karsten, *op. cit.* i. 26 n. 2.

[6] Gallardo *Tierra del Fuego—Los Onas*, p. 151.

a dance,[1] and the same is done in other savage tribes.[2] Thus the Easter Islanders paint themselves—chiefly with red and white—only at dances and festivals, which are occasions for great licentiousness.[3] Among the Aht of British Columbia " some of the young men streak their faces with red, but grown-up men seldom now use paint, unless on particular occasions," and the women cease to use it about the age of twenty-five.[4] Speaking of the North American Indians in general, Mr. Sinclair observes that they considered their body-painting to enhance the beauty of both men and women.[5] Of the aborigines of the Upper and Middle Finke River in Central Australia, Schulze wrote that " to beautify themselves they rub their bodies with grease to make the skin shine, and try to ornament it by painting, and the application of tufts and cords " ;[6] and in his description of the South Australian natives in general Dr. Eylmann states that the desire to please is undoubtedly the chief motive for their practice of painting themselves.[7] On Flinders Island, whither the remnant of the Tasmanian race were removed, a rebellion nearly burst out when orders were once issued forbidding the use of ochre and grease, for " the young men feared the loss of favour in the eyes of their countrywomen."[8] Sparrman tells us that the two Hottentots whom he had in his service, when they expected to meet some girls of their own nation, painted their noses, cheeks, and the middle of the forehead with soot.[9] Among the Bayaka of Congo both sexes paint the chest with cam-wood, confessedly to improve their appearance;[10] whilst the Bambala beaux

[1] Whiffen, *North-West Amazons*, p. 88 *sq.*

[2] *Supra*, p. 501 *sq.* [3] Geiseler, *Die Oster-Insel*, pp. 35, 41.

[4] Sproat, *Scenes and Studies of Savage Life*, p. 28.

[5] Sinclair, ' Tattooing of the North American Indians,' in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. xi. 399.

[6] Schulze, ' Aborigines of the Upper and Middle Finke River,' in *Trans. and Proceed. Roy. Soc. South Australia*, xiv. 223.

[7] Eylmann, *op. cit.* p. 387.

[8] Bonwick, *Daily Life of the Tasmanians*, p. 25 *f.*

[9] Sparrman, *Voyage to the Cape of Good Hope*, ii. 80.

[10] Torday, *Camp and Tramp in African Wilds*, p. 131. Torday and Joyce, ' Notes on the Ethnography of the Ba-Yaka,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxvi. 41. See also *Iidem*, *Les Bushongo*, p. 279.

and belles paint their bodies red with clay, likewise for the express purpose of increasing their beauty.[1]

Closely connected with the painting of the body is the practice of tattooing, which existed in Europe both in prehistoric[2] and historic[3] times, and is extremely widespread among modern savages. There is hardly any visible part of the human body, except the eyeball, that has not been subject to it. The Sandwich Islanders tattooed the top of the head, the eyelids, the ears, the nose, and sometimes even the tip of the tongue;[4] the Easter Islanders the edges of the ears and the fleshy part of the lips;[5] the Abyssinian women the gums.[6] Tattooing has the advantage over body-painting that the marks are indelible and permanent, whereas the latter has to be repeated from time to time. At the same time those marks are a certificate of courage.[7] Speaking of the tattooing of the Polynesians, Mr. Macmillan Brown observes that "the transition from temporary painting to the permanency of tattooing must have been greatly aided by the necessity of courage in the endurance of pain that is entailed, as well as the perennial desire of the human heart to be 'beautiful for ever.'"[8] The Andamanese, says Mr. Man, consider tattooing "primarily, as ornamental, and secondly, as proving the courage of the individual, and his (or her) power of enduring pain."[9] Sometimes it serves the object of inspiring fear in the enemy; according to Crozet, the Maori chiefs studied to invent

[1] Torday, *op. cit.* p. 80. Joest says (*op. cit.* p. 20), "Eitelkeit ist die Mutter der Körperbemalung, ihr Zweck war und ist ein kosmetischer, sie ist ein Act der geschlechtlichen Zuchtwahl." I became acquainted with his work only after the present chapter of the first edition had been prepared for press.

[2] Déchelette, in *Revue archéologique*, ser. iv. vol. ix. 38 *sqq.*

[3] Herodotus, v. 6 (Thracians). Caesar, *De bello Gallico*, v. 14 (Britons). See Lacassagne, *Les tatouages*, p. 9.

[4] Freycinet, *Voyage autour du monde*, ii. 580.

[5] Beechey, *op. cit.* i. 39. [6] Parkyns, *Life in Abyssinia*, ii. 29.

[7] Franklin, *Journey to the Shores of the Polar Sea*, p. 71. Bock, *Temples and Elephants*, p. 170. Dalton, *op. cit.* p. 251.

[8] Brown, *Maori and Polynesian*, p. 184.

[9] Man, 'Aboriginal Inhabitants of the Andaman Islands,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xii. 331.

designs which made them look horrible and gave them a most fearful look.[1] Sometimes also the tattooing records achievements in war; Keyser speaks of a chief in New Guinea who had sixty-three blue tattoo lines on his chest which represented the number of enemies he had slain,[2] and Finsch says that among the Motu of Port Moresby only men who had killed somebody were allowed to tattoo their chests.[3] In Uea, or Wallis Island, to the west of the Samoa Group, tattooing in the men " was always a mark of dignity, and sometimes the recompense of valour."[4] Among the Tsalisens of Formosa it is permitted to no other men than chiefs and members of their families, whom it serves " both as an ornament and as a sign of high rank."[5] D'Urville professed to see in the tattooing of the Maori an analogy to European heraldry, although it illustrated only the merits of the person decorated with it, not those of his ancestors; and we know that some distinctive part of it was a mark of identity, used in place of a signature.[6] Among the North American Indians, whilst certain devices could be worn only for valiant deeds, other designs were tattooed on slaves.[7] In ancient Rome masters tattooed their slaves, especially such as were working on the fields, in order to find them in case they escaped; and during the reign of Honorius certain classes of labourers engaged in public work were tattooed for a similar purpose.[8] In Easter Island a young married man tattooed the vulva of his wife on his chest as a sign that he was married.[9] The tattooed marks are in various

[1] Crozet, *Voyage to Tasmania, &c.*, p. 39. See also Thomson, *Story of New Zealand*, i. 77; Brown, *op. cit.* p. 190.

[2] Keyser, *Our Cruise to New Guinea*, p. 44 *sq.*

[3] Finsch, *Bekleidung, Schmuck und Tätowirung der Papuas der Südostküste von Neu-Guinea*, p. 22. *Cf.* Seligman, *Melanesians of British New Guinea*, p. 130 (Koita).

[4] Mangeret, *Mgr. Bataillon et les missions de l'Océanie*, i. 97.

[5] Davidson, *Island of Formosa*, p. 572.

[6] Robley, *Moko; or Maori Tattooing*, pp. 17, 18, 10 *sqq.*

[7] Sinclair, in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. xi. 399.

[8] Berchon, in *Actes de l'Académie nationale des sciences, belles-lettres et arts de Bordeaux*, 1885, p. 804.

[9] Geiseler, *op. cit.* p. 29.

cases represented as tribal tokens or means of distinguishing clansmen from enemies;[1] but it should be noticed that certain designs which are common to the whole tribe or clan easily come to be looked upon in that light, although they were not originally intended to be marks of recognition.[2] Tattooing is further practised as a remedy for disease, or as a prophylactic against it.[3] The Western Déné believed that one or two transversal lines tattooed on the arms or legs of a young man by a pubescent girl prevented premature weakness of these limbs.[4] In Morocco a man whom I knew had a tattoo mark underneath either temple which was intended to prevent him from sleeping too much. In the same country many tattoo marks, representing an eye or the five fingers, are obviously in their origin charms against the evil eye, even when they are nowadays looked upon as ornaments;[5] and elsewhere also certain tattoos are used as magical means of protection against similar influences[6] or against dangers in war[7] or as charms for good

[1] Agassiz, *Journey in Brazil*, p. 318. v. Martius, *op. cit.* i. 484, 501, &c. Ehrenreich, *Beiträge zur Völkerkunde Brasiliens*, p. 11. Beechey, *op. cit.* ii. 401. Powers, *Tribes of California*, p. 109. Mackenzie, *Voyages from Montreal to the Frozen and Pacific Oceans*, p. cxx. Waitz-Gerland, *op. cit.* vi. 38. Klose, *Togo unter deutscher Flagge*, p. 480 *sq.* Ellis, *Ewe-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast*, p. 146. Fülleborn, *Das Deutsche Njassa- und Ruwuma-Gebiet*, pp. 75, 77.

[2] *Cf.* Fülleborn, *op. cit.* pp. 75, 77; Livingstone, *Last Journals*, i. 49.

[3] Seligman, *op. cit.* p. 493 (Southern Massim). v. Rosen, *Träskfolket*, p. 301 (Batwa of North-Eastern Rhodesia). Fülleborn, *op. cit.* p. 78 (natives of "German East Africa"). Baumann, *Usambara*, p. 222 (Wapara). Marquordt, 'Bericht über die Kavirondo,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xli. 755. Fouquet, article reviewed in *L'Anthropologie*, viii. 496 (Copts). Mallery, 'Picture-Writing of the American Indians,' in *Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethnol.* x. 418.

[4] Morice, 'Notes on the Western Dénés,' in *Trans. Canadian Institute*, iv. 182.

[5] See my article on the 'Magic Origin of Moorish Designs,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxiv. 221.

[6] Marquardt, *loc. cit.* p. 755.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 755. Mallery, *loc. cit.* p. 418. *Cf.* Colquhoun, *Amongst the Shans*, p. 213.

luck in the chase[1] or success in love or other advantages.[2] Some North American Indians have their totems tattooed on their persons;[3] but Gerland's theory that tattoos were originally figures of totem animals, though they are no longer so,[4] is an arbitrary assumption. Even where they obviously represent animals, they may be quite unconnected with totemism; the Punjab "practice of tattooing a scorpion, a snake, a bee or a spider has its origin in sympathetic magic, which is supposed to protect people so marked."[5] Marquardt observes that not one of the animals which the Samoans regarded as sacred figures in their tattoo patterns.[6] In some parts of West Africa every child is immediately after birth dedicated to some definite fetish by having a mark tattooed on its abdomen;[7] and the native priests of Dahomey have hierarchical tattoo marks showing to what god they are vowed and what rank they hold, and all these marks are considered so sacred that no layman is allowed to touch them.[8] The eunuch priests of Attis, again, were tattooed with a pattern of ivy leaves.[9] But it is only in rare cases that tattooing is known to have any religious significance. Cook's statement that in the South Sea Islands it was in no way connected with religion[10] has been supported by various writers who have studied the practice on the spot.[11] The Fijian belief that it was instituted by the

[1] Fülleborn, *op. cit.* p. 78.

[2] Mallery, *loc. cit.* p. 418. Rose, 'Note on Female Tattooing in the Panjâb,' in *Indian Antiquary*, xxxi. 297.

[3] Frazer, *Totemism*, p. 28 *sq.* [4] Waitz-Gerland, *op. cit.* vi. 36 *sqq.*

[5] Rose, in *Indian Antiquary*, xxxi. 298.

[6] Marquardt, *Die Tätowirung beider Geschlechter in Samoa*, p. 18.

[7] Bastian, *Afrikanische Reisen*, p. 71.

[8] Ellis, *Ewe-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast*, p. 146.

[9] Frazer, *Adonis Attis Osiris*, i. 278.

[10] Waitz-Gerland, *op. cit.* vi. 38.

[11] Kubary, 'Die Bewohner der Mortlock Inseln,' in *Mittheil. Geograph. Gesellsch. Hamburg*, 1878–79, p. 240. Finsch, 'Ueber die Bewohner von Ponapé,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xii. 308 *sq.* Joest, *op. cit.* p. 78. Marquardt, *op. cit.* p. 16 *sqq.* Dr. Karsten (*op. cit.* i. 219) writes with reference to the South American Indians that "even in our own days most Indians are, no doubt, aware of tattooing being in its essence a religious custom, believing that the indelible marks and patterns which they wear in the face or on other parts of

god Ndengei and that its neglect will be punished after death,[1] and similar stories found among some other peoples,[2] tell us nothing about the origin of the custom, since any usage practised from time immemorial may readily be ascribed to the command of a god. But the Tahitians have a legend which deserves being quoted in full because it seems to give us some real insight into the matter.

Taaroa, their god, and Apouvaru had a daughter, who was called Hinaereeremonoi. "As she grew up, in order to preserve her chastity, she was made 'pahio,' or kept in a kind of enclosure, and constantly attended by her mother. Intent on her seduction, the brothers invented tattooing, and marked each other with the figure called Taomaro. Thus ornamented, they appeared before their sister, who admired the figures, and, in order to be tattooed herself, eluding the care of her mother, broke the enclosure that had been erected for her preservation, was tattooed, and became also the victim to the designs of her brothers. Tattooing thus originated among the gods, and was first practised by the children of Taaroa, their principal deity. In imitation of their example, and for the accomplishment of the same purposes, it was practised among men. . . . The two sons of Taaroa and Apouvaru were the gods of tattooing. Their images were kept in the temples of those who practised the art professionally, and every application of their skill was preceded by a prayer addressed to them, that the operation might not occasion death, that the wounds might soon heal, that the figures might be handsome, attract admirers, and answer the ends of wickedness designed."[3]

the body will protect them against all sorts of evil influences." But this seems to be a conjecture rather than a statement of observed facts.

[1] Williams and Calvert, *Fiji*, p. 138. Pritchard, *Polynesian Reminiscences*, p. 391. Seemann, *Viti*, p. 113. Wilkes, *op. cit.* iii. 355. Thomson, *Fijians*, p. 218.

[2] Wilkes, *op. cit.* v. 88 (Gilbert Islanders). v. Siebold, *Ethnologische Studien über die Aino auf der Insel Yesso*, p. 15. Egede, *Description of Greenland*, p. 132 *sq.*; Nordenskiöld, *Den andra Dicksonska expeditionen till Grönland*, p. 468 (Greenlanders).

[3] Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, i. 262 *sq.*

Tattooing may, as we have seen, serve a great variety of purposes, but in most of the instances mentioned above it is restricted to one or a few marks with a specific meaning. When practised on a larger scale it is generally considered to improve the appearance of the person subject to it, and we have reason to believe that in such cases it is practised with this object in view. Kubary,[1] Finsch,[2] Joest,[3] Marquardt,[4] Krämer,[5] and others agree that in the islands of the Pacific Ocean it is principally, if not exclusively, a means of embellishment; and from various other parts of the world we hear it spoken of as an ornament.[6] The North American Indians, says Mr. Sinclair, "regarded it as enhancing the beauty of the fair sex, and the good looks of the braves."[7] Even to the European taste the incised lines and figures have in many cases a certain beauty. Speaking of the Gambier Islanders, Beechey assures us that their tattooing undoubtedly improves their appearance.[8] Yate remarks that "nothing can exceed the beautiful regularity with which the faces and thighs of the New Zealanders are tattooed," the volutes being perfect specimens, and the regularity mechanically correct.[9] Forster observed that among the natives of Waitahoo (Marquesas Islands) the punctures were disposed with the utmost care, so that the marks on each leg, arm, and cheek and on the corresponding

[1] Kubary, in *Mittheil. Geograph. Gesellsch. Hamburg*, 1878–79, p. 240.

[2] Finsch, in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xii. 308. *Idem*, *Ueber Bekleidung, &c.*, p. 16. *Idem*, in Joest, *op. cit.* p. 39.

[3] Joest, *op. cit.* p. 53 *sqq.* [4] Marquardt, *op. cit.* p. 16.

[5] Krämer, *Die Samoa-Inseln*, ii. 65, 66 n. 1. See also Friedlaender, 'Notizen über Samoa,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xxxi. 25 *sq.* In Uea tattooing was simply an ornament in the women (Mangeret, *op. cit.* i. 97).

[6] Riedel, *op. cit.* p. 280 (natives of Tenimber and Timorlaut). Davidson, *op. cit.* p. 565 (Atayals of Formosa). Hobley, *op. cit.* p. 31 (Nilotic tribes of Kavirondo). Klose, *op. cit.* p. 480 *sq.* (Bassari in Togoland). Delhaise, *Les Warega*, p. 170. Fülleborn, *op. cit.* p. 75 (natives of "German East Africa"); &c.

[7] Sinclair, in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. xi. 399.

[8] Beechey, *op. cit.* i. 139.

[9] Yate, *Account of New Zealand*, p. 147 *sq.*

muscles were exactly similar.[1] Among the Tahitians, according to Darwin, the ornaments follow the curvature of the body so gracefully, that they have a very pleasing and elegant effect;[2] and among the Easter Islanders "all the lines were drawn with much taste, and carried in the direction of the muscle."[3] The fact that the tattooed lines follow closely the natural forms of the body in order to render them more conspicuous has been observed in the case of other peoples also.[4]

The beauty which the tattooing is intended to produce, however, is by no means purely æsthetical: it is meant to serve the purpose indicated in the Tahitian legend—to be a sexual lure. Among the Maori, according to Taylor, it was the great ambition of the young men to have fine tattooed faces, "both to render themselves attractive to the ladies, and conspicuous in war."[5] A girl would seldom accept an untattooed man; to have a smooth unmarked face was to have enormous odds against one in love-making.[6] And the profusely tattooed thighs and lower part of the back must also have proved very fascinating; for a Maori said to one of our informants, "The women do like to see a chap tattooed that way."[7] The girls, again, had

[1] Forster, *Voyage round the World*, ii. 14 *sq.*

[2] Darwin, *Journal of Researches*, p. 481 *sq.*

[3] Beechey, *op. cit.* i. 39.

[4] Waitz-Gerland, *op. cit.* vi. 573. Jones, *Grammar of Ornament*, p. 13 note. *Cf.* the tattooed circle round the mouth of the Juris (Wallace, *Travels on the Amazon*, p. 510) and the female Arecunas (Brett, *Indian Tribes of Guiana*, p. 268); the rings round the eyes of the women in the Admiralty Islands (Moseley, in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* vi. 401), of the Australians (Angas, *South Australia Illustrated*), and the Patagonians (King and Fitzroy, *Voyages of the Adventure and Beagle*, ii. 135); the cicatrices like parallel ridges upon the chest, thighs, and shoulders of the Tasmanians (Bonwick, *op. cit.* p. 24); and the tattoos on the hands and feet of Egyptian women (Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, i. 54, 57).

[5] Taylor, *Te Ika a Maui*, p. 321. See also Robley, *op. cit.* p. 22.

[6] Tregear, *Maori Race*, p. 291. *Cf. ibid.* p. 258.

[7] Rutland, 'Survivals of Ancient Customs in Oceania,' in *Jour. Polynesian Soc.* xiii. 102.

usually horizontal blue lines tattooed on their lips before marriage, because "red lips were not considered sightly, but were disliked."[1] Speaking of Polynesian tattooing generally, Mr. Macmillan Brown remarks that one of the *motifs* of it was sexual: "it was intended to increase the influence of the individual over the imagination of the other sex, an intention brought out more clearly by the body tattooings of the Samoans, Tongans, and other islanders."[2] In Samoa, according to Marquardt, "the men tattoo themselves in order to please the women and the women in order to increase their attraction for the men; they all do it simply to make themselves more beautiful so as to become more sought after."[3] Until a young man was tattooed he could not think of marriage, but as soon as it was done he considered himself entitled to all the privileges of mature years.[4] "When it is all over," says Pritchard, "and the youths thoroughly healed, a grand dance is got up on the first available pretext to display the tattooing, when the admiration of the fair sex is unsparingly bestowed. And this is the great reward, long and anxiously looked forward to by the youths as they smart under the hands of the *matai*."[5] On the island of Santa Anna, in the Solomons, a youth has likewise to be tattooed before he is at liberty to marry,[6] and in the same group of islands this adornment is also "absolutely indispensable to the girl's prospect of being sought in marriage."[7] In Florida, for example, "no girl would be considered marriageable unless tattooed."[8] In Fiji, if a girl were untattooed at the age of puberty, "her peculiarity would be whispered with derision among the gallants of the district, and she would have difficulty in finding a husband." When questioned upon the matter,

[1] Best, 'Maori Marriage Customs,' in *Trans. and Proceed. New Zealand Institute*, xxxvi. 64. Tregear, *op. cit.* p. 264.

[2] Brown, *op. cit.* p. 187 *sq.* See also *ibid.* p. 183 *sq.*

[3] Marquardt, *op. cit.* p. 16. See also *ibid.* p. 8.

[4] Turner, *Samoa*, p. 88. [5] Pritchard, *op. cit.* p. 144 *sq.*

[6] Guppy, *Solomon Islands*, p. 136.

[7] Penny, *Ten Years in Melanesia*, p. 91.

[8] Codrington, *Melanesians*, p. 237. *Cf. ibid.* p. 234.

a chief declared to Sir Basil Thomson that "physically there was the greatest difference in the world between mating with a tattooed and an untattooed woman, and that the idea of marriage with an untattooed woman filled him with disgust." Sir Basil, however, believes that the reason for the practice must be sought for in some unknown sexual superstition and not in ornamental purposes, because the marks were limited to a broad horizontal band covering those parts that were concealed by the *liku*, or apron;[1] but this argument seems by no means conclusive, considering that the tattooing may be older than the *liku*, and even apart from this, Sir Basil says himself that in addition to the tattooing of the buttocks barbed lines and dots were marked upon the fingers of young girls to display them to advantage when handing food to the chiefs, and that the raised cicatrices which may still be seen upon the arms and backs of the women "are intended only for ornament, and have no other significance."[2] The Southern Massim in British New Guinea, whose women are always profusely tattooed, state as reason for this "that it makes the girl look nice and accentuates her good skin."[3] Speaking of some savages of the same colony, Chalmers remarks that the women tattoo themselves "to please the men";[4] and in Samarai, a small island outside the south-eastern point of New Guinea, the tattooing of the young girls is said by Finsch to serve no other object but to make it easier for them to find a husband.[5] In the Kei Islands, to the south-west of New Guinea, it is, on the other hand, according to Riedel, the men who "tattoo themselves in order to please the women."[6] When Mertens asked the natives of Lukunor, in the Carolines, what was the meaning of their tattooing, one of them answered, "It has the same object as your clothes, that is, to please the women."[7] Bock remarks, "As

[1] Thomson, *op. cit.* p. 217 *sqq.* [2] *Ibid.* pp. 218, 220.
[3] Seligman, *op. cit.* p. 493.
[4] Chalmers, *Pioneering in New Guinea*, p. 166.
[5] Finsch, in Joest, *op. cit.* p. 41. [6] Riedel, *op. cit.* p. 228.
[7] Waitz-Gerland, *op. cit.* vol. v. pt. ii. 67.

the Dyak women are tattooed to please their lovers, so the Laos men undergo the ordeal for the sake of the women."[1]

In Morocco, although tattoo marks may be made, for example, to make a man a good shot, or to cure a swollen knee, or to act as charms against the evil eye, more elaborate patterns, at least, are uniformly regarded as ornaments. A Berber from the tribe Aith Sádděn, near Fez, who had a large tattoo on his right hand, told me that he had it made when he was a boy in order to be pleasing to the women; and he added that many young men of his tribe have the right or left hand and the lower part of the forearm, as also one of their shoulders, tattooed for the same purpose, so as to find favour with the women without paying them anything. A beautifully tattooed girl is praised in their songs, and attracts many lovers who pay her well; and when given in marriage she fetches a high bride price.

Among the Banabuddu, on the shores of the Victoria Nyanza, where the men used to tattoo a network of design on their breasts and the women during their youth had the same design made on their stomachs, a woman who refused having this done to her "would not be equally attractive to the opposite sex."[2] Dr. Fülleborn observes that sexual considerations seem to be an important reason for tattooing among the Wahyao and Makua in "German East Africa," whose women are profusely tattooed on that part of the body which is concealed by their loin-cloth. When he asked for an explanation of this custom he was told "that it gives the man a more agreeable sensation to pass his hand over a surface covered with cicatrices than over a smooth one."[3] Young Kadiak wives are said to "secure the affectionate admiration of their husbands by tattooing the breast and adorning the face with black lines."[4] Cranz states that among the Greenlanders the mother tattoos her daughter

[1] Bock, *Temples and Elephants*, p. 170.
[2] Cunningham, *Uganda*, p. 68 *sq.* [3] Fülleborn, *op. cit.* p. 78.
[4] Bancroft, *op. cit.* i. 72.

in childhood because she is afraid that the girl will otherwise attract no husband.[1] It is a common custom that the tattooing of either men or women is performed about the age of puberty.[2] But among many peoples it is not accomplished at once, so that the patient shall be able to bear the inflammation and pain at every stage of the process; and not infrequently it begins when the girls are quite young children, being constantly added to until they marry.[3] Among the Nagas of Upper Assam it was the custom "to allow matrimony to those only who made themselves as hideous as possible by having their faces elaborately tattooed."[4] The Makalaka girls in South Africa could not marry until about four thousand stitches had been made in the skin of the chest and stomach and a black fluid had been rubbed into the wounds.[5] In Samoa great licentiousness was connected with the custom of tattooing;[6]

[1] Cranz, *History of Greenland*, i. 129.

[2] Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, i. 262 (Tahitians). Pritchard, *op. cit.* p. 393 (Tongans). Krämer, *op. cit.* ii. 63 *sq.* (Samoans). Thomson, *op. cit.* p. 217 (Fijians). Wilkes, *op. cit.* ii. 141 (Samoans); iii. 355 (Fijians); v. 103 (Gilbert Islanders). Montgomery, *Journal of Voyages and Travels by Tyerman and Bennet*, i. 127 (natives of Eimeo). v. Langsdorf, *op. cit.* i. 118 (Nukahivans). Beechey, *op. cit.* i. 139 (Gambier Islanders). Seligman, *op. cit.* p. 493 (Southern Massim). Bock, *Head-Hunters of Borneo*, p. 189 (Dyaks). Schadenberg, 'Die Negritos der Philippinen,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xii. 136. Davidson, *op. cit.* p. 565 (Atayals of Formosa). Fryer, *Khyeng People of the Sandoway District, Arakan*, p. 4. Forsyth, *Highlands of Central India*, p. 148 (Gonds). Wilson and Felkin, *Uganda and the Egyptian Soudan*, ii. 97 (Baris). Dobrizhoffer, *Account of the Abipones*, ii. 20. v. Martius, *op. cit.* i. 217 (Guarayos). Bancroft, *op. cit.* i. 47 (Eskimo), 98 (Tlingit).

[3] Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, i. 262 (Tahitians). Angas, *Polynesia*, p. 328 (Marquesas Islanders). *Idem*, *Savage Life and Scenes in Australia and New Zealand*, i. 314 (Maori). Montgomery, *op. cit.* i. 127 (natives of Eimeo). Seligman, *op. cit.* p. 264 *sq.* (Roro-speaking tribes of British New Guinea). Man, in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xii. 331 (Andaman Islanders). Fytche, *Burma*, ii. 61. St. John, 'Ainos,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* ii. 249.

[4] Dalton, *op. cit.* p. 39.

[5] Mauch, *Reisen im Inneren von Süd-Afrika*, p. 38 *sq.*

[6] Turner, *op. cit.* p. 90.

and in Tahiti the chiefs prohibited it altogether on account of the obscene practices by which it was invariably accompanied in that island.[1]

Under the general heading "tattooing" is often included the practice of scarification, and in the present connection it is unnecessary to draw a very rigid distinction between the two processes. Their ethnical distribution largely depends on the colour of the skin. "Scarification," says Grosse, "has found practice only among dark-skinned peoples, for the scars stand out plainly only on a dark skin. For a similar reason, tattooing has spread only among the fairer peoples."[2] Warriors make scars on their bodies to record the number of enemies they have slain in battle.[3]

[1] Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, i. 226.—In the work referred to above, Joest also expresses the opinion that the principal desire that induces men and women to tattoo themselves is to increase their attractions in the eyes of the opposite sex (see particularly p. 56). Mr. Finck, on the other hand, in a violent attack on my view, writes (*op. cit.* p. 248) that the use of tattooing "as a stimulant of the passion of the opposite sex probably never occurred to a savage until it was suggested to him by a philosophising visitor." In support of this discourteous statement he gives a number of quotations relating to tattooing, in none of which he finds the slightest reference to the purpose of beautifying the body in order to attract the other sex; and he says (*ibid.* p. 254) that this purpose is not even hinted at in the summary made by Mallery of the seventeen different motives to which the latter has been able to trace the practice of tattooing. Mr. Finck's own list is of course no evidence whatever, being anything but complete, and his representation of Mallery's views is grotesquely misleading. What Mallery really says (*loc. cit.* p. 418) is, that tattooing appears to be used, or to have been used very recently, for many purposes "besides the specific object of designating a tribe, clan, or family, and also apart from the general intent of personal ornament," and that the most notable of "those purposes" are the seventeen which he then enumerates. The importance Mallery attaches to "the general intent of personal ornament" is evident from the following statement:—"The mere idea of decoration as shown in what civilised people call deformations of nose, lip, ear, teeth, and in fact all parts of the body, is sufficient to account for the inception of any form of tattoo."

[2] Grosse, *op. cit.* p. 78. See also Parkinson, *op. cit.* p. 487.

[3] Stow, *Native Races of South Africa*, p. 535 (Bangwaketse).

Scars or cicatrices are used as tribal marks,[1] as a remedy for illness,[2] as prophylactic charms,[3] as mourning tokens[4] or an expression of grief.[5] Among the South American Indians, according to Dr. Karsten, scarification is practised as a means of ridding the body of evil spirits that have entered into it.[6]

Most often, however, I believe, scarification is said to be partly or exclusively a kind of decoration.[7] Some tribes of Madagascar, for instance, are in the habit of making marks, "which are intended to be ornamental," by slight incisions in the skin.[8] The scarification which is practised by the natives throughout the Australian continent, in a large measure at least, serves the purpose of adornment.[9] Among the South Australian Aldolinga the scars raised chiefly across the breast and the upper portion of the arms "are simply made to beautify their bodies."[10] Barrington assures

[1] Ward, *Voice from the Congo*, p. 255. Mockler-Ferryman, *British Nigeria*, p. 229. Baumann, *Usambara*, p. 180. Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 744. Brough Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, i. 296. Mathew, *Eaglehawk and Crow*, p. 121 *sq.* Mrs. Langloh Parker, *Euahlayi Tribe*, p. 125.

[2] Roscoe, *Northern Bantu*, p. 78 (Banyoro). Speiser, *Two Years with the Natives in the Western Pacific*, p. 112 *sq.* (natives of Port Olry in the New Hebrides).

[3] Howitt, *op. cit.* p. 746 (Yuin tribe). Hobley, *op. cit.* p. 20 (Bantu Kavirondo). [4] Stair, *Old Samoa*, p. 117.

[5] Mathew, *Two Representative Tribes of Queensland*, p. 107.

[6] Karsten, *op. cit.* i. 168 *sqq.*

[7] Theal, *Yellow and Dark-skinned People of Africa south of the Zambesi*, p. 237 *sq.* (Bantu). Stannus, 'Notes on some Tribes of British Central Africa,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xl. 317 *sq.* Barrett, 'Notes on the Customs and Beliefs of the Wa-Giriama, etc., British East Africa,' *ibid.* xli. 23. Hobley, *op. cit.* p. 20 (Bantu Kavirondo). Speiser, *op. cit.* p. 112 *sq.* (natives of Port Olry in the New Hebrides). Turner, *op. cit.* p. 310 (natives of Tanna). Stair, *op. cit.* p. 116 (Samoans). *Cf.* Grosse, *op. cit.* p. 75.

[8] Sibree, *op. cit.* p. 210.

[9] Curr, *Australian Race*, i. 402; ii. 475. Eylmann, *op. cit.* p. 108 *sqq.* Howitt, *op. cit.* p. 744. Brough Smyth, *op. cit.* i. 296. Mrs. Langloh Parker, *op. cit.* p. 125. Mathew, *Eaglehawk and Crow*, p. 121. *Idem*, *Two Representative Tribes of Queensland*, p. 106 *sq.*

[10] Krichauff, 'Customs of the "Aldolinga,"' in *Proceed. Roy. Geograph. Soc. Australasia: South Australian Branch*, ii. 79 *sq.*

us that among the natives of Botany Bay "scars are, by both sexes, deemed highly ornamental."[1] And the raised cuts of the tribes of New South Wales described by Palmer are said by him to be "merely ornamental and convey no idea of tribal connection," the women marking themselves in this manner "to add to their looks, and to make themselves attractive."[2] In some parts of the Solomons, Parkinson tells us, "a well healed scarification, which clearly shows the lines of the design, is the greatest ornament of men and women; the latter rise in price according to the beauty of the design."[3] In Fiji "rows of wart-like spots are burned along the arms and backs of the women, which they and their admirers call ornamental."[4]

There are thus various groups of very widespread practices which in a large measure must be regarded as means of stimulating the sexual instinct of the opposite sex. They may, as we have seen, serve other objects as well; and I have no doubt that superstitious beliefs, in particular, have played an important part in their origin. Even the fact that these practices are most prevalent about the age of puberty, as they would naturally be in their capacity of sexual stimulants, is probably more or less connected with superstitious ideas relating to the phenomena of pubescence, or possibly, as Professor Hirn suggests, with the change of social status accompanying sexual maturity.[5] But it is both inconsistent and absurd to accept, like Mr. Finck, all other explanations of their origin and at the same time declare that the remarks of travellers regarding the addiction of savages to personal "ornamentation" are merely "the unwarranted assumptions of superficial observers, who, ignorant of the real reasons why the lower races paint, tattoo, and otherwise 'adorn' themselves, recklessly inferred that they did it to 'make themselves beautiful.'"[6]

[1] Barrington, *History of New South Wales*, p. 11.

[2] Palmer, 'Notes on some Australian Tribes,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xiii. 286.

[3] Parkinson, *op. cit.* p. 487.

[4] Williams and Calvert, *op. cit.* p. 137.

[5] Hirn, *op. cit.* p. 220.

[6] Finck, *op. cit.* p. 232.

In some cases these practices may stimulate the sexual instinct as expressions of strength, courage, or endurance,[1] but generally, I presume, they do so as means of attracting attention, of exciting through the charm of novelty,[2] and, particularly, of expressing sexual desire or sexual intentions in those who adorn themselves. If, as Robert Burton put it, natural beauty is a much stronger loadstone when " those artificial enticements and provocations of gestures, clothes, jewels, pigments, exornations, shall be annexed unto it "[3]— the main reason for this is that they are invitations to love.

Thus we can understand that even practices so repugnant to our taste as that of perforating the septum of the nose or removing teeth may be attractive, whilst their omission, if they have once been established as genuine customs, becomes positively repulsive. In Cochin China, where the women blacken their teeth, a man said contemptuously of the British Ambassador's wife that " she had white teeth like a dog " ;[4] and the Abipones of Paraguay, who carefully plucked out all the hairs with which our eyes are naturally protected, despised the Europeans for their thick eyebrows and called them brothers to the ostriches.[5] But even where a certain kind of ornamentation has become general and is prescribed by custom for all the members of the community who are of the same sex, there is generally scope left for variety in the form of deviations or exaggerations,[6] and thus the old custom may still remain a positive lure. As bright colours and other secondary sexual characters in animals are marks of recognition and means of attraction, so self-decoration in mankind is a conscious indication of sexual feelings and therefore a sexual stimulant. And as display in animal courtship excites not only the

[1] *Cf.* Marquardt, *op. cit.* p. 16 *sq.*, Tregear, *op. cit.* p. 258, and Brown, *op. cit.* p. 183 *sq.*, with reference to tattooing.

[2] Walker observes (*Beauty*, p. 41) that " an essential condition of all excitement and action in animal bodies, is a greater or less degree of novelty in the objects impressing them."

[3] Burton, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, iii. 2. 2. 3, p. 521.

[4] Waitz, *Introduction to Anthropology*, p. 305.

[5] Dobrizhoffer, *op. cit.* ii. 15.

[6] This is admitted even by Mr. Finck (*op. cit.* p. 245).

individual courted but also the courter, so self-decoration for sexual purposes has in some measure a stimulating effect not only upon others but upon one's self. The native chief with whom Sir Basil Thomson discussed the tattooing of the Fijian women left him with the impression that, besides the other advantages the chief had mentioned, "tattooing was believed to stimulate the sexual passion in the woman herself."[1] And I think it is a common experience among ourselves that there is self-excitement in finery calculated to make the person attractive to the opposite sex. Moreover, as the secondary sexual characters of animals chiefly occur in the males, so self-decoration in the savage world is very frequently more prevalent among men than women. The common notion that women are by nature vainer and more addicted to dressing and decorating themselves than men cannot be said to hold true of the lower races in general.

Speaking of the Aleut on the Fur-Seal Islands of Alaska, Elliott says, "In these lower races there is much more vanity displayed by the masculine element than the feminine, according to my observation; in other words, I have noticed a greater desire among the young men than among the young women of savage and semi-civilised people to be gaily dressed, and to look fine."[2] Concerning the Cree, Mackenzie remarks that "the women, though by no means inattentive to the decoration of their own persons, appear to have a still greater degree of pride attending to the appearance of the men, whose faces are painted with more care than those of the women."[3] Among all the Indian tribes whom Richardson saw on his route through the northern parts of the fur countries, the women adorned their persons less than the men of the same tribes;[4] and the like

[1] Thomson, *op. cit.* p. 219.

[2] Elliott, 'Report on the Seal Islands of Alaska,' in *Tenth Census of the United States*, p. 21 *sq.*

[3] Mackenzie, *op. cit.* p. xciv. *Cf.* Harmon, *Journal of Voyages and Travels in the Interior of North America*, p. 319 *sq.*

[4] Franklin, *Second Expedition to the Shores of the Polar Sea*, p. 197. *Cf.* Mackenzie, *op. cit.* p. 126.

is said of the Comanche.[1] Among the Uaupés, Wallace observed that the men and boys appropriated all the ornaments.[2] In Tierra del Fuego Lieutenant Bove found the men more desirous of ornaments than the women.[3] Proyart made a similar observation with regard to the Negroes of Loango;[4] and Schweinfurth[5] and Barth,[6] who had a vast experience of African races, agree that the women usually wear fewer ornaments than the men. Among the Gambier Islanders, according to Beechey, the women "have no ornaments of any kind, and appeared quite indifferent to the beads and trinkets which were offered them."[7] The native women of Orangerie Bay of New Guinea, except that they are tattooed, adorn themselves less than the men, and none of them paint their faces and bodies, as the men frequently do.[8] Among the Papuans of the Mimika district in the same island, according to Captain Rawling, the women are given to still less self-adornment than the men, and, with the exception of a few beads, wear nothing but the loin-cloth.[9] In the Admiralty Islands young girls "sometimes have a necklace or two on, but they never are decorated to the extent to which the men are," it being evidently not considered good taste for them to adorn their persons.[10] Among the aborigines of the New Hebrides,[11] New

[1] Schoolcraft, *Indian Tribes of the United States*, i. 235.

[2] Wallace, *Travels on the Amazon*, p. 281. *Cf.* v. Martius, *op. cit.* i. 597.

[3] Bove, *Patagonia. Terra del Fuoco. Mari Australi*, p. 129.

[4] Proyart, 'History of Loango,' in Pinkerton, *Collection of Voyages and Travels*, xvi. 575.

[5] Schweinfurth, *Im Herzen von Afrika*, ii. 7 *sq.*

[6] Barth, *Reisen und Entdeckungen in Nord- und Central-Afrika*, ii. 475.

[7] Beechey, *op. cit.* i. 138.

[8] d'Albertis, *New Guinea*, i. 200. See also Miklucho-Maclay, 'Ethnologische Bemerkungen über die Papuas der Maclay-Küste in Neu-Guinea,' in *Natuurkundig Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch Indie*, xxxvi. 296 *sq.*

[9] Rawling, *Land of the New Guinea Pygmies*, p. 57.

[10] Moseley, *Notes by a Naturalist on the Challenger*, p. 461. *Idem*, in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* vi. 399. Romilly, *Western Pacific and New Guinea*, p. 115.

[11] Campbell, *A Year in the New Hebrides*, p. 145.

Hanover,[1] and the Australian continent [2] adornments are mostly monopolised by the male sex. Of the natives of Gippsland, for instance, it is said :—" The ornaments worn by the females were not much regarded by the men. The woman did little to improve her appearance ; . . . if her physical aspect was such as to attract admirers she was content."[3]

It has been suggested that the plainer appearance of the women depends upon their oppressed and despised position and the selfishness of the men.[4] But it seems doubtful whether this is the true explanation, since, generally speaking, savage ornaments are not costly things. Of all the various kinds of self-ornamentation tattooing is the most laborious. Yet we find that among many savage peoples just this kind of self-decoration is more common or more elaborate among the women than among the men, or that it is entirely limited to the former.[5] In Melanesia, for example, it is chiefly women who are tattooed, whereas in Polynesia it is chiefly men,[6] although the Polynesian women, on the whole, occupy a higher social position than their Melanesian sisters.[7] In Fiji, where women were fearfully oppressed, genuine tattooing was found on them only ;[8] but in Samoa, where they were held in much consideration,[9]

[1] Strauch, ' Bemerkungen über Neu-Guinea, &c.,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* ix. 43.

[2] Waitz-Gerland, *op. cit.* vi. 735. Breton, *Excursions in New South Wales, &c.*, p. 210 *sq.* Bonwick, ' Australian Natives,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xvi. 204. Eylmann, *op. cit.* p. 404. *Cf.* Schulze, ' Aborigines of the Upper and Middle Finke River,' in *Trans. and Proceed. Roy. Soc. South Australia*, xiv. 229.

[3] Brough Smyth, *op. cit.* i. 275.

[4] Darwin, *Descent of Man*, ii. 372 *sq.* Avebury, *Origin of Civilisation*, p. 43. Forster, *op. cit.* ii. 219. Mackenzie, *op. cit.* p. 126 *sq.*

[5] See, *e.g.*, Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, iv. 202 *sqq.* ; Karsten, *op. cit.* i. 220 *sqq.* (South American Indians).

[6] Waitz-Gerland, *op. cit.* vi. 575. Rivers, *History of Melanesian Society*, ii. 436 *sq.*

[7] See Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, i. 643 *sq.* ; Meinicke, *Die Inseln des Stillen Oceans*, i. 67.

[8] Mariner, *Account of the Natives of the Tonga Islands*, ii. 267. Williams and Calvert, *op. cit.* p. 145. Wilkes, *op. cit.* iii. 332.

[9] Wilkes, *op. cit.* ii. 148. Waitz-Gerland, *op. cit.* vi. 121.

they were less extensively and less regularly tattooed than the men.[1]

The comparative scarcity of female ornaments among many savages may to some extent be explained by Spencer's suggestion that ornaments partly derive their origin from trophy-badges, or Wundt's, that they indicate rank and fortune;[2] but these explanations could only have a limited application. In so far as self-decoration is intended to stimulate the sexual instinct of the opposite sex, we must conclude that the greater desire of the men to make themselves attractive by ornamentation is in the first place due to the likings of the women, and that the plainer appearance of the women is a consequence of the men's greater indifference to their ornaments. Darwin has pointed out that among our domesticated quadrupeds individual antipathies and preferences are exhibited much more commonly by the female than by the male; indeed, the male as a rule seems to be ready to pair with any female, provided she belongs to his own species.[3] So also women seem generally to be more particular in their choice than men, when the union takes place without reference to interest. A Maori proverb says, "Let a man be ever so good-looking, he will not be much sought after; but let a woman be ever so plain, men will still eagerly seek after her."[4] With regard to the Negroes of Sogno, Merolla da Sorrento wrote, "Women would have experience of their husbands before they married them, in like manner as the men were to have of them; and in this particular I can aver that they are commonly much more obstinate or fickle than men, for I have known many instances in which the men were willing to be married, while the women held back, and either fled away or made excuses."[5] Among the Eastern Central Africans described by Mr. Duff Macdonald many cases are known of slave wives running away from

[1] Krämer, *op. cit.* ii. 63.

[2] Wundt, *Ethik*, i. 152 *sqq.* *Cf.* Hirn, *op. cit.* p. 220 *sq.*; Landtman, *Kulturens ursprungsformer*, pp. 200, 202.

[3] Darwin, *op. cit.* ii. 290 *sqq.* [4] Taylor, *op. cit.* p. 293 *sq.*

[5] Merolla da Sorrento, 'Voyage to Congo,' in Pinkerton, *op. cit.* xvi. 236.

free husbands, but none of slave husbands running away from free wives.[1] In a subsequent chapter we shall see that endogamous restrictions, whether they have reference to race, nation, tribe, or rank, often apply to women only; and there can be little doubt that this to some extent is due to the fact that the sexual instinct of women is more discriminating than that of men. If in countries with European civilisation women nevertheless are more particular about their appearance and more addicted to self-decoration than the other sex, the reason for it may be sought for in the greater difficulty they have in getting married. But there is seldom any such difficulty in the savage world. Here it is, on the contrary, the man who runs the risk of being obliged to lead a single life.

[1] Macdonald, *Africana*, i. 141.

CHAPTER XVI

PRIMITIVE MEANS OF ATTRACTION

(Concluded)

WE have still to consider a certain class of objects which men attach to their bodies, namely, such as fall under the heading of clothing. As the term implies, the purpose for which they are used is to clothe or cover the body, or some part of it; but the relation between self-decoration and clothing is very intimate. Not only are ornaments attached to clothes, but the latter are frequently used for purposes of ornamentation or allurement as well as covering the body. "The greatest provocations of lust are from our apparel," says Robert Burton;[1] and Dr. Havelock Ellis justly observes that one of the chief sex allurements would be lost "and the extreme importance of clothes would disappear at once if the two sexes were to dress alike."[2] Indeed, it is in many cases impossible to decide whether a certain object attached to the body should be called clothing or ornament. And whilst clothes readily become decorations, there is, on the other hand, every reason to believe that mere decorations have also developed into clothes.

The origin of clothing may no doubt be traced to several different sources. The most obvious one is the desire to protect the body from frost and damp.[3] When man emigrated from his warm native home and settled down in less hospitable regions it became necessary for him to screen himself from the influences of a raw climate. The Eskimo

[1] Burton, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, iii. 2. 2. 3, p. 524.

[2] Ellis, *Psychology of Sex*, (vol. iv.) Sexual Selection in Man, p. 209.

[3] See Stoll, *Das Geschlechtsleben in der Völkerpsychologie*, p. 484 *sq.*

wrap themselves up in furs, and the wretched natives of Tierra del Fuego throw a piece of skin over their shoulders, or one of them, "on the side from which the wind blows."[1] But covering may also be used as a protection against influences of another kind. The custom of women veiling their faces, so common in Muhammadan countries, was probably adopted as a safeguard against the evil eye;[2] and in early Arabia very handsome men, too, protected themselves in a similar manner, especially at feasts and fairs when they were particularly exposed to dangerous glances.[3] The question which especially interests us in the present connection, however, is why man began to cover that part of the body which is most frequently concealed, although the rest of the body was left nude.

In this case also one of the motives may have been the desire of protection. Some travellers among Brazilian Indians are of opinion that the string or strip of bast worn by certain tribes, partly at least, serves the object of protecting the glans or the sexual mucous membrane against the attacks of insects or other injury;[4] and a similar suggestion has been made with reference to the tying up of the prepuce by the Nukahivans.[5] But the dread of exposing the glans, which is found among some other South Sea

[1] Ross, *Voyage of Discovery in the Southern and Antarctic Regions*, ii. 285. Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition*, i. 121.

[2] See Westermarck, 'Magic Origin of Moorish Designs,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxxiv. 211.

[3] Wellhausen, *Reste des arabischen Heidentums*, p. 196.

[4] von den Steinen, *Unter den Naturvölkern Zentral-Brasiliens*, p. 192 *sqq.* Krause (*In den Wildnissen Brasiliens*, p. 204) says that the explanation unanimously given by the Karayá is that the glans is tied up in order not to be seen by the women, but he thinks that the primary aim of the practice may be protection. For the practice itself see also Ehrenreich, *Beiträge zur Völkerkunde Brasiliens*, pp. 11 (Karayá), 52 *sq.* (Yamamadi); Haseman, 'Notes on the Pawumwa Indians of South America,' in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. xiv. 342.

[5] Fleurieu, quoted by v. Krusenstern, *Voyage round the World*, i. 156. See also Hovorka, 'Verstümmelungen des männlichen Gliedes bei einigen Völkern des Alterthums und der Jetztzeit,' in *Mittheil. Anthrop. Gesellsch. Wien*, xxiv. 140 *sqq.*

Islanders as well,[1] has also been attributed to fear of magic influences.[2] Mr. Sommerville states that in Tanna, of the New Hebrides, "the closest secrecy is adopted with regard to the penis, not at all from a sense of decency, but to avoid the Narak (that is, bewitching force), the *sight* even of that of another man being considered most dangerous." The natives accordingly wrap it round with many yards of calico and other like materials, winding and folding them until a preposterous bundle eighteen inches or two feet long and two inches or more in diameter is formed.[3] And, as Professor Hirn observes, the reproductive organs are not only, in virtue of their connection with the mysterious miracle of life, objects of superstitious awe, but, owing to the same consideration, they themselves may require particular protection against dangerous influences.[4] The Bali and other Kamerun tribes believe that the evil eye is most dangerous to the male organs of generation, causing impotence; hence the men take great care to conceal them when subject to medical examination.[5] And besides the evil eye there are innumerable spirits that constitute so many dangers, for women in particular, and the possibility of being fecundated by whirlwinds or rain or other natural phenomena.[6]

[1] Cook, *Journal of a Voyage round the World*, p. 106 (Maori). *Idem*, *Voyage to the Pacific Ocean*, ii. 233 (Atooi of the Sandwich Islands). Rivers, *History of Melanesian Society*, ii. 433 (Gambier Islanders). Of the North Queensland aborigines Dr. Roth (*North Queensland Ethnography: Bulletin 8. Notes on Government, Morals, and Crime*, p. 7) tells us that, "except in those areas where introcision is practised, a man must never be seen with the preputium retracted." The Romans also considered that the glans should be carefully concealed by pugilists, athletes, and others who exposed their bodies (Stieda, 'Anatomisch-archäologische Studien. III. Die Infibulation bei Greichen und Römern,' in *Anatomische Hefte*, xix. 283).

[2] Rivers, *op. cit.* ii. 435. Karsten, *Studies in South American Anthropology*, i. 180 *sq.*

[3] Sommerville, 'Ethnological Notes on New Hebrides,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xxiii. 368. *Cf. supra*, p. 417.

[4] Hirn, *Origins of Art*, p. 218. See also Ratzel, *Völkerkunde*, i. 64.

[5] Plehn, 'Beobachtungen in Kamerun,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xxxvi. 720.

[6] See Hirn, *op. cit.* p. 218 *sq.*; Landtman, *Kulturens ursprungsformer*, p. 200; Karsten, *op. cit.* i. 173 *sqq.*

Sinhalese women never expose their genitals because they fear that if they did, "a devil, imagined as a white and hairy being, might have intercourse with them."[1] Among the Semangs of Malacca the women's girdles "are regarded both as a protection against the effects of 'hot rain' and against 'pains in the waist.'"[2] The Bantu Kavirondo, among whom young unmarried girls are usually nude, consider it very bad if a man takes hold of the dress of a woman who has borne children, even though it be her own husband; he who does so has to give a goat, which is killed and eaten, so as to remove the spell which will otherwise cause the woman's death. Yet if "a woman's dress is touched or torn off by an enemy, no curse is entailed."[3]

Among several other peoples, also, only the married women cover themselves, either at once or, sometimes, after the birth of the first child, the unmarried ones remaining entirely naked.[4] It has been said that the reason for this is the jealousy of husbands, which has consequently been regarded as the primary cause, or as one of the causes, of clothing.[5] To the husband's mind, it is argued, the

[1] Ellis, *op. cit.* vol. i. Evolution of Modesty, &c., pp. 15, 56.

[2] Annandale and Robinson, *Fasciculi Malayenses*, i. 12.

[3] Hobley, *Eastern Uganda*, p. 21.

[4] Snow, *Two Years' Cruise off Tierra del Fuego*, ii. 46 (Fuegians). Church, *Aborigines of South America*, p. 105 (Mojos of South-West Amazonia; some of the married women dress). Ling Roth, 'Aborigines of Hispaniola,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xvi. 275. Guppy, *Solomon Islands*, p. 130 (natives of St. Christoval and the adjacent small islands); Elton, 'Notes on Natives of the Solomon Islands,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xvii. 96 (natives of the islands east of Guadalcanar). Turner, *Samoa*, p. 342 (New Caledonians). Finsch, *New-Guinea*, p. 96 (Papuans of Dorey). Petherick, *Egypt, the Soudan and Central Africa*, pp. 352 (Shilluk), 390 *sq.* (Dinka). Wilson and Felkin, *Uganda and the Egyptian Soudan*, ii. 49; *Emin Pasha in Central Africa*, p. 82 (Banyoro). Hutter, *Wanderungen und Forschungen im Nord-Hinterland von Kamerun*, p. 421 (Bali). Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, p. 770 (natives in parts of West Africa between the Niger and the Gaboon, especially on the Kamerun River, at Old Calabar, and in the Niger Delta).

[5] Letourneau, *L'évolution de la morale*, p. 149. Schurtz, *Grundzüge einer Philosophie der Tracht*, p. 17. Thomas, *Source Book for Social Origins*, p. 549. Ellis, *op. cit.* vol. i. Evolution of Modesty, pp. 63.

garment appears—illogically, though naturally—a moral and physical protection against any attack on his property; and "as the conception of property also extended to the father's right over his daughters, and the appreciation of female chastity developed, this motive spread to unmarried as well as married women." It is difficult to believe, however, that a feeling so grim and earnest as the jealousy of a married man would invent a merely symbolical means of protection utterly inadequate as a preventive of adultery. But the clothing of married women may have originated as a safeguard against supernatural dangers connected with pregnancy and child-birth, and would then, when generally accepted, be required by modesty and become an indication of their married state. Where garments of some sort are worn by all women, both married and unmarried, those of the former are often more seemly than those of the girls. Thus among the Shulis of the Egyptian Sudan, the married women wear a narrow fringe of string in front, the unmarried wearing nothing but bead ornaments.[1] Among the natives of Tassai, New Guinea, the former use a larger and thicker kind of petticoat of pandanus leaf, divided into long grass-like shreds, reaching to the knee; while that worn by the latter consists merely of single lengths made fast to a string which ties round the waist.[2] In Fiji the *liku*—a kind of band made from hibiscus-bark—is before marriage worn very short, but after the birth of the first child is much lengthened;[3] and a similar practice occurs in other islands of the Pacific Ocean.[4]

It has further been suggested that the fear of causing

64, 80. Dr. Ellis thinks that when clothing had been once established the conception of women as property imported a new and powerful sanction to an emotion already based on more natural and primitive facts, that of sexual modesty.

[1] Wilson and Felkin, *op. cit.* ii. 62. *Cf. ibid.* ii. 97 (Baris); Shooter, *Kafirs of Natal and the Zulu Country*, p. 6.

[2] Macgillivray, *Narrative of the Voyage of H.M.S. Rattlesnake*, i. 263.

[3] Wilkes, *op. cit.* iii. 355. Seemann, *Viti*, p. 351.

[4] Forster, *Voyage round the World*, ii. 280. Waitz-Gerland, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, vi. 562. *Cf.* Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal*, p. 27 (Abors).

disgust has been the motive for covering the sexual centre. Dr. Havelock Ellis emphasises its close proximity to the points of exit of disgusting excretions.[1] But this explanation could certainly not apply to the practice of concentrating the covering on the sexual focus and leaving the anal region practically uncovered. There are indeed cases in which the clothing is behind and not in front; but they seem to be exceptional, and, as Dr. Ellis himself points out, there are probably other explanations for them. He also draws attention to the suggestion made by Lombroso and Ferrero, that the fear of the decomposition of the vaginal secretions causing disgust to men is the origin of modesty among savage women, as it remains the sole form of modesty among some prostitutes to-day.[2] Such a fear may certainly in some cases have led to clothing, as it in other cases leads to concealment by postures. Dr. Eylmann remarks that native women in South Australia in lying or sitting down avoid too much exposure, especially when they are in a state which hurts their vanity;[3] and of the Brazilian Mundrucûs we are told by Tocantins that their women, in spite of being completely naked, carefully avoid any postures which might be considered indecorous, and that they do it so skilfully that nobody can notice when they have certain periods peculiar to their sex.[4] As regards the origin of clothing in the case of males, a theory already set forth by St. Augustine deserves mention. He says that after the fall of our first parents "there began in the movement of their bodily members a shameless novelty which made nakedness indecent: it at once made them observant and made them ashamed; . . . and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons."[5] This explanation contains the psychological truth that nakedness becomes

[1] Ellis, *op. cit.* vol. i. Evolution of Modesty, pp. 51, 52, 80.

[2] Lombroso and Ferrero, *La donna delinquente*, p. 374.

[3] Eylmann, *Die Eingeborenen der Kolonie Südaustralien*, p. 128.

[4] Tocantins, 'Estudos sobre a tribu "Mundurucu",' in *Revista trimensal do Instituto Historico Geographico e Ethnographico do Brasil*, vol. xl. pt. ii. 113.

[5] St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, xiv. 17 (Migne, *Patrologiæ cursus*, xli. 425 *sq.*).

indecent when it suggests sexual intercourse and thereby hurts the feeling of sexual modesty. It is therefore conceivable that clothing has been adopted as a means of hiding the most obvious physical sign of sexual excitement. But this suggestion would be better supported by facts if the clothing used by savages were of a kind more suited to effect such concealment than it actually is, and if it were more needed for the purpose than it seems to be. In any case the common theory that clothing owes its origin to the feeling of shame[1] can have a meaning only if nakedness attracts attention to the sexual centre to such a degree as to suggest the idea of sexual intercourse, which, as we have seen, is the real cause of sexual shame. And this is evidently not the case among peoples who are used to nakedness. Whilst modesty relating to the sexual function may be said to be universal, there are a large number of peoples among whom both men and women, or one of the sexes, are in the habit of going completely naked and yet show no trace of shame, and other peoples who when they dress themselves are utterly neglectful of what we consider the first requirements of decency.

Thus in the northern parts of the Californian Peninsula both men and women have been found in a state of nudity.[2] Among the Miwok, according to their own confession, persons of both sexes and of all ages were formerly absolutely naked.[3] Lyman found the same to be the case with the Paiuches in Northern Colorado,[4] Columbus with the aborigines of Hispaniola,[5] Pizarro with the Indians of Coca,[6] v. Humboldt with the Chaymas of New Andalusia,[7] and other travellers among various other South American

[1] Wundt, *Ethik*, i. 152. Schurtz, *Grundzüge einer Philosophie der Tracht*, p. 9 *sq.* Stoll, *op. cit.* p. 486 *sqq.*; &c.

[2] Baegert, 'Account of the Aboriginal Inhabitants of the Californian Peninsula,' in *Smithsonian Report*, 1863–64, p. 361.

[3] Powers, *Tribes of California*, p. 348.

[4] Waitz, *op. cit.* iv. 210.

[5] Ling Roth, in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xvi. 275.

[6] Waitz, *op. cit.* iv. 193 note.

[7] v. Humboldt, *Personal Narrative of Travels to the Equinoctial Regions of the New Continent*, iii. 230.

savages.[1] In some Indian tribes the men alone go naked,[2] in others the women.[3] In the northern parts of North America Mackenzie met a troop of natives of whom the men wore many ornaments and much clothing but showed not the slightest notion of sexual bashfulness in their dress. And of the Fuegians we are told that although they have the shoulder or the back protected by a skin, the rest of their body is perfectly naked.[4]

It seems that in most Australian tribes both sexes, or at least the men, wear no clothing except in cold weather, when they throw something over the shoulders or the back.[5]

[1] de Lery, *Histoire d'un voyage faict en la terre du Brésil*, p. 121. Wied-Neuwied, *Travels in Brazil*, p. 59 (Puris at St. Fidelis). Wallace, *Travels on the Amazon*, p. 513 (Purupurús). v. Schütz-Holzhausen, *Der Amazonas*, p. 179 (Catamixis). Bleyer, 'Die wilden Waldindianer Santa Catharinas: die "Schoklêng,"' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xxxvi. 832. Church, *op. cit.* p. 105 (Mojos in South-Western Amazonia). Azara, *Voyages dans l'Amérique méridionale*, ii. 83 (some Indians in the neighbourhood of the river Paraguay).

[2] Herrmann, 'Die ethnographischen Ergebnisse der Deutschen Pilcomayo-Expedition,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xl. 131 (Sotegaraik). Church, *op. cit.* p. 115 (Guarayos). Azara, *op. cit.* ii. 12, 42, 74, 126 (Charruas, Pampas, Tupis, Payaguas). Charlevoix, *History of Paraguay*, i. 86 (Guaycurûs). The same was often the case among the Nootka (Bancroft, *Native Races of the Pacific States*, i. 182) and the Patwin of California (Powers, *op. cit.* p. 220).

[3] 'History of the Life and Actions of Christopher Colon,' in Pinkerton, *Collection of Voyages and Travels*, xii. 101 (aborigines of Trinidad). v. Martius, *Beiträge zur Ethnographie Amerika's*, i. 388, 427, 504 (Mundrucûs, Marauás, Juris). Wallace, *op. cit.* pp. 492, 509 (Uaupés, Curetús). Whiffen, *North-West Amazons*, pp. 72, 89 (Witoto and Boro).

[4] Forster, *op. cit.* ii. 499. King and Fitzroy, *Narrative of the Voyages of the Adventure and Beagle*, i. 23. Wilkes, *op. cit.* i. 121. Bove, *Patagonia. Terra del Fuoco. Mari Australi*, p. 129. Armstrong, *Personal Narrative of the Discovery of the North-West Passage*, p. 33. Darwin, *Journal of Researches*, p. 228. See also Gallardo, *Tierra del Fuego.—Los Onas*, p. 131 *sq.*

[5] Curr, *Australian Race*, i. 93. Labillardière, *Account of a Voyage in search of La Pérouse*, ii. 27 *sq.* Bonwick, *Daily Life and Origin of the Tasmanians*, p. 104 *sq.* Oberländer, 'Die Eingeborenen der australischen Kolonie Victoria,' in *Globus*, iv. 278. Mathew, 'Australian Aborigines,' in *Jour. and Proceed. Roy. Soc. N. S. Wales*, xxiii. 391 *sq.* *Idem*, *Eaglehawk and Crow*, p. 85. *Idem*,

"They are as innocent of shame," says Palmer, "as the animals of the forests."[1] Cook found the aborigines of Tasmania quite naked, and other travellers did the same, or, if not, attributed the little clothing they wore to the necessity of protecting themselves against the cold.[2] Among various other peoples inhabiting islands in the Pacific Ocean,[3] as also some tribes in Borneo[4] and Sumatra,[5] the people of Jarai bordering upon the empire of Siam,[6] and the Nagas of Assam,[7] both sexes were naked or, if they covered themselves a little, did so in a way which could have nothing to do with the feeling of decency; whilst in many Pacific islands it was generally the men only who were completely devoid of covering.[8] Of those on the south-west coast of

Two Representative Tribes of Queensland, p. 95. Breton, *Excursions in New South Wales, &c.*, p. 211 *sq.* Henderson, *Excursions and Adventures in New South Wales*, ii. 104. Tench, *Narrative of the Expedition to Botany Bay*, p. 80. Schulze, 'Aborigines of the Upper and Middle Finke River,' in *Trans. and Proceed. Roy. Soc. South Australia*, xiv. 229. Stirling, 'Anthropology,' in *Report on the Work of the Horn Scientific Expedition to Central Australia*, iv. 37. Withnell, *Customs and Traditions of the Aboriginal Natives of North Western Australia*, p. 13.

[1] Palmer, 'Notes on some Australian Tribes,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xiii. 281 note.

[2] Ling Roth, *Aborigines of Tasmania*, p. 128 *sqq.* Mrs. Prinsep, *Journal of a Voyage from Calcutta to Van Diemen's Land*, p. 79. Nixon, *Cruise of the Beacon*, pp. 25, 28. West, *History of Tasmania*, ii. 83. Bonwick, *op. cit.* pp. 24, 104. Breton, *op. cit.* p. 398.

[3] Wilkes, *op. cit.* iv. 277 (natives of Penrhyn Island); v. 46 (natives of Drummond's Island). Labillardière, *op. cit.* ii. 274 (Solomon Islanders), 287, 289 (natives of the Louisiade Archipelago). Parkinson *Dreissig Jahre in der Südsee*, p. 490 *sq.* (natives in the interior of Bougainville in the Solomons). Pfeil, *Studien und Beobachtungen aus der Südsee* p. 48 (various tribes in the Bismarck Archipelago).

[4] Bock, *Head-Hunters of Borneo*, p. 183.

[5] Forbes, 'Kubus of Sumatra,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xiv. 122.

[6] Crawfurd, *History of the Indian Archipelago*, iii. 5.

[7] Blochmann, 'Koch Bihár, Koch Hájo, and A'sám, in the 16th and 17th Centuries,' in *Jour. Asiatic Soc. Bengal*, vol. xli. pt. i. 84 n. †.

[8] Powell, *op. cit.* pp. 74 *sq.* (natives of the Duke of York Group), 250 (natives of New Britain). Parkinson, *op. cit.* pp. 342 (natives of Squally Island north-east of New Ireland), 431 (natives of Wuwulu and Aua west of the Admiralty Islands). Guppy, *op. cit.*

New Guinea, Gill wrote that they "glory in their nudeness, and consider clothing to be fit only for women."[1] In one part of Timor, on the other hand,[2] as also in a tribe of the Andamanese,[3] it is the women who are devoid of any kind of covering.

Passing to Africa, we meet with instances of the same kind. The Central African Pygmies, both men and women, often go naked in their forest homes, although in the presence of strangers they don a small covering.[4] The Bushmen of South Africa also went naked, except when they used a piece of skin barely sufficient to cover the back.[5] Among the Bateso, a tribe of the Nilotic group living in the Central Province of the Uganda Protectorate, neither sex wear any clothing, although they are particularly fond of ornaments.[6] Sir Charles Eliot observes that, with the exception of those natives on the coast who have any pretensions to be Muhammadans and the people of Uganda, "the native races of East Africa show an entire absence of the feelings which lead the European and Asiatic to cover their bodies. . . Most natives appear to be simply in the state of Adam and Eve before the fall, . . . and to have no idea of indecency.

p. 130; Elton, in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xvii. 96 (some Solomon Islanders). Rivers, *History of Melanesian Society*, ii. 442 (Banks Islanders). Earl, *Papuans*, p. 48; d'Albertis, *New Guinea*, ii. 380; Chalmers, *Pioneer Life and Work in New Guinea*, pp. 110, 112; Landtman, *Nya Guinea färden*, p. 68; Gill, *Life in the Southern Isles*, p. 203; Waitz-Gerland, *op. cit.* vi. 568; Haddon, 'Ethnography of the Western Tribe of Torres Straits,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xix. 336; *Idem*, in *Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits*, v. 272 (various tribes in New Guinea and neighbouring islands). Keate, *Account of the Pelew Islands*, p. 318. Kotzebue, *Voyage of Discovery into the South Sea*, iii. 191 (natives of Pelli of the Caroline Group). Among the Maori "men often went naked without any breach of modesty, or decorum" (Colenso, *Maori Races of New Zealand*, p. 47).

[1] Gill, *op. cit.* p. 230.

[2] Forbes, 'Tribes of Timor,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xiii. 406.

[3] Man, 'Aboriginal Inhabitants of the Andaman Islands,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xii. 330. [4] Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, pp. 538, 769.

[5] Kretzschmar, *Südafrikanische Skizzen*, p. 225. Chapman, *Travels in the Interior of South Africa*, i. 78. Barrow, *Account of Travels into the Interior of Southern Africa*, i. 276.

[6] Roscoe, *Northern Bantu*, p. 272.

It is noticeable that even the races who are more or less clothed, such as the Wakamba, wear their garments so carelessly that they by no means fulfil our ideas of propriety. As a rule this nudity is confined to the men, but in Kavirondo it extends to both sexes. . . . Neither the Bantu nor the Nilotic Kavirondo are particularly low in the scale of civilisation."[1] According to Sir Harry Johnston, complete nudity in the male is, or has until recently been, characteristic of " the Nilotic Negroes, the pagan Hamites (Gala and Bahima), the hybrid races between the Hamite and the Nile Negro, between the Hamite and the Bantu, and a few Bantu races who are either very much under the influence of neighbouring Masai or Gala tribes or have still retained in South Central Africa the impress of Bahima customs."[2] The peoples among whom the men either go naked or dress without the least regard to decency as we understand it, or did so not long ago, include the Baris,[3]

[1] Eliot, *East Africa Protectorate*, p. 93 *sq.* Among the Nilotic tribes of Kavirondo unmarried men go naked, whilst married men who have a child wear a small piece of goat skin practically useless as a covering; nor wear unmarried girls any clothes, although married women wear a tail of strings behind but not in front (Hobley, *op. cit.* p. 31). Among the Bantu Kavirondo the men generally go naked, though the old men and chiefs wear a skin slung toga-wise from the shoulder; young unmarried girls are usually nude, but the other women wear a fringe of black string in front and a tail behind (*ibid.* p. 21).

[2] Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, pp. 767, 769. He adds (*ibid.* p. 769 n. *) :—" The only Bantu tribes which formerly were, or at the present day are, without feelings of shame in regard to the exposure of the person in the male are the A-kamba, A-kikuyu, Wa-chaga, and other tribes in British East Africa living in close relations with the Masai or the Gala; the Kavirondo, who were similarly influenced by the Nile Negroes; the Bakonjo of Ruwenzori, who in this may have copied the Hima customs; the Barundi of North Tanganyika likewise; the Nkonde tribes of the north end of Lake Nyasa; the Mashukulumbwe (*cf.* Holub, *op. cit.* ii. 299) and Batonga of the Central Zambezi; and the Zulus of South and South Central Africa." Of the Bahima Mr. Roscoe writes (*op. cit.* p. 103), " Men go scantily dressed: they are often destitute of clothing except for a small skin-cape thrown over their shoulders."

[3] Wilson and Felkin, *op. cit.* ii. 96.

Shilluk,[1] Dinka,[2] Masai,[3] Nandi,[4] Madis,[5] Wataveta,[6] Watuta,[7] Washashi,[8] Hottentots,[9] and the Efik people of Old Calabar.[10] Apud Masaios membrum virile celare turpe existimatur, honestum expromere, atque etiam ostentare; yet Sir Harry Johnston has never known them to be guilty of any gesture of deliberate indelicacy.[11] So also among the ancient inhabitants of Lancerote, according to Bontier and Le Verrier, the men used no covering; and in Teneriffe "the inhabitants went naked, except some few who wore goatskins."[12] Among the Bubis of Fernando Po,[13] the natives of Loango[14] and Balonda,[15] and some tribes on the Congo, for example the Bopoto,[16] complete nudity prevails, or prevailed, among the women. In parts of West Africa it is, or was, customary for young women to go entirely naked before marriage, and in Swaziland until quite recently not only unmarried women but very often matrons were stark naked.[17] Even among the prudish Baganda, who made it a punishable offence at one time for a man to expose any part of his leg above the knee, the wives of the king would attend at his court perfectly naked.[18]

[1] Schweinfurth, *Im Herzen von Afrika*, i. 322. Petherick, *op. cit.* p. 352.

[2] Schweinfurth, *op. cit.* i. 163. Petherick, *op. cit.* p. 390 *sq.*

[3] Last, 'Visit to the Masai People,' in *Proceed. Roy. Geograph. Soc.* N.S. v. 530. Eliot, *op. cit.* p. 137.

[4] Johnston, *op. cit.* p. 862 *sq.* Hollis, *Nandi*, p. 27.

[5] Felkin, 'Notes on the Madi or Moru Tribe of Central Africa,' in *Proceed. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh*, xii. 316.

[6] New, *Life, Wanderings, &c. in Eastern Africa*, p. 357.

[7] Cameron, *Across Africa*, i. 285 *sq.*

[8] Kollmann, *Victoria Nyanza*, p. 187 *sq.* See also *ibid.* p. 188 *sq.*

[9] Theal, *Yellow and Dark-skinned People of Africa south of the Zambesi*, p. 73.

[10] Johnston, *op. cit.* p. 770.

[11] *Idem*, *Kilima-njaro Expedition*, p. 413 note. *Idem*, *Uganda Protectorate*, p. 808.

[12] Bontier and Le Verrier, *The Canarian*, pp. 138, 139, xxxv.

[13] Möller, Pagels, and Gleerup, *Tre år i Kongo*, i. 15.

[14] Wilson and Felkin, *op. cit.* ii. 53.

[15] Livingstone, *Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa*, p. 305.

[16] Ward, *Voice from the Congo*, p. 256.

[17] Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, p. 770 *sq.*

[18] *Ibid.* p. 771. Eliot, *op. cit.* p. 130.

It must not be supposed that the peoples who attach no idea of shame to the entire exposure of the body are devoid of sexual modesty or are less modest than those who cover themselves.[1] Mr. Kerr Cross remarks that "as a general rule, in Africa modesty is in reverse proportion to clothing."[2] M. Hyades assures us that the same feeling is very developed among the Yahgans of Tierra del Fuego, who are used to live naked: "they manifest it in their bearing and in the ease with which they show themselves without clothing, compared with the awkwardness, blushing, and shame which they exhibit, men and women, if one gazes at certain parts of their bodies."[3] The Andamanese are said to "pay no attention to their own nudity, although by nature they are modest."[4] Parkinson observes that the modesty of a perfectly naked New Ireland girl is as great as, if not greater than, that which is found in most of our fashionable ladies in Europe. And he adds that "nakedness by itself causes no sexual excitement in a native."[5] This is undoubtedly true of all peoples who wear no clothing. "Where all men go naked, for instance in New Holland," says Forster, "custom familiarises them to each other's eyes, as much as if they went wholly muffled up in garments."[6] In an account of the Nagas in the southern mountains of Assam, written by a Persian historian of the seventeenth century, we read that "the women only cover their breasts as they say that it would be absurd to cover those limbs which every one might have seen from their birth; but this was not the case with the breasts, which since then had formed and should, therefore, be covered."[7] That the nakedness of savages is not alluring, when one gets used to it, has been attested by many travellers. Lery, in his description of

[1] See, *e.g.*, Bonwick, *op. cit.* p. 57 *sq.*; Maupetit, 'La pudeur,' in *Bull. Soc. d'Anthr. Paris*, ser. vi. vol. v. 405 *sqq.*

[2] Cross, 'Notes on the Country lying between Lakes Nyassa and Tanganyika,' in *Proceed. Roy. Geograph. Soc.* N.S. xiii. 88. *Cf.* Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, p. 730 (Bantu Kavirondo).

[3] Hyades and Deniker, *Mission scientifique du Cap Horn*, vii. 239.

[4] Kloss, *In the Andamans and Nicobars*, p. 188.

[5] Parkinson, *op. cit.* p. 271. [6] Forster, *op. cit.* ii. 383.

[7] Blochmann, in *Jour. Asiatic Soc. Bengal*, vol. xli. pt. i. 84.

the voyage he made to Brazil in the sixteenth century, says that the stay among naked savages is not a provocation to lust, and that the nudity of their women proved to be much less exciting than our women's clothes.[1] Speaking of the Fuegians, Captain Snow remarks:—"More harm, I think, is done by false modesty,—by covering and *partly* clothing, than by the truth in nature always appearing as it is. Intermingling with savages of wild lands who do not clothe, gives one, I believe, less impure and sensual feelings than the merely mixing with society of a higher kind."[2] In his 'Africa Unveiled' Mr. Rowley observes that "when the sight becomes accustomed to the absence of raiment, your sense of propriety is far less offended than in England"; [3] and Winwood Reade expresses the opinion that there is nothing voluptuous in the excessive *déshabillé* of an equatorial African girl, nothing being so moral and so unlikely to excite the passions as nakedness.[4] Similar views are taken by various other travellers.[5] They are confirmed by the experience made by our artists at home. Du Maurier observes that it is "a fact well known to all painters and sculptors who have used the nude model (except a few shady pretenders, whose purity, not being of the right sort, has gone rank from too much watching) namely, that nothing

[1] de Lery, *op. cit.* p. 121. With reference to the Uaupés, Wallace says (*op. cit.* p. 296) that "there is far more immodesty in the transparent and flesh-coloured garments of our stage-dancers, than in the perfect nudity of these daughters of the forest."

[2] Snow, *op. cit.* ii. 51. [3] Rowley, *Africa Unveiled*, p. 146.

[4] Reade, *Savage Africa*, p. 546.

[5] Speaking of the naked women of New Ireland, Zimmermann says (*op. cit.* ii. 103 *sq.*):—"In der That muss ich auch sagen, dass nach kurzer Zeit, nach einer durchaus nicht lange dauernden Gewöhnung an diese Sache, man gar nichts anstössiges mehr in diesem gänzlichen Mangel an Kleidung findet. . . . Ich habe sehr häufig bemerkt, dass ein Kleid irgend einer Dame, welches nicht nach der allgemeinen Mode geschnitten war, mir stärker auffiel als mir der gänzliche Mangel an Bekleidung der Eingeborenen der tropischen Inseln aufgefallen ist; dazu kommt noch, dass die Leute dem Beobachter durchaus keine Veranlassung geben, an etwas unschickliches zu denken." See also Grose, *Voyage to the East-Indies*, i. 244; Johnston, *Kilima-njaro Expedition*, p. 437.

is so chaste as nudity. Venus herself, as she drops her garments and steps on to the model-throne, leaves behind her on the floor every weapon in her armory by which she can pierce to the grosser passions of men."[1] Flaxman said that the students in entering the academy seem to hang up their passions along with their hats.

On the other hand, we hear of naked savages who are ashamed to cover themselves, looking upon clothing as something indecent. The pious father Gumilla was greatly astonished to find that certain Indians on the Orinoco did not blush at their nakedness. He says that on the contrary, if the missionaries distributed to them, and especially to the women, cloth with which to cover themselves, they threw it into the river so as not to be obliged to make use of it; and when they were told to cover themselves, they answered, "We are not going to cover ourselves because it makes us ashamed."[2] Speaking of the Chaymas of New Andalusia, who, like most savage peoples dwelling in very hot regions, have an insuperable aversion to clothing, v. Humboldt states that under the torrid zone the natives are ashamed, as they say, to be clothed, and flee to the woods when they are too soon compelled to give up their nakedness.[3] In an Indian hut at Mucúra in Brazil, Wallace found the women entirely without covering and apparently quite unconscious of the fact. One of them, however, possessed a *saía*, or petticoat, which she sometimes put on, and seemed then "almost as much ashamed of herself as civilised people would be if they took theirs off."[4]

Facts like these must certainly tend to discredit the popular view that modesty is the mother of clothing. And our confidence in it does not increase when we consider what sort of covering savages often use.

Among the Wintun, a Californian tribe, a fashionable young woman wears a girdle of deerskin, the lower edge of which is slit into a long fringe with a polished pine-nut at the end of each strand, while the upper border and other

[1] Du Maurier, *Trilby*, i. 146.
[2] Gumilla, *El Orinoco ilustrado*, i. 137.
[3] v. Humboldt, *op. cit.* iii. 230. [4] Wallace, *op. cit.* p. 357.

portions are studded with brilliant bits of shell.[1] When a Carib girl attained the age of ten or twelve years she assumed around the waist "a piece of cotton cloth worked and embroidered with minute grains of shells of different colours, decorated in the lower part with fringe."[2] Dr. von den Steinen describes the so-called *uluri*, which is worn by Carib, Nu-Arawak, and Tupi women, as a little ornamental triangular piece of bark-bast, which looks very coquettish when new; and he observes that both this elegant garment, the red thread of the Trumaí, and the variegated flag of the Bororó, "attract attention, like ornaments, instead of drawing attention away."[3] Among the Central Australian tribes described by Spencer and Gillen "the only covering takes the form of small aprons worn by women and pubic tassels worn by men. The latter articles vary to a considerable extent in size. In the southern tribes—the Arunta, Loritja, and Kaitish—they are usually small and quite inadequate as a covering; in fact they are frequently coated with white pipe-clay, which serves the purpose, especially during the progress of corrobborees, when large numbers of men and women meet together, of drawing attention to the part which in other tribes they are designed to conceal. They are not often larger in size than a five-shilling piece, and may be even smaller."[4] Speaking of the perineal band made of bark cloth which is the one article of dress universally worn by both sexes among the Mafulu mountain people of British New Guinea, Mr. Williamson states:—"One is tempted to think, as regards both men and women, that, from the point of view of covering, the bands might be dispensed with altogether. This remark applies still more strongly to the case of young boys and unmarried girls, including among the latter big full-grown girls, who are in fact fully developed women, whose bands can hardly be regarded as being more than nominal."[5] In

[1] Powers, *op. cit.* p. 233. [2] Heriot, *op. cit.* p. 306 *sq.*

[3] von den Steinen, *op. cit.* p. 193 *sqq.* *Cf.* v. Martius, *op. cit.* i. 579, 642, 702 *sq.* note.

[4] Spencer and Gillen, *Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 683 *sq.*

[5] Williamson, *Mafulu Mountain People of British New Guinea*, p. 26 *sq.*

Tahiti a *maro*, composed of red and yellow feathers, was in Cook's time considered a present of very great value, and the women thought it "most ornamental" to enfold their loins with many windings of cloth.[1] Seemann says that in Fiji the girls "wore nothing save a girdle of hibiscus-fibres, about six inches wide, dyed black, red, yellow, white, or brown, and put on in such a coquettish way, that one thought it must come off every moment."[2] A similar practice is widespread in the islands of the Pacific, fringes made of cocoa-nut fibre or of leaves slit into narrow strips or filaments of bark, frequently dyed with gaudy colours, being in many of these islands the only garment of the natives. This costume, with its conspicuous tint and mobile fringe, has a most graceful appearance and a very pretty effect, but is far from being in harmony with our ideas of modesty. In the island of Yap, according to Cheyne, "the dress of the males, if such it may be called, is slovenly in the extreme. They wear the *maro* next them, and, by way of improvement, a bunch of bark fibres dyed red, over it."[3] In New Caledonia, in Forster's time, the natives only tied "a string round the middle and another round the neck;"[4] whilst in some other groups the dress of the men consisted of nothing but a leaf[5] or a mussel or shell.[6]

In Kordofan the unmarried girls only tied round their loins a fringed leathern belt, which was frequently decorated with agates.[7] Among the Nandi they "wear little more clothing than a very small apron of leather ornamented with beads and tassels."[8] Among the Negroes of Benin, according to Bosman, they had no other garment than some

[1] Cook, *Voyage to the Pacific Ocean*, ii. 16 *sq.* *Idem*, *Journal of a Voyage round the World*, p. 44. [2] Seemann, *Viti*, p. 168.

[3] Cheyne, *Description of Islands in the Western Pacific Ocean*, p. 144. [4] Forster, *op. cit.* ii. 383.

[5] Waitz-Gerland, *op. cit.* vi. 561, 565 (New Caledonia, New Hebrides, Ulaua).

[6] *Ibid.* vi. 567 (some parts of New Guinea). Labillardière, *op. cit.* i. 279 *sq.*; Moseley, in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* vi. 397 *sq.*; Parkinson, *op. cit.* p. 368 (Admiralty Islands).

[7] Pallme, *Travels in Kordofan*, p. 71.

[8] Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, p. 863 *sq.*

strings of coral twisted about the middle.[1] In Lukungu the entire covering of most of the women consists of a narrow string with some white china beads threaded on it.[2] The Hottentot women, according to Barrow, bestowed their largest and most splendid ornaments upon the little apron, about seven or eight inches wide, that hung from the waist. "Great pains," he says, "seem to be taken by the women to attract notice towards this part of their persons. Large metal buttons, shells of the cypræa genus, with the apertures outwards, or anything that makes a great show, are fastened to the borders of this apron."[3] The Bushman women of South Africa, met with by the same traveller, had as their only covering a belt of springbok's skin, the part which was intended to hang in front being cut into long threads. But the filaments, he says, "were so small and thin that they answered no sort of use as a covering; nor, indeed, did the females, either old or young, seem to feel any sense of shame in appearing before us naked."[4]

In these and similar instances—I have only chosen a few representative cases—it does not look as if the covering was adopted from a feeling of modesty, but in many of them, at least, it is quite obvious that it is used as a means of embellishment. This is also expressly pointed out by several of our informants, and some of them even go so far as to suggest that the primary object of the clothing was to serve as an ornament. De Laet says of the coast tribes of Guiana that men and women mostly remain naked, and only sometimes cover the pudenda, more from love of decoration than from a sense of shame.[5] In his description of the Upper Napo Indians in Ecuador Mr. Simson remarks, "Clothing with all savages is primarily looked upon as mere embellishment, though Indians who have frequent communication with more civilised men begin to show some shame when entirely nude."[6] Dr. von den

[1] Bosman, 'New Description of the Coast of Guinea,' in Pinkerton, *op. cit.* xvi. 524. [2] Möller, Pagels, and Gleerup, *op. cit.* i. 169.
[3] Barrow, *op. cit.* i. 155. [4] *Ibid.* i. 276 *sq.*
[5] de Laet, *Novus orbis*, book xvii. ch. 11, p. 641.
[6] Simson, *Travels in the Wilds of Ecuador*, p. 158.

Steinen asserts that the Bakaïrí of Central Brazil "envy us our clothes as a valuable ornament."[1] The pubic covering of a South Australian native is, according to Dr. Eylmann, decoration rather than clothing.[2] Forster says of the natives of Mallicolo that "it is uncertain whether the scanty dress of their women owes its origin to a sense of shame, or to an artful endeavour to please"; and of the men of Tanna, that "round their middle they tie a string, and below that they employ the leaves of a plant like ginger, for the same purpose and in the same manner as the natives of Mallicollo. Boys, as soon as they attain the age of six years, are provided with these leaves; which seems to confirm what I have observed in regard to the Mallicollese, *viz.*, that they do not employ this covering from motives of decency. Indeed, it had so much the contrary appearance, that in the person of every native of Tanna or Mallicollo, we thought we beheld a living representation of that terrible divinity who protected the orchards and gardens of the ancients."[3] Parkinson regards the shell used by men in the Admiralty Islands as an ornament;[4] and a similar view is taken of the miniature pubic covering, consisting of a plaited capsule or a shell or cocoon, which is worn in some parts of Africa.[5] Speaking of the very simple dress of the male Hottentot, Barrow says, "If the real intent of it was the promotion of decency, it should seem that he has widely missed his aim, as it is certainly one of the most immodest objects, in such a situation as he places it, that could have been contrived."[6] In the Bali countries of Kamerun any clothing worn by the natives is, according to Hutter, meant to serve either as decoration or as protection against the weather. When it is not called for from either point of view, for example when the people are working in the field or bathing, both men and women denude their bodies completely without finding it in the

[1] von den Steinen, *op. cit.* p. 190. [2] Eylmann, *op. cit.* p. 401.
[3] Forster, *op. cit.* ii. 230, 276 *sq.* [4] Parkinson, *op. cit.* p. 368.
[5] Ankermann, in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xxxvii. 64. For this practice among the Wangoni see Fülleborn, *Das Deutsche Njassa- und Ruwuma-Gebiet*, p. 152. [6] Barrow, *op. cit.* i. 154.

least indecent to do so; and if anybody gives them a piece of cloth and asks them to cover their pudenda, they simply fail to understand the meaning of it. And yet, our informant adds, these people are not low savages but a comparatively civilised and intelligent race.[1] Sir Harry Johnston states that among the Nandi peoples, who are quite indifferent to nudity in the men, "clothing is only worn for warmth or for adornment, and not for the purposes of decency."[2] And in his book on 'The River Congo' the same writer observes:—"Clothing was first adopted as a means of decoration rather than from motives of decency. The private parts were first adorned with the appendages that were afterwards used by a dawning sense of modesty to conceal them."[3]

A thing may of course be invented for one purpose and afterwards used for another purpose, and it is therefore conceivable that savages who now look upon their clothes as ornaments did not do so from the beginning. Yet there is every reason to believe that in many cases at least the pubic covering was originally adopted as a sexual lure.

[1] Hutter, *op. cit.* p. 375.

[2] Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, p. 862 *sq.*

[3] *Idem, River Congo*, p. 418. I became acquainted with this book only since the appearance of the first edition of the present work, where I already advocated the theory that covering, "at least in a great many cases," owes its origin to the desire of men and women to make themselves mutually attractive. This view has subsequently gained the support of Grosse (*Beginnings of Art*, p. 96 *sqq.*), Groos (*Play of Man*, p. 263), Bloch (*Sexual Life of Our Time*, p. 138), Parkinson (*Dreissig Jahre in der Südsee*, p. 271), and others. So, too, Dr. Havelock Ellis (*op. cit.* vol. i. Evolution of Modesty, p. 61) thinks there can be no doubt that the contention "that ornament and clothing were, in the first place, intended, not to conceal or even to protect the body, but, in large part, to render it sexually attractive, is fully proved." But he also writes (*ibid.* p. 47) that, although the statement that the primary object of clothes is to accentuate, rather than to conceal, has in it a large element of truth, it is by no means a complete account of the matter. In this I agree with Dr. Ellis, and in the present edition in particular I have taken care not to carry my theory to an extreme, admitting that, although the desire to be sexually attractive is probably one cause of the origin of clothing, there may be various other causes as well.

If people attach objects to other parts of the body in order to stimulate the passions of the opposite sex, is it not all the more probable that the objects they attached to the sexual centre itself were intended to serve the same object? While nakedness is not exciting if the eye is used to it, covering or half-covering readily becomes so. Montaigne asks:—"Why did Poppea invent the use of a mask to hide the beauties of her face, but to enhance it to her lovers? . . . Why do people cover with so many hindrances, one over another, the parts where our desires and their own have their principal seat?"[1] Virey gives the answer, "The less one sees, the more does imagination picture."[2] So also, when Mr. Ward asked a native Congo chief the reason why the women of his district wore no costume, the import of his reply was, "Concealment makes the inquisitive hungry."[3] The Khyoungtha of the Chittagong Hills have a tradition worth mentioning in this connection. "A certain queen noticed with regret that the men of the nation were losing their love for the society of the women, and were resorting to vile and abominable practices, from which the worst possible results might be expected. She therefore prevailed upon her husband to promulgate a rigorous order, prescribing the form of petticoat to be worn by all women in future, and directing that the males should be tattooed, in order that, by thus disfiguring the males, and *adding piquancy to the beauty of the women*, the former might once more return to the feet of their wives."[4] We can easily imagine that among a tribe of naked savages, when someone, whether man or woman, put on a bright-coloured fringe, a few gaudy feathers, a string with beads, a bundle of leaves, a dazzling shell, or a piece of cloth, this could not fail to

[1] Montaigne, *Essays*, book ii. ch. 15, vol. ii. 331.

[2] Virey, *De la femme sous ses rapports physiologique, moral et littéraire*, p. 300. "Nur das Verborgene reizt," says Zimmermann (*op. cit.* ii. 84), "und Diejenigen welche auf den Gesellschafts-Inseln die verhüllende Kleidung und den heimlichen Genuss und das Verbergen der natürlichen Gefühle einführten, haben gewiss die Sitten nicht verbessert."

[3] Ward, *Voice from the Congo*, p. 258.

[4] Lewin, *Wild Races of South-Eastern India*, p. 116 *sq.*

attract attention and served as an invitation. It is of great importance for our argument that among many peoples who generally go perfectly naked a covering is worn in circumstances which indicate that it is used simply as a means of sexual attraction.

We have previously noticed the important part which dances and festivals play in the erotic life of savage peoples, and the endeavour of young men and women on these occasions to please each other by painting their bodies and decorating them with all sorts of ornaments. Then, also, it is the custom for them, in tribes who are otherwise naked, to put on a scanty covering. Among the Tasmanians, whose dances were performed "with the avowed intention of exciting the passions of the men," the women wore in the dance a covering of leaves or feathers, which, as among Australian natives on similar occasions, was removed directly afterwards.[1] Among the Australian Pegulloburras, who generally go entirely naked, the women on festive occasions wear round the middle small fringes.[2] Preparatory to their dances the Huitoto Indians of the Putumayo region used to paint themselves all over in various colours and adorn themselves with feather ornaments and necklaces, and the few who possessed clothes generally wore them on these occasions.[3] Speaking of the Witoto and Boro of the North-West Amazons, Mr. Whiffen remarks that "if for ordinary life the attire of the Indian is of the slightest, on the occasion of a festival or a dance the most elaborate sartorial preparations have to be made"; and he also says of them that "their ornaments are more important than their dress, in fact their ornaments are their dress."[4] Wallace writes of the Uaupés that, "while dancing in their festivals, the women wear a small *tanga*, or apron, made of beads, prettily arranged. It is only about six inches square, but is never worn at any other time, and immediately the dance is over, it is taken off." Besides, their bodies are

[1] Bonwick, *op. cit.* pp. 27, 38.
[2] Curr, *Australian Race*, ii. 472.
[3] Hardenburg, *Putumayo*, p. 161 *sq.*
[4] Whiffen, *op. cit.* pp. 75, 79.

painted.[1] The same was the case with the Tahitian Areois, known for their licentious life and their lewd dances and pantomimes, who also sometimes, on public occasions, put on a girdle of the yellow *ti* leaves, which in appearance resembled the feather girdles of the Peruvian or other South American tribes.[2] As to the South African Basuto, Casalis says that marriageable girls "frequently indulge in grotesque dances, and at those times wear, as a sort of petticoat, long bands composed of a series of rushes artistically strung together."[3]

We have seen that among several peoples only the married women are clothed, whereas the unmarried ones go entirely naked. But among other peoples the case is just the reverse, the marriageable girls covering their nakedness, but later on, when married, laying off their garments—a practice which seems analogous to that of a married woman being deprived of her ornaments and her hair. Barth found this to be the case in various heathen tribes in the interior of Africa.[4] In many parts of Australia young girls wear a sort of apron of fringe suspended from a belt round the waist, but give it up when they marry,[5] or sometimes only after the birth of the first or second child.[6] Thus among the natives of Botany Bay, New South Wales, according to Barrington, "the females at an early age wear a little apron, made from the skin of the opossum or kangaroo, cut into slips, and hanging a few inches from the waist; this they wear till they grow up and are taken by men."[7] Macgillivray states that in many tribes of Torres Straits the

[1] Wallace, *Travels on the Amazon*, pp. 493, 281. v. Martius, *op. cit.* i. 597. [2] Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, i. 235.

[3] Casalis, *Basutos*, p. 269.

[4] Barth, *Reisen und Entdeckungen in Nord- und Central-Afrika*, ii. 467 *sq.*

[5] Freycinet, *op. cit.* ii. 748. Snow, *op. cit.* ii. 46. Palmer, in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xiii. 281 note, 286. Mathew, in *Jour. and Proceed. Roy. Soc. N. S. Wales*, xxiii. 392.

[6] Taplin, 'Narrinyeri,' in Woods, *Native Tribes of South Australia*, p. 15. Brough Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, i. 275. Curr, *Australian Race*, iii. 19.

[7] Barrington, *History of New South Wales*, p. 23 *sq.*

women have a petticoat of fine shreds of pandanus leaves, the ends worked into a waistband, upon the construction of which much labour is expended; but it is only "sometimes put on, especially by the young girls, and when about to engage in dancing." Under this, however, another covering is usually worn.[1] Among the Tupi tribes of Brazil, as soon as a girl became marriageable "cotton cords were tied round her waist and round the fleshy part of both arms; they denoted a state of maidenhood, and, if any one but a maiden wore them, they were persuaded that the Anhanga would fetch her away. . . . It cannot have been invented for the purpose of keeping the women chaste till marriage, for these bands were broken without fear, and incontinence was not regarded as an offence."[2] Very generally in the savage world, where climate does not put obstacles in the way, boys or girls or both sexes go naked till they reach the age of puberty, covering being thus resorted to at the same period as most ornaments;[3] but for this there may be other reasons besides the desire to be attractive.[4] A very

[1] Macgillivray, *op. cit.* ii. 19 *sq.*

[2] Southey, *History of Brazil*, i. 240 *sq.* *Cf.* v. Martius, *op. cit.* i. 111.

[3] Krause, *In den Wildnissen Brasiliens*, p. 204 (Karayá). Haseman, 'Notes on the Pawumwa Indians of South America,' in *American Anthropologist*, N.S. xiv. 342. Thomson, *Fijians*, p. 217. Codrington, *Melanesians*, pp. 234, 240. Speiser, *Two Years with the Natives in the Western Pacific*, p. 235 (natives of Pentecost in the New Hebrides). Rawling, *op. cit.* p. 57 (Papuans of the Mimika district in Dutch New Guinea). Waitz-Gerland, *op. cit.* vi. 42 (Polynesians). Bonney, 'Aborigines of the River Darling,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xiii. 127; Cameron, 'Notes on some Tribes of N. S. Wales,' *ibid.* xiv. 358; Bonwick, 'Australian Natives,' *ibid.* xvi. 209; Angas, *Savage Life and Scenes in Australia*, i. 98 *sq.* Riedel, *op. cit.* p. 463 (Damanese). Caillié, *Travels through Central Africa to Timbuctoo*, i. 351; Nachtigal, *Sahara und Sudan*, i. 221; Reade, *Savage Africa*, pp. 45, 245 *sq.*; Roscoe, *Northern Bantu*, p. 164; Möller, Pagels, and Gleerup, *Tre år i Kongo*, i. 128; Chapman, *Travels in the Interior of South Africa*, i. 36 (various African peoples).

[4] Dr. Karsten suggests (*op. cit.* i. 164) that the cotton cords of the Tupis "were magical things which were put on the girl at the critical epoch in her life, when she became a woman, in order to protect her against the *Anhanga*."

interesting statement, made by Lohmann, is that among the Saliras only harlots clothe themselves; and they are said to do so in order to attract through the unknown.[1]

In conformity with other ornaments, what we consider decent covering is said to be more common among savage men than women. "If dress were the result of a feeling of shame," Professor Waitz observes, "we should expect it to be more indispensable to woman than to man, which is not the case."[2] In America, according to v. Humboldt—among the Caribs, for instance—the men are often more decently clothed than the women.[3] The same is stated of the Nagas of Upper Assam;[4] and, with particular reference to African savages, Barth remarks, "I have observed that many heathen tribes consider a covering, however poor and scanty it may be, more necessary for man than woman."[5] Whether this is the rule among savage peoples is doubtful. At any rate, the egoism of the men cannot be blamed for the nakedness of the women. For a savage Eve may pluck her clothes from the trees.

It is finally worth noticing that the use of a covering is not the only way in which savage men and women pay attention to the pubic region, or draw attention to it. In many of the Pacific islands this part of the body is tattooed, even so profusely as to give the person, at a distance, the appearance of being dressed.[6] In such cases tattooing has been said to answer the purposes of decency in the absence

[1] Lohmann, quoted by Bastian, *Rechtsverhältnisse bei verschiedenen Völkern der Erde*, p. 174.

[2] Waitz, *Introduction to Anthropology*, p. 300.

[3] v. Humboldt, *op. cit.* vi. 10. [4] Dalton, *op. cit.* p. 41.

[5] Barth, *Reisen*, ii. 473. *Cf.* Möller, Pagels, and Gleerup, *op. cit.* i. 269.

[6] Finsch, 'Die Bewohner von Ponapé,' in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xii. 311, 314. Waitz-Gerland, *op. cit.* vol. v. pt. ii. 188 (Vaitupu); vi. 34 (Samoa). Krämer, *op. cit.* ii. 65 (Samoa). Wilkes, *op. cit.* iii. 355 (Fiji). Mariner, *op. cit.* ii. 266 (Tonga). Cook, *Voyage to the Pacific Ocean*, ii. 192, 232 (Atooi of the Sandwich Islands). Tautain, 'Sur le tatouage aux îles Marquises,' in *L'Anthropologie*, vii. 247. Hale, *U.S. Exploring Expedition*, vol. vi. Ethnography and Philology, p. 39 (Polynesians).

of clothing ;[1] but its primary object may have been a different one. De indigenis Tenimberis et Timorlaonis dum loquitur Riedel, adulescentes et puellas dicit saepe consulto abradere pilos pubis nulla alia mente, nisi ut illæ partes alteri sexui magis conspicuae fiant.[2] The sexual organs of both men and women are frequently subject to mutilations or other practices, the purpose of which may have been to make the person more attractive to the opposite sex. This is distinctly said to be the case with the artificial perforatio penis, followed by the insertion of some suitable object, which is in vogue among the Dyaks of Borneo and some other peoples. It is intended to increase the libido sexualis of the women and is therefore highly appreciated by them ; hence a man who has submitted to several such operations and consequently can carry several inserted objects is particularly sought after.[3] A very obscure form of mutilation, on the other hand, is the Australian subincision, generally practised at the age of puberty and consisting in cutting the lower wall of the urethra so that it is slit completely open from below, the cleft sometimes extending only halfway back, sometimes the whole way back to the scrotum. Various explanations of it have been suggested, the object most frequently assigned to it being that of limiting population by decreasing the chances of conception ; but nothing can be definitely stated as to its origin.[4] Following a suggestion made by myself, Mr.

[1] See Krämer, *op. cit.* ii. 65.

[2] Riedel, *op. cit.* p. 293. *Cf.* Zimmermann, *op. cit.* ii. 189 *sq.* (Papuans).

[3] Miklucho-Maclay, ' Ueber die künstliche Perforatio Penis bei den Dajaks auf Borneo,' in *Verhandl. Berliner Gesellsch. Anthrop.* 1876, p. 23. *Idem*, ' Perforatio glandis penis bei den Dajaks auf Borneo und analoge Sitten auf Celebes und auf Java,' *ibid.* p. 24 *sqq.* Hovorka, in *Mittheil. Anthrop. Gesellsch. Wien*, xxiv. 133 *sqq.*

[4] Schuermann, ' Aboriginal Tribes of Port Lincoln,' in Woods, *Native Tribes of South Australia*, p. 231. Miklucho-Maclay, ' Ueber die Mika-Operation in Central-Australien,' in *Verhandl. Berliner Gesellsch. Anthrop.* 1880, p. 85 *sqq.* Curr, *The Australian Race*, i. 75. Mathew, in *Jour. and Proceed. N. S. Wales*, xxiii. 411. Stuart, ' The " Mika " or " Kulpi " Operation of the Australian Aborigines,' *ibid.* xxx. 115 *sqq.* Bancroft, ' Note on Mutilations practised by

Mathew expresses the view that its aim is ornamentation and increased virility of appearance, and in support of this opinion he quotes a statement to the effect that in Central Australia, on the occasion of the rite of subincision being undergone, young men who have been operated upon once and even twice previously will voluntarily come forward and call upon the operators to enlarge the incision to the utmost; which shows that a pride is taken in the enlarged appearance.[1] It is only when a young man has been subject to this operation and thereby become a *kulpi* that he is considered to be a "thorough man"; and among the Dieri a *kulpi* alone has the privilege of appearing before the women in a state of perfect nudity.[2] Mr. Mathew observes that where subincision is practised, female introcision—that is, the forcible lacération and enlargement of the vaginal orifice—becomes inevitable, and that the latter therefore is a consequence of the operation performed upon the men.[3] In fact, as Dr. Roth points out, female introcision only takes place in those districts where male introcision (subincision) is practised, both being equally indispensable preliminaries to marriage; but according to him the former practice may have led to the latter. "It is possible," he says, "that the cutting of the perineum and general laceration, &c., of the female was originally a matter

Australian Aborigines,' *ibid.* vol. xxxi, p. xxvi. *sq.* Eylmann, *op. cit.* p. 118 *sqq.* Hovorka, in *Mittheil. Anthrop. Gesellsch. Wien*, xxiv. 132 *sq.* Stirling, *loc. cit.* pp. 26, 27, 33 *sq.* Stoll, *op. cit.* p. 527 *sqq.* Messrs. Spencer and Gillen, who give a detailed description of the practice (*Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 251 *sqq.*), state that at the present day, and as far back as their traditions go, the Arunta natives at least have no idea of its having been instituted with a view to preventing or even checking population; and they add (*ibid.* p. 264) that, as a matter of fact, it does not do it.

[1] Mathew, *Eaglehawk and Crow*, p. 121.

[2] Howitt, 'Diery and other kindred Tribes of Central Australia,' in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xx. 86 *sq.* Gason, *Dieyerie Tribe of Australian Aborigines*, p. 21 *sq.*

[3] Mathew, *Eaglehawk and Crow*, p. 121. *Cf.* Spencer and Gillen, *op. cit.* p. 263. On female introcision in Australia see *ibid.* p. 92 *sqq.*, and Spencer and Gillen, *Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 133 *sqq.*

of convenience for the male, the mutilation in her case subsequently coming to signify her fitness, capability, or experience in the art of the full enjoyment of copulation, and that, on the principle of a form of mimicry, the analogous sign was inflicted on the male to denote corresponding fitness on his part."[1] Thus even according to this theory subincision and female introcision ultimately owe their origin to the preference given to one of these practices by the opposite sex and to the other practice following as a consequence of it. In Ponapé, one of the Caroline Islands, again, a lad, on reaching marriageable age, is subject to semi-castration, according to Dr. Finsch both to escape the possibility of orchitis and because the girls consider men thus disfigured handsomer and more attractive than others; and the same custom prevails in Niutabutabu, of the Tonga Islands.[2]

The most widely spread of all the mutilations of the sexual organs is circumcision. It is in use among all Muhammadan peoples, among most of the tribes inhabiting the West Coast of Africa, among the Kafirs, among nearly all the peoples of Eastern Africa, among the Christian Abyssinians, Bogos, and Copts, throughout the various tribes inhabiting Madagascar,[3] and in the heart of the Black Continent, among the Mangbettu and Akka. It is practised very commonly in Australia, in many islands of Melanesia[4] and the Indian Archipelago,[5] and in Polynesia universally. It has also been met with in some parts of America, *e.g.*, in Yucatan,[6] on the Orinoco,[7] and among certain tribes of the

[1] Roth, *Ethnological Studies among the North-West-Central Queensland Aborigines*, p. 179 *sq.* See also *ibid.* p. 175.

[2] Finsch, in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xii. 316. Christian, *Caroline Islands*, p. 74.

[3] Sibree, *op. cit.* p. 217.

[4] Waitz-Gerland, *op. cit.* vi. 560 *sq.* Parkinson, *op. cit.* p. 182 (New Britain). Rivers, *History of Melanesian Society*, i. 292. A usual mode of "circumcision" in Melanesia and Polynesia is to split the prepuce longitudinally without the removal of any part.

[5] Schmidt, *Liebe und Ehe im alten und modernen Indien*, p. 186 *sq.*

[6] Lafitau, *Mœurs des sauvages ameriquains*, i. 412.

[7] v. Martius, *op. cit.* i. 582 note.

Rio Branco in Brazil.[1] The Jews, Muhammadans, Abyssinians, and a few other peoples being excepted, it is performed when the boy attains manhood; and where it is in use it is generally considered a necessary preliminary to marriage, "uncircumcised" being a bad word and the women often refusing all intercourse with such a man.[2]

Many different explanations of this custom have been suggested.[3] A frequent belief is that it was adopted from hygienic motives. But, as Andree points out, circumcised and uncircumcised peoples live in the same neighbourhood side by side, without any difference in their physical condition;[4] Sturt observes that in Australia "you would meet with a tribe with which that custom did not prevail, between

[1] Wallace, *Travels on the Amazon*, p. 517. For the distribution of circumcision see Andree, 'Die Beschneidung,' in *Archiv f. Anthropologie*, xiii. 53 *sqq.*; *Idem*, *Ethnographische Parallelen und Vergleiche, Neue Folge*, p. 166 *sqq.*; Ploss-Renz, *Das Kind*, ii. 157 *sqq.*; Stoll, *op. cit.* p. 499 *sqq.*; Zaborowski, 'La circoncision, ses origines et sa répartition en Afrique et à Madagascar,' in *L'Anthropologie*, vii. 653 *sqq.*—The prevalence of circumcision in ancient Japan has been inferred from the present notion that it is a shame "pour les Japonais d'être *kawakamuri*, c'est-à-dire d'avoir le gland recouvert par le prépuce. . . . Tout Japonais qui se respecte se présente soit aux bains publics soit à une visite médicale, avec un gland entièrement découvert" (Laloy, 'Déformations des organes génitaux chez les Japonais,' in *L'Anthropologie*, xiv. 375).

[2] Andree, in *Archiv f. Anthropologie*, xiii. p. 75. Bastian, *Rechtsverhältnisse*, p. xx. Krämer, *Die Samoa-Inseln*, ii. 61. Ellis, *Yoruba-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast*, p. 67. Weeks, 'Anthropological Notes on the Bangala of the Upper Congo River,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xl. 402.

[3] See, *e.g.*, Hovorka, in *Mittheil. Anthrop. Gesellsch. Wien*, xxiv. 135; Waitz-Gerland, *op. cit.* vi. 41, 784; Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, ii. 67; Müller, *Allgemeine Ethnographie*, p. 337 *sq.*; Burton, 'Notes on the Dahoman,' in *Memoirs Anthr. Soc. London*, i. 318; Reade, *Savage Africa*, p. 539 *sq.*; Modigliani, *Un viaggio a Nias*, p. 702; Thomson, *Fijians*, p. 217; Meiners, *Allgemeine kritische Geschichte der Religionen*, ii. 467; Trusen, *Die Sitten und Gebräuche der alten Hebräer*, p. 117 *sqq.*; Frazer, *Magic Art*, i. 92 *sqq.*; *Idem*, *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament*, ii. 330; Gray, 'Circumcision (Introductory),' in Hastings, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, iii. 664 *sqq.*

[4] Andree, in *Archiv f. Anthropologie*, xiii. 78.

two with which it did."[1] Moreover, as Spencer remarks, while circumcision does not exist among the most cleanly races in the world, it is common among the most uncleanly ;[2] among the Herero and Bechuanas, for example, the boys are circumcised, though these peoples are described as exceedingly filthy in their habits.[3] It seems more probable that circumcision has something to do with the superstitious fear of sexual "uncleanness."[4] Mr. Purcell states that in Australian tribes practising it "no man, woman, or youth, that has been circumcised, will take food from a boy of his own tribe who has not undergone the rite. Should a man from an uncircumcising tribe visit these people, they won't eat in his presence, as they don't consider him clean."[5] So also in Fiji uncircumcised youths were regarded as unclean, and were not permitted to carry food for the chiefs.[6] The Yoruba-speaking peoples of the Slave Coast call circumcision "the cutting that saves."[7] The Muhammadans regard it as "cleansing": by circumcision "the boy becomes clean, and capable of performing religious exercises, of praying and entering the mosque." [8]

The most satisfactory explanation which has been suggested for this practice is, in my opinion, that it at once makes the boy a man and gives him the appearance of sexual maturity,[9] or that it by giving him such an appearance is supposed to make him a man capable of procreation.[10] Grown-up girls would then no longer have any objection to him, and circumcision, also, might thus be regarded as a means of sexual attraction, whether intended to be so or

[1] Sturt, *Narrative of an Expedition into Central Australia*, ii. 140.

[2] Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, ii. 67.

[3] Galton, *Narrative of an Explorer in Tropical South Africa*, p. 192 *sq.* Andersson, *Lake Ngami*, p. 465.

[4] *Cf.* Crawley, *Mystic Rose*, p. 137 *sq.*

[5] Purcell, 'Rites and Customs of Australian Aborigines,' in *Verhandl. Berliner Gesellsch. Anthrop.* 1893, p. 287.

[6] Williams and Calvert, *op. cit.* p. 144.

[7] Ellis, *Yoruba-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast*, p. 67.

[8] Ploss-Renz, *Das Kind*, ii. 167. Klunzinger, *Upper Egypt*, p. 195.

[9] Ploss-Renz, *op. cit.* ii. 147. Andree, *Ethnographische Parallelen, Neue Folge*, p. 211 *sq.* von den Steinen, *op. cit.* p. 198 *sq.*

[10] Parkinson, *op. cit.* p. 182 (New Britain).

not. In Tanna, one of the New Hebrides, where the prepuce is so cut as to leave a wing on each side forming a large lump underneath, it is considered that "the larger the operation, the more of a man does it make the boy."[1] Dr. von den Steinen observes that the Brazilian practice of stretching and tying up the prepuce has the same effect as circumcision and may therefore be performed from the same motive, although he also regards it as a protection against insects.[2] Among the Pawumwa Indians it is especially unmarried men who are addicted to it.[3]

Among many peoples of Africa and in certain tribes of the Malay Archipelago and South America the girls also undergo a sort of circumcision, which is likewise looked upon as a necessary preliminary to marriage.[4] Sunt autem gentes, quarum contrarius mos est, ut clitoris et labia minora non exsecentur, verum extendantur, et saepe longissime extendantur. Atque ista etiam deformatio insigne pulchritudinis existimatur.[5] De indigenis Ponapéis haec adnotat Finsch: labia interna longius extenta et pendentia puellis et uxoribus singulare sunt incitamentum, quae res eodem modo se habet apud alias gentes, ut apud Hottentottas.[6] Speaking of this practice among the Bawenda in Northern Transvaal, a German missionary says that it is considered a matter of great importance for the marriage of a girl. Before the young man pays the bride price he tries to satisfy himself as to the accuracy of the information he has received on the matter; for "the more the labia pudendi protuberate the more pleased they are."[7]

[1] Gray, 'Some Notes on the Tannese,' in *Report of the Fourth Meeting of the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science, held at Hobart, in* 1902, p. 659.

[2] von den Steinen, *op. cit.* p. 199.

[3] Haseman, in *American Anthropologist*, N. S. xiv. 342.

[4] See Ploss-Bartels, *Das Weib*, i. 246 *sqq.*; Ploss-Renz, *Das Kind*, ii. 220 *sqq.*; Gray, in Hastings, *op. cit.* iii. 667 *sqq.*

[5] Ploss-Bartels, *Das Weib*, i. 243 *sq.* Ploss-Renz, *Das Kind*, ii. 215 *sqq.* [6] Finsch, in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* xii. 316.

[7] Wessmann, 'Reife-Unsitten bei den Bawenda in Nord-Transvaal,' in *Verhandl. Berliner Gesellsch. Anthrop.* 1896, p. 363. See also Stannus, 'Notes on some Tribes of British Central Africa,' in *Jour. Roy. Anthr. Inst.* xl. 317.

Among means of attraction directly connected with the sexual centre may also perhaps be counted certain attitudes exhibited by women among naked tribes. These attitudes, for example their postures when they sit on the ground, have been regarded as signs of modesty; and their object may undoubtedly be to conceal something which otherwise might attract unpleasant attention. But at the same time they imply consciousness of certain facts, and the exhibition of this consciousness is hardly a mark of undiluted bashfulness. There is a close connection between concealment and allurement, and coquetry borders on modesty. Stirling says of some Australian natives, "As to the women it was nearly always to be observed that, when seen in camp without clothing, they, especially the younger ones, exhibited by their attitudes a keen sense of modesty if indeed a consciousness of their nakedness can be thus considered."[1] Dr. Eylmann states that among those natives both the younger men and women are more conceited of their pudenda than of any other part of their bodies, the face alone excepted.[2]

M. Reinach finds it difficult to believe that evolution can transform a sentiment into its contrary and make modesty grow out of a sort of "exhibitionism."[3] And many a reader will probably share his scepticism and ask how it is that clothing has come to be required by decency if it was originally adopted as a lure. No doubt, as everybody knows, modesty is very closely associated with clothing. Even peoples living in warm climates, whose covering is as scanty as possible, may be utterly ashamed to appear without it. The women of the tribes of South Andaman are so modest that they will not remove their small apron of leaves, or put anything in its place, in the presence of any person, even of their own sex.[4] The Fijians, "though almost naked, . . . have a great idea of modesty, and consider it extremely indelicate to expose the whole person. If either

[1] Stirling, *loc. cit.* p. 36 *sq.* [2] Eylmann, *op. cit.* p. 127.

[3] Reinach, 'La prohibition de l'inceste et ses origines,' in *L'Anthropologie*, x. 69.

[4] Man, in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* xii. 330 *sq.*

a man or woman should be discovered without the *maro*, or *liku*, they would probably be killed."[1] Among the Pelew Islanders the women have an unlimited privilege of striking, fining, or, if it be done on the spot, killing any man who makes his way into their bathing-places.[2] In those Australian tribes where a covering is worn by the women they will retire out of sight to bathe.[3] The women of Nukahiva have only one small covering, but are so tenacious of it that the most licentious will not consent to take it off; and the men, who wear nothing but a string round the prepuce, are utterly ashamed if it happens to fall off.[4] The Admiralty Islanders, according to Moseley, always cover themselves hastily on removing their pubic shell for barter, and evidently consider that they are exposing themselves "either indecently or irreligiously" if they show themselves perfectly nude.[5] Facts of this sort, however, can be easily explained without the supposition that the covering which is now required by decency also was at first adopted from a similar motive.

"The ideas of modesty," Forster truly remarks, "are different in every country, and change in different periods of time."[6] Speaking of the mouth ornament worn by the women of Port des Français in Alaska, which makes the lower part of the mouth jut out two or three inches, La Pérouse says, "We sometimes prevailed on them to pull off this ornament, to which they with difficulty agreed; they then testified the same embarrassment, and made the same gestures, as a woman in Europe who discovers her bosom."[7] Von Humboldt wrote:—"A woman in some parts of Asia is not permitted to show the ends of her fingers; while an Indian of the Caribbean race is far from considering herself naked, when she wears a *guajuco* two inches broad. Even this band is regarded as a less essential part of dress

[1] Wilkes, *op. cit.* iii. 356. [2] Semper, *Die Palau-Inseln*, p. 68.
[3] Curr, *The Australian Race*, i. 99. [4] Lisiansky, *op. cit.* p. 85 *sq.*
[5] Moseley, in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.* vi. 398. *Cf.* Labillardière, *op. cit.* i. 279 *sq.*; v. Krusenstern, *op. cit.* i. 156.
[6] Forster, *op. cit.* ii. 383.
[7] La Pérouse, *Voyage round the World*, ii. 142.

than the pigment which covers the skin. To go out of the hut without being painted with arnotta, is to transgress all the rules of Caribbean decency."[1] In Tonga a man would consider it very indecent not to be tattooed.[2] A Muhammadan woman who is used to veil her face would blush exceedingly for showing it bare. The Tubori women in Central Africa, who wear only a narrow strap to which is attached a twig hanging down behind, feel greatly ashamed if the twig happens to fall off.[3] Savages in Sumatra and Celebes who carefully cover the knee consider it highly improper to expose it.[4] In China a woman must not show her foot to any other man than her husband; it is even improper to speak of a woman's foot, and in decent pictures this part of the body is always concealed under the dress.[5]

These instances are sufficient to show how relative and conventional the ideas of modesty often are. Where it is the custom to paint or tattoo the body, people are ashamed to appear unpainted or untattooed. Where women are in the habit of covering their faces, such a covering is considered indispensable for every modest woman. Where people for some reason or other have come to conceal the foot, the knee, or the ends of the fingers, their modesty prevents the exposure of the part which is hidden. Nobody would doubt that in these cases it is the covering that has caused the feeling of modesty and not modesty that has caused the covering. Or are we to believe that the shame we should feel if we walked about barefooted is the original cause of our wearing boots? The feeling of shame, as Bain puts it, "is resolved by a reference to the dread of being condemned, or ill-thought of, by others."[6] Custom is a tyrant who threatens with condemnation, disgrace, or

[1] v. Humboldt, *op. cit.* vi. 12 *sq.* [2] Mariner, *op. cit.* ii. 267.
[3] 'Dr. E. Vogel's Reise nach Central-Afrika,' in Petermann's *Mittheilungen*, 1857, p. 138.
[4] Crawfurd, *History of the Indian Archipelago*, i. 209.
[5] Stricker, 'Der Fuss der Chinesinnen,' in *Archiv f. Anthropologie*, iv. 243.
[6] Bain, *Emotions and the Will*, p. 211.

scorn anybody who acts in defiance of its rules. Whatever be the foundation for a certain practice, and however trivial it may be, people have a tendency to disapprove or deride any marked deviation from it for the simple reason that such a deviation is unusual. The young ladies of Balonda, wholly unconscious of their own deficiency, could not maintain their gravity at the sight of the naked backs of Livingstone's men. "Much to the annoyance of my companions," he says, "the young girls laughed outright whenever their backs were turned to them, for the Balonda men wear a dress consisting of skins of small animals, hanging before and behind from a girdle round the loins."[1] By degrees the custom may be associated with religion and then becomes even more powerful than it was before. We are told of a Fijian priest who, like all his countrymen, was satisfied with a *masi*, or scanty hip-cloth, but on hearing a description of the naked inhabitants of New Caledonia and of their idols, exclaimed contemptuously, "Not have a *masi* and yet pretend to have gods!"[2] And, as Peschel remarks, "were a pious Mussulman of Ferghana to be present at our balls, and see the bare shoulders of our wives and daughters, and the semi-embraces of our round dances, he would silently wonder at the long-suffering of Allah, who had not long ago poured fire and brimstone on this sinful and shameless generation."[3]

Like the uncovering of any other part of the body, so also the exposure of the pubic region, if usually concealed, would be apt to cause a feeling of shame as a transgression of the rule of custom. But this is by no means the complete explanation of the shame felt at such exposure. Sexual modesty, which leads to the concealment of the sexual function, is apt to be hurt by the sight of a part of the body which too openly directs the thought to that function. Such is not generally the case with nakedness when the eye is used to it, but it is different with a nakedness to which

[1] Livingstone, *Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa*, p. 305.

[2] Williams, quoted by Peschel, *Races of Man*, p. 171.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 171.

the eye is *not* used.[1] This explanation may seem somewhat contradictory to the theory that clothing originated as a sexual lure. If modesty forbids the exposure of a part which is usually covered, because of its association with the sexual function, why did it not for the same reason forbid the alluring covering of that part when previously exposed? The answer to this question lies in the fact that modesty draws a distinction between discreet invitation and coarse and open provocation. The former is pleasing and therefore not to be ashamed of, the latter is repulsive and therefore regarded as shameful. But the limit between that which modesty allows and that which it forbids is not fixed and well defined. As we have seen, there are naked savages who are ashamed to cover themselves, and on the other hand there are clothed savages who are not ashamed to show themselves naked. All depends on what is felt as shocking and what is not. Thus it is not correct to say, as does M. Reinach, that the modesty which avoids nakedness is the opposite of the feeling which led to covering as a means of attraction. The desire to avoid something repugnant is not the opposite of the desire to be attractive.

The inferences made in this and the preceding chapter may perhaps seem to be opposed to the marked tendency

[1] If some peoples, like the Takulli (Harmon, *op. cit.* p. 286), Aleut (Georgi, *Beschreibung aller Nationen des russischen Reichs*, p. 364 *sq.*; Dall, *Alaska*, pp. 139, 397), and the Ita Eskimo (Kane, *Arctic Explorations*, ii. 114), who cover almost the entire body, nevertheless feel as little shame in regard to nakedness "as the very brute creation," the reason for it is that the warmth of the summer sun or the heat of their dwellings in the winter induces them to throw off all their clothes, so that they are used to complete nakedness as well as to clothing. On the east coast of Greenland the Eskimo men and women, when indoors, are perfectly naked with the exception of the *nâtit*, a narrow band about the loins, of dimensions "so extremely small as to make it practically invisible to the stranger's inexperienced eye" (Nansen, *First Crossing of Greenland*, i. 338; ii. 277). The fact that peoples who are used to extensive clothing are particularly ashamed to expose the pubic region shows that modesty with regard to that part of the body cannot be due to the influence of habit alone.

in modern anthropology to look for superstitious origins of savage customs. With this tendency I am in full sympathy. My research work in Morocco has convinced me that in very many cases the belief in magic forces is at the bottom of customs which have never before been traced to such a cause; and I have little doubt that in the genesis of practices which we have now discussed superstition has played a larger part than is known at present.[1] But at the same time it should be remembered that the sexual impulse is even more primitive than the belief in mysterious or supernatural forces and agents. We have therefore no right to assume, without direct evidence, that what is now looked upon as a sexual stimulant originally was something else; and even if it is known to have been so, it may from the beginning have been a sexual stimulant as well. An object may be attached to the body both as a charm and as an ornament; and the little apron of a savage girl may have been adopted for the double purpose of concealing something unpleasant or disgusting and of positively increasing her attractions.[2]

It has been argued that savages would not endeavour to ornament themselves in order to become attractive to the opposite sex unless their girls enjoyed great liberty in the choice of a mate; that such liberty is generally wanting in the savage world; and that consequently the practices which have been interpreted as means of attraction must have another meaning. This argument, however, suffers from several defects. Men are not indifferent to the feelings of women and the impression they make upon them even though they can force to submission the women they desire. Where a girl is not allowed to choose her husband she may nevertheless be able to choose her lover. Though not consulted when asked in marriage, it may lie in her power to

[1] This has recently been much emphasised by Dr. Karsten (*op. cit. passim*), who, in fact, assigns superstitious motives to all sorts of "self-decoration" as practised among the South American Indians. See also Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, iv. 194, 200–202, 207; Landtman, *Kulturens ursprungsformer*, p. 203.

[2] *Cf.* Ellis, *op. cit.* vol. i. Evolution of Modesty, p. 59.

influence the proceedings in some way or other, and if given away against her will she may manage to dissolve the union. But very frequently savage women have considerable liberty to choose their husbands; and we have reason to suppose that under more primitive conditions they were freer in that respect than they are at somewhat higher stages of culture. This subject will be discussed in a following chapter.

END OF VOL. I.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY THE CORNWALL PRESS, LTD.,
PARIS GARDEN, STAMFORD STREET, LONDON, S.E. 1.